



LIBRARY  
Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

No. Case, *D/27* .....  
No. Shelf, Section *38* .....  
No. Book, No. ....

The John M. Krebs Donation.

SCC  
2384





























# ELEMENTS

OF

## PROPHETICAL INTERPRETATION.

BY

THE REV. J. W. BROOKS,

VICAR OF CLAREBRO', RETFORD.



PHILADELPHIA:

ORRIN ROGERS, 67 SOUTH SECOND STREET.

E. G. Dorsey, Printer.

1841.



# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
On the Use and Importance of Prophecy, - - - -	9

## CHAPTER II.

The Covenant of Promise, - - - -	17
----------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER III.

The Voice of the Church, - - - -	31
----------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER IV.

On the Interpretation of Prophecy, - - - -	83
--	----

## CHAPTER V.

On the Second Advent of Christ, - - - -	118
---	-----

## CHAPTER VI.

The Kingdom of Christ, - - - -	133
--------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER VII.

The Judgment, - - - -	150
-----------------------	-----

## CHAPTER VIII.

The Restoration of Israel, and the New Jerusalem Dispensation,	180
--	-----

## CHAPTER IX.

On Daniel and the Apocalypse, - - - -	219
---------------------------------------	-----

## CHAPTER X.

On Time Mystically Expressed,	-	-	-	-	-	-	241
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

## CHAPTER XI.

On the Antichrist,	-	-	-	-	-	-	254
--------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

## CHAPTER XII.

The Ten Kingdoms—the Name of the Beast—the Two Witnesses— the Prophetical Dates,	-	-	-	-	-	-	302
APPENDIX,	-	-	-	-	-	-	343

TO THE  
REV. EDWARD BICKERSTETH,  
RECTOR OF WATTON, HERTS.

---

DEAR CHRISTIAN FRIEND,

THE feelings of my heart, combined with the circumstances of the case, prompt me to inscribe this volume to you, who are instrumentally the cause of its appearance, and to whom I am indebted for many suggestions afforded me during its progress. I may indeed truly assert, that I should not have entered on the work but at your solicitation; and had you not urged on me the undertaking, as a duty which I owed to the Church of Christ. Not that I would have any infer from this, that you fully accord with all that the book contains: for though I believe that we have been led into the same views in the general, and I trust by the guidance of the Spirit of God; yet am I bound to acknowledge that there are in the *latter* chapters some particulars, concerning which you either differ or are disposed to hesitate.

In regard to the topics of the two latter chapters, I would state farther, in the way of apology for their appearance, that had I not been in a measure *compelled* to treat of them, by the course which was previously laid down for me, I should not have entered upon them at all. I have several times, in the course of this volume, drawn the attention of the reader to the circumstance, that Prophecy may be divided into two principal portions; viz. that which, in the main, is delivered in plain and literal terms, and that which is involved in symbols and mystical expressions. As regards the former portion, my mind is, in the general, fully persuaded; and as I consider it as plain

to be understood, and as susceptible of demonstration, as any other subject of divine revelation, so I have not hesitated to treat it with the same degree of confidence and decision that I should discuss the doctrine of *justification*. In regard, however, to the other portion, the meaning of which, independent of its application, is not always so apparent, I confess my own mind is not on several points decidedly made up; and I have therefore felt reluctant to commit myself on topics, which I do not clearly and convincingly see my way in. Much injury has been done to the cause of prophetic interpretation by writers publishing their views too hastily; insomuch that some have no sooner caught a glimpse of what they have imagined to be the correct meaning of a passage, than they have immediately given it to the world, and have almost as quickly been led to recall or to modify their statements. I have seen, however, that a work of the description which I have been induced to undertake would be exceedingly defective, did it not comprehend *both* classes of Prophecy; and I have therefore resolved at least to prepare for the student such *information* concerning the latter class as I possessed, or was within my reach; preferring on these points rather to assume the functions of the historian than of the expositor. If indeed I must speak the truth, there is a lamentable want among professing Christians of ordinary information on all subjects connected with Prophecy; the consciousness of which deters many from entering seriously upon its investigation; and it has consequently been a special object with me throughout, that the laborious minister, who is prevented by his numerous avocations from reading many works, may have at hand something like a summary of the history of prophetic interpretation, together with the principles brought into view, on which all prophetic interpretation should proceed.

It is almost superfluous, after the above statement, to add, that I am greatly indebted for many things, both in the way of exposition and of information, to the writings of others. If I have not always quoted their works by name, it has been because I have omitted in many instances to take extracts; and my recollection sometimes fails to supply me even with the *name* of the author to whom I stand indebted. I have occasionally also been obliged to take authorities at second hand, from the want of access, in a country town, to the original authors: though I trust that I have in no case done this where the matter quoted is of fundamental importance to the argument in hand. At the same time, however, that I make these acknowledgments, I feel myself equally called upon to declare, in regard to the first class of prophecies to which I



have alluded, that my opinions have been formed almost entirely upon a careful and independent study of the Scriptures.

In referring to the works of contemporary writers, I have occasionally felt it a duty to the reader to speak of their works, or of particular points in their works, in the language of animadversion. But I nevertheless most freely acknowledge, that I by no means consider myself entitled to act the censor; and there is scarcely one of those, whose writings may fall under observation, to whom I am not disposed to acknowledge my inferiority.

I ought likewise to apologize for some inadvertencies and repetitions which will be found in the work. These must be placed to the account of the large demands which have been made upon my time from other quarters during its progress, and which have frequently not only distracted my attention, but drawn largely, I fear, upon your patience and that of the much respected publishers of the work. And after all, my dear friend, I cannot but feel, that you have entrusted this important work to very feeble hands; and that the reader will not only speedily discover this, but marvel that you have not rather undertaken it yourself. Had I been aware, indeed, before I was well advanced in it, that your "*Practical Remarks on the Prophecies*" would have been so greatly enlarged as they have been subsequently in your "*Practical Guide*," I should altogether have declined the undertaking, and have urged you instead to have still more largely extended that publication; which I am persuaded would have been far more acceptable and instructive to the religious public, than any thing that can be advanced by me.

Such, however, as the work is, I now send it forth to the Christian Church, humbly thanking our blessed Master who has enabled me to bring it to a conclusion. It is an encouraging circumstance to me to know, that the little volume published under the title of *Abdiel's Essays*, of which you have first betrayed me to be the Author, has been owned of the Lord in directing serious attention to the solemn truths of prophecy;\* and it is still farther encouraging to find the numbers daily increasing of able and pious ministers, who, from your writings and those of others, are becoming sensible of the duty of investigating this important branch of Scripture, and are beginning to be persuaded of the *pre-millennial* advent of our Lord. I earnestly beseech him still more abundantly to bless our mutual labours, to the setting forth of his glory, and

\* One or two sections of the above mentioned work have necessarily been repeated, with some alteration, in this volume.

to the leading many of his children, who are now slumbering in respect to his approach, to arise and trim their lamps, "and to stand with their loins girt and their lights burning, and themselves like unto men that wait for their Lord, when he will return from the wedding; that when he cometh and knocketh they may open unto him immediately. BLESSED are those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching!" (Luke xii.)

Believe me to be, my dear Christian Friend and Brother in the Lord, yours affectionately in the faith and hope of Christ's speedy appearing,

J. W. BROOKS.

*Retford, October, 1836.*

# ON PROPHECY.

---

## CHAPTER I.

### ON THE USE AND IMPORTANCE OF PROPHECY.

It excites a painful feeling in the writer of this volume, when he reflects, that circumstances render it necessary, that a work on *Prophecy*, intended more especially for the use of *Christian* readers, needs to be commenced with arguments on the importance and advantage of *taking heed thereto*. One would suppose it were enough for any who acknowledge the Bible to be a revelation from JEHOVAH, merely to remind them of the Apostle's declaration—"ALL *Scripture* is profitable;" and that then, without caring for the obloquy cast upon the study, and the seeming obscurity in which prophecy is involved, they would, like Mary, "diligently keep" all these sayings of the Spirit, "and ponder them in their hearts." Such, however, is the prejudice and misapprehension which Satan has contrived to raise up against this portion of the word of God, that, like those who in the early ages pleaded for Christianity itself, we must now adopt the tone and language of apologists.

1. It must surely be regarded as a most alarming symptom, connected with the signs of these alarming times, that professors of serious religion should require to have the practical use of *any* portion of SCRIPTURE demonstrated to them, before they will give it serious attention; if they will even do it then. For is it not affronting to the Deity to suppose, that he would reveal any thing to his church not calculated to edify it, or which individual members of it may wilfully neglect, without serious detriment to their souls? Let us only imagine, that the Lord were now personally to manifest himself in an assembly of Christians, and were to converse with them on those things revealed in the prophets: should we not be inclined to conclude of that man, who should make light of his discourse

because he got upon the subject of *prophecy*,—or who should even betray, by indifference or inattention, that he took not a lively interest in it,—that he was an *unbeliever*, and had not had the love of God shed abroad in his heart by that Holy Ghost who *spake by the prophets*? Now we might, possibly, be wrong in concluding to so great an extent as this; for marvellous indeed is the power of *prejudice* even in good men: but we could not avoid concluding of such a one, that he was under the influence of some strange delusion, and was obnoxious to the rebuke of being “*slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken.*” The application must be obvious, to those at least who acknowledge the *written word* to be equally the word of God, as if he were now visible on earth declaring it.\*

2. It may, however, be probably objected by some, that they do not question the authority and profitableness of all Scripture *in the general*; but they conceive prophecy to be *comparatively* of less importance and less profitable than other doctrines, which they therefore deem it better chiefly to regard. From the present circumstances of the church of Christ, there is a something which appears plausible in this objection; but it will be found, nevertheless, upon examination, opposed to that practical deference and subjection to the word of God, which the believer must avow it to be his duty to yield, and therefore mischievous in principle. Those who have any experimental acquaintance with divine things must be aware how impossible it is, in the first place, for any man to judge of the practical tendency of a doctrine, until he has first heartily embraced it, or experienced somewhat of its power. Till then, he either regards it with indifference, or is decidedly opposed to it, as dangerous and liable to abuse. Many conceive the doctrine of justification by faith without the preferable course is to keep it in the back ground, and the works of the law to be unfavourable to holiness, and that to insist on moral duties. Many imagine further, that to preach the need of the Holy Spirit’s aid, for every good thought, and word, and work, is calculated to paralyze human

\* As a proof that we might be wrong in concluding altogether against the piety of such, note the prejudice and unbelief exhibited in regard to truths of fundamental importance, by men whose election of God we cannot question. The necessity for the death of Jesus was not understood by any of his disciples before the event; and Peter in particular, is rebuked, as speaking after Satan, and not of God, in this matter (Matt. xiv. 23). Thomas was wonderfully sceptical, in regard to the resurrection from the dead. All the disciples, even after the outpouring of the Spirit, were prejudiced in some measure against the calling of the Gentiles; whilst numbers of sincere persons had their minds warped in regard to the important doctrine of justification by faith. These things ought at least to make us slow to judge our brethren.

exertion, and to weaken the motives to personal diligence. And how much greater a number cannot conceive of the doctrine of *election*, "that it doth, in godly persons, greatly establish and confirm the faith of eternal salvation, and fervently kindle their love towards God."\* To admit the propriety, therefore, of ministers judging for themselves what is *comparatively* important in the case of prophecy, is to admit the principle in every other case; whereas numbers of those who have been disposed to think this in regard to prophecy, would contend, in the instances just enumerated, that it is a minister's duty "to declare the *whole counsel* of God."

There are circumstances, however, which appear not only to render the question of the practical utility and comparative importance of prophecy in a measure capable of demonstration; but which even seem to bespeak its *superior* importance. First, may be instanced, the comparative *bulk* of the prophetic scriptures: for if we regard the number of books directly prophetic, together with the copious prophetic passages in other books, especially the Psalms, the declared typical character of much scripture history, (1 Cor. x. 11.) of the ceremonial law, of the tabernacle service, (Epistle to Hebrews, *passim*,) all which, as they were adumbrations of *things to come*, partook of a prophetic complexion; the natural and unprejudiced conclusion would be, that the subject is of very *great* importance. Secondly, we may notice, that as the prophets, under the Mosaical dispensation, interwove with their instructions continual warnings and admonitions of future events; so, under the New Testament dispensation, the incidental reference to the future is of continual occurrence; and there is really no doctrine in the New Testament supported by so many independent passages *practically applying* it, as may be adduced from the gospels and epistles in behalf of those views, which form the great sum and substance of prophetic truth;† and perhaps there is no better mode of estimating the practical tendency of a doctrine, than by a reference to the frequency with which the Holy Ghost has himself practically applied it. Intimately connected with this latter circumstance is the manner in which we find, from the scriptures, the church has actually been sustained, in the midst of fiery trials, by the hope derived from prophecy: which is indeed one very important use and intent of it. For example: the whole cloud of witnesses, mentioned in Heb. xi., who at various periods bore testimony to the truth, *were tortured, not accepting deliverance, that they might*

\* See Article xvii. of the Church of England.

† See this point proved at large, with the practical proofs adduced, in the Investigator, or Monthly Expositor on Prophecy, vol. i. pages 21, 67, and 237.

obtain a better resurrection; which hope both animated and supported them, (Heb. xi. 10, 14, 16, 39.) And the hope derived from prophecy of things to come sustained the primitive Christians, and likewise the Reformers, in some of their severest trials both of body and mind.

3. But there is another plausible objection must now be met. For it is by some conceded, that *fulfilled* prophecy may be useful: it is **not** only *unfulfilled* prophecy they consider dangerous, and its study to be consequently avoided. The intelligent reader will at once perceive, that even *this* dogma would still divert us from the cordial reception and serious consideration of a *portion* of God's word: but not only so, it betrays a great want of acquaintance with the intent and use of prophecy. For the believer derives but little advantage from *fulfilled* prophecy, so far as he is himself *personally* concerned. Its chief use to him is a weapon against the infidel and sceptic: and it has proved mighty in this respect (particularly of late in the hands of Mr. Keith\*) as an evidence of the truth of Christianity. The believer wants not this evidence to convince *him*: it will afford him, indeed, an exalted notion of the prescience of that God whom he already adores; and it is further useful to assist him to a right apprehension of that which is *un-fulfilled*, and to increase his confidence in its accomplishment; but he is more concerned to keep his eye continually fixed upon the *latter*, on the right understanding of which does the correctness of his views in regard to the expectations and destinies of the church entirely depend. Thus the apostles appealed continually to the fulfilled prophecies, to convince those who were not persuaded that Jesus was the Christ; but the attention of believers in him is constantly directed to the hope of his coming again in glory, and to the circumstances which are to precede and accompany that event.

But let us suppose an ingenuous inquirer were induced implicitly to adopt the notion, that it were unsafe to give heed to other than fulfilled prophecy; in what perplexity would he find himself immediately involved! For how is he, in the first place, to ascertain what is fulfilled and what unfulfilled, without studying both?† Prophecies containing warnings must, according to this system, not be studiously considered until the danger be overpast in regard to which the warning is given; whereby the purport and use of such prophecies would be manifestly frustrated. And unless the mind were become

\* See the Evidence of Prophecy, by the Rev. A. Keith.

† The absurdity is the more apparent in the present day, when a race of interpreters is springing up, (as the Rev. S. R. Maitland, the Rev. W. Burgh, &c.) who argue of many large portions of prophecy, supposed by the majority of commentators to be fulfilled, that they are yet unaccomplished.



familiar with them, it would not be possible to recognise the events as the accomplishment of prophecy when they *did* come to pass: the want of which familiarity with their prophets prevented the Jews, during our Lord's ministry on earth, from perceiving and understanding the peculiar signs of their own times, and exposed them to the severe rebuke and awful charge of *HYPOCRISY!*\* Many, indeed, who allow that it is proper to study fulfilled prophecy, do not intend to go the full extent of the admission they make: viz. they do not approve of making the application of it to *their own times*, even though the things predicted be accomplishing before their eyes. They have no objection to consider prophecies which they presume to have been accomplished some two or three centuries, or two or three thousand years back; but when they come to be urged with those things that apparently belong to the age in which we live, they deprecate the presumption of such a use of prophecy as warmly, as if some one had affected to offer them an oracular interpretation of what was unfulfilled.

Various other instances, which illustrate the duty and the practical advantages of taking heed to unfulfilled prophecy, will come before us in the course of this volume: one or two, however, of a remarkable and decisive character, may in this place be brought forward. The first is contained in Jeremiah xxvii. wherein is a prophecy concerning the dominion and greatness given for a time to the king of Babylon; insomuch that all nations should serve him and his son's son; after which he should suffer a reverse, and all nations should serve themselves of him. Now, on the conviction from the inspired word, that only those nations should enjoy quiet who would at once peaceably submit to the yoke of the king of Babylon, the prophet exhorts his countrymen at once to go and be subject to him, warning them of the fatal consequences if they should rather listen to those who prophesied *peace*. *This was unfulfilled prophecy:* and can we conceive it possible for a practical application of scripture to be more bold, and at the same time more unpalatable, than that made by Jeremiah? Was it not calculated to expose him to the reproach of being an indiscreet and unsober visionary, alarmist and fanatic? was not its tendency such as might plausibly be questioned by worldly

\* Why of *hypocrisy*? It would be well if all religious professors would seriously consider what appears to be the ground of this charge. They were persons *professing* godliness to whom it was spoken. Now they did take so much interest in *worldly* matters, as to think it worth their while to notice the signs of the heavens, and to judge from them what sort of weather was likely to follow; but though affecting to esteem heavenly things of far more importance, they betrayed, *by the very circumstance of neglecting prophecy*, that they were not really in *earnest* about them. See Matt. xvi. 3.

men, and suited to bring on the prophet (as indeed it did) the suspicion of being a traitor in the pay of the king of Babylon? What instance can be pointed to in modern times, even among abuses of the study, (which have undoubtedly occurred), more fitted to prejudice men against prophecy than this? Yet where can we turn for a more decided proof of the peril of those who despise or disparage unfulfilled prophecy.

The above instance is taken from the more literal prophecies; the next shall be from those which, by the generality of commentators, are declared to be veiled in symbol or allegory; of which the most prominent and copious is the Apocalypse of St. John. Could it be lawful in any instance to neglect prophecy, we should surely find some intimations of it in connection with such a book as this. We might expect to find it open with a warning of the danger of misapprehending or misapplying it, or even of meddling with it at all until fulfilled. But instead of this we have, at its opening, first, an express encouragement for *ministers* to bring it before their people; (*blessed is he that READETH*)—secondly, a blessing pronounced also on those who *attend* to him when he does so; (*and they that HEAR the words of this prophecy*)—thirdly, a blessing on the devout bearing it in mind, (*and that KEEP those things which are written therein,*) (Rev. i. 3.) And the book concludes by declaring that he is *accursed* who keeps this prophecy, or any part of it, back: for such is the scope of the words—“If any man shall take away from the *words* of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book,” (Rev. xxii. 19.) How different is this from the admonitions of the danger of looking at prophecy, put forth so frequently in an authoritative tone, by those who ought rather diligently to exhort their hearers “to hearken to it, and to keep the words,” &c. Where do we meet with one single warning of the kind in Scripture? Had it been needful to have clogged the subject with such restrictions, doubtless the Holy Spirit would have done it, and not have left it to fallible human beings, who are commonly the victims, more or less, of prejudice, to prescribe to us what portions of God’s word are profitable, and what are not. On the contrary, we have seen declared the *blessedness* of those who take heed to prophecy, and the *hypocrisy and danger* of those who may neglect it.

4. The same may be said concerning the *requirements* for the study of prophecy, which are so often insisted on. Such learning, such reading, and such various qualifications and endowments of mind and spirit, are prescribed, as to make



modest men (the men least in danger) shrink back from the study in despair. Thus it is to many believers absolutely shut up; whilst the persons who bind these heavy burdens on others, are not in general laborious and diligent inquirers themselves: on the contrary, they neither enter on the study, nor suffer them to enter that are disposed. It is freely admitted, that some students of prophecy have betrayed great insobriety, dogmatism, and the like. It is evident also that Daniel and St. John, who enjoyed such remarkable revelations, were men much in the Spirit and in communion with God; men professing much love and lowliness of mind, and who sought the Lord in this matter by prayer and fasting. *These* are the requisites to be brought to the study; but they are requisites within the attainment of all who believe in the power and promises of God, and the riches of the fulness of the grace of Christ; and they are requisites equally needed for the study or perusal of every part of God's word, if only our desire is to profit by it. As much dogmatism and extravagance is to be met with in the setting forth what are called the doctrines of *grace*, especially of *election*, as can possibly be complained of in regard to *prophecy*; but we do not find those, who object against prophecy on this account, warn us on the same ground against the other doctrines.

Neither must it be concluded, that the truth may not be with men, because they do not come up to our notions of a becoming temper or spirituality of mind: for this were to make the measure of piety, or the Christian attainments of men, the criterion of the things they teach, instead of testing them by the scriptures of God; and it would set us upon judging and surmising concerning each other; when we ought rather to be inquiring, *what is written*. God has, undoubtedly, spoken important truths by the mouths of men whom we consider destitute of grace, as Balaam and Caiaphas; and by men of weak faith also and ungracious temper, as Jonah: and why may not like-minded persons be even now made the instruments of throwing light upon his word?

If the reader of these remarks happen to be a minister of the word of God, he is affectionately entreated to consider his responsibility; how he is bound, as a faithful minister, to deliver the *whole counsel* of God; and especially, in regard to the Apocalypse, not to take away from or add to it, (Rev. xxii. 18.) And is it not to "take away from the words of this prophecy," yea, to take away *all* the words of it, when ministers systematically abstain from bringing forward its contents? An idea prevails with some who do not deprecate prophetic investigation in the abstract, that it is suited only for the *private*

*study of ministers*, and that it were improper to make it, in its regular turn with other scripture, the subject of their pulpit expositions. Now it is certainly not for men, before they have arrived at some conviction in regard to prophetic truth, to utter their crudities before the church; but the Lord nevertheless commands "that every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven should bring forth out of his treasure things new and old:" (Matt. xxiii. 52.) and this is said with respect to subjects decidedly of a prophetic character; as may be seen by the context. So again, what ministers have been told in darkness, they are to speak in light; and what they hear in the ear, they are to preach upon the housetops, (Matt. x. 27.) It is a leaven of popery to suppose that any class of men are, by the mere circumstances of birth, rank, wealth, office or education, privileged to monopolize any portion of the word of God.

It must be admitted, therefore, that that system which deprives prophecy of the degree of importance, (whatsoever it may be,) which the scriptures assign to it, must be so far wrong; and whatsoever is wrong in doctrine must be, to that extent, mischievous in practice, however plausible. It may be that individuals are, notwithstanding, *saved*; but its pernicious effects upon the generality of hearers, and to a great degree upon those who are in the main believers, is incalculable. FAITH is, in a measure, deprived of its food; though faith, it is true, regards the past and present as well as the future, (Heb. xi. 1, 3:) but HOPE never can be called into action but by the consideration of things *future*; and it therefore ceases to be an active principle in the heart, so soon as futurity is withdrawn from its contemplation. Who can say, for example, how far that *lukewarmness*, which is admitted to exist among professors of the present day, may not be owing, in a great degree, to the want of realizing belief and hope in the testimony of God concerning the impending *advent* of the Lord Jesus—the morning star and great sun of prophecy? For the passions and affections will necessarily be languid, if they be moved at all, by *bare assent* to a thing, even though the thing itself be of the greatest moment; whereas a full persuasion of the *reality* of an interesting object, excites the most lively and vigorous emotions. Those writers or preachers who put off the advent of the Lord Jesus to a remote period, do at least speak directly contrary to the scope and tenor of the New Testament, which every where keeps it in view.\* Their arguments for so doing, if good for anything, will be good until doomsday itself arrive; and the Church, according

\* See, on this point, the *Investigator* on Prophecy, vol. i. p. 18.

to them, will be as wrong in taking up this hope and expectation eagerly on the very evening before the actual event itself, as it is *now!* Such arguments do indeed lead men to cry, "Where is the promise of his coming?" (2 Pet. iii. 4,) and therefore their tendency is to expose them to the perdition of the ungodly.

In the meanwhile the signs of the times in which we live, cry to us with the voice of a trumpet to be ready ourselves, and to warn our hearers likewise. Satan has had no small hand in raising up the existing prejudice and indifference in regard to prophecy. *He* well knows its practical tendency, if *we* do not: *He* can tell that his time is but short, even if Christians will not be "wise to know the times and seasons:"—and therefore to divert us from the consideration thereof, transformed into an angel of light he urges men, on the one hand, to some extravagance calculated to bring odium on the hope of the Lord's appearing; or he presents to them, on the other hand, some unscriptural conceit, which deadens or paralyzes the mind in regard to it, so that they practically neglect it altogether. The great water floods are evidently arising and increasing fast upon us; and the Church is rapidly passing into the dark and cloudy day of tribulation. In the opinion of all thinking and intelligent men, some awful and portentous crisis is at hand; and how is the true Church to be comforted in the midst of it, or guided through it, but by taking heed to the more sure word of PROPHECY; which is specially a light intended for a dark time, until the day dawn and the day star arise in our hearts.\* "*The lion hath roared: who will not fear?—The LORD GOD hath spoken: who can but prophecy?*" Amos iii. 8.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### THE COVENANT OF PROMISE.

The chief object of all prophecy appears to be to prepare the Church for the advent of Messiah; the manifestation of whose salvation and kingdom and glory, together with the various circumstances immediately connected with these mat-

\*2 Peter i. 19. The context shows that Peter had in his mind the "fiery trial," which is what I apprehend him to mean by the dark time. 2 Peter iii. 5 and 12.

ters, are the most prominent features of the prophetic page. Unless, therefore, we have in the outset a right apprehension of them, it is most probable that we shall fail to adopt correct principles of interpreting the prophecies which concern them. In order, however, to arrive at a proper apprehension of these things, it will be useful just to glance at the history of man's apostacy.

By permitting man to fall at various periods into a state of disobedience and rebellion, and to experience the misery and darkness consequent on such a state, the Lord would apparently teach every order of intelligent beings,—the thrones and principalities and powers in heavenly places, as well as the whole human race,—that the strength of the creature, both moral and intellectual, is derived immediately from the Creator; and that the creature, therefore, cannot stand for one single moment upright, but through the power of Almighty God. No natural or local circumstances, however advantageous,—no external means of grace, however imposing,—no inward talents or endowments, however dazzling, will avail of themselves to keep the creature erect, if he *trust* to them: he must look up throughout to GOD; he must learn that he is sustained in all respects by HIM; he must know that “in Him he lives, and moves, and has his being;” or he will certainly apostatize.

To say nothing of the condition of the *angels* who left their first estate and fell, how various have been the trials vouchsafed to *man*. He has been placed in a condition of nobility and innocence, and has fallen! He has witnessed the terrors of Mount Sinai and the glory of the Shecinah, and had the Lord speaking to him daily by his Spirit in his prophets, and has fallen! He has been now for nearly two thousand years under a dispensation, which was ushered in with the most striking spiritual gifts and endowments, and yet he has been continually apostatizing; insomuch that we cannot place our finger on one single spot on the globe, where we are assured Christianity was enjoyed during the first three centuries in its purity, without perceiving at the same time the most lamentable historical proof connected with it, that man has fallen: and the prophetic account of the close of this dispensation shows, that, with the exception of a very small remnant—an election upheld by grace—this fall will become universal and most signal! Man is further destined, in the dispensation which is approaching, to enjoy a combination of all the advantages hitherto experienced from the foundation of the world, together with an unparalleled degree of splendour, power, and prosperity; and we know that he is also destined in the end

to fall! And then only will that great moral lesson be completed, which the Lord is thus practically, through every age, teaching to his creatures; that they may know throughout the eternity that remains, that GOD IS ALL IN ALL.

Another great and important matter has however been gradually unfolding, parallel with the development of the apostacy of the creature; and that is the great plan of *redemption* through the Messiah, and of the ultimate restoration of man, and of the world from all the disastrous effects of the curse. If the earth has been filled ever since the fall with violence, and deceit, and misery, arising from the influence of those unrighteous principles which the darkened mind of man has supposed to conduct to personal happiness; the word of prophecy has held out to the expectation of those, who have been brought to understand the cause of their misery, not only a way of obtaining the pardon of their sin, but the prospect of a time when the creature shall be redeemed from the bondage of corruption, and from the vanity to which, through sin, he is subjected; when wars shall cease in all the earth; when Satan, the great deceiver of the nations, shall be restrained and ultimately destroyed; and a reign shall ensue of righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. In this period, even those on whom death has passed, shall be restored to life in a spiritual and heavenly body, which no longer will be the seat of sin, but in every respect a handmaid to the Spirit; until which period the dead rest from their labours.

Various indistinct intimations of these things, prior to the giving of the Law, might be pointed to: as the promise to Eve that the Seed of the woman should bruise the Serpent's head, which avowedly has reference to the final destruction of the devil and his works; the prophecy of Enoch, which we know from St. Jude, (v. 18.) foretold "the coming of the Lord with myriads of his Saints;" the manner in which the faithful dead are spoken of, as being "gathered to their people," (doubtless to be reserved to stand in their lot at the end of days,) whilst the living were threatened, if rebellious, to be "cut off from their people." But instead of dwelling upon these and other similar intimations, it will be more satisfactory to pass at once to the terms of the COVENANT made with Abraham, and amplified with Isaac and Jacob.

And here the reader is requested to bear in mind that the Covenant made with Abraham is what is called the "New Covenant" and the "Covenant of Promise:" for unless he be clear in this matter also, he will be unable to understand "the hope of his calling" in Christ Jesus, as set forth in the word of prophecy. It is the more needful to premise thus much,

seeing that many, even pious Christians, have but a vague notion of the nature of the covenant of grace. They seem not to understand that there is any *document* in existence, other than the whole of the New Testament; in which they suppose it to be throughout diffused, intermingled with the narrative and moral precepts which also there abound: so that if any would obtain more definite ideas of it, they must, by a divine chemistry, decompose and separate the whole, and laboriously collect the scattered particles they want. But St. Paul puts the matter in a very clear and simple point of view, by informing us, that it is the covenant made with Abraham which we are now under: for this covenant (he argues) the law, that was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. (Gal. iii. 17.) So that the instrument was in reality drawn up, and formally signed and sealed in the days of the great Father of the faithful; though, like other testaments, it was not published and fully acted upon, till after the death of the Testator. (Heb. ix. 15—17.) And thus it is evident that it is in relation to the period of its coming into force, not to the period of its being given, that it is called the *New Covenant*—being in reality an older Covenant than that given through Moses.

This covenant which, as before observed, was first made with Abraham, and afterwards confirmed and amplified with Isaac and Jacob, is to be found in the following places in the book of Genesis: viz. chapters xii. 1—3; xiii. 14—17; xv. 4—21; xvii. 4—16; xxii. 15—18; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 13—15.\* There can be no reasonable doubt, since it is this covenant which St. Paul refers to, that it contains the substance of all those blessings afterwards enlarged upon by the prophets and apostles. The whole, however, appears reducible to *three* distinct heads, on each of which it will be necessary to offer a few observations.

1. The first is the promised *seed*. If we consult Galatians iii. 16, we must feel persuaded, that this has principally a reference to CHRIST, who is pre-eminently *the Seed* in which all the nations of the earth are to be blessed. (Gen. xxii. 18.) For though the promise appears primarily to relate to *Isaac*,

\* That it is one and the same covenant made with all three is evident from the terms of it. God says to Abraham, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, *and thy seed after thee*:" and afterwards more expressly he says, "But my covenant will I establish with *Isaac*," &c. (chap. xvii. 21.) Then to Isaac he declares, "I will bless *thee*, &c. and perform the oath which I swore unto Abraham thy father. (xxvi. 3.) Afterwards Isaac, in his prophetic blessing of *Jacob* says, "God Almighty give *thee* the blessing of Abraham;" and God confirms this by reiterating the same promises at Bethel, and declaring, "I will not leave thee until I have done that which I have spoken of." (xxviii. 12—15.)



yet is it afterwards renewed to Isaac himself, and subsequently to Jacob, in similar terms: "and in *thy* seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." (Gen. xxvi. 4; xxviii. 14.) and as it would be absurd, on the one hand, to suppose that the *seed* of Jacob could mean Isaac his father; so, on the other hand, in reference to Jacob's *posterity*, there appears to be none eminently the child of promise, excepting Christ.

But, beside this reference to *Christ* as the seed, the posterity of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are likewise spoken of in this covenant in a more general sense. First, they are expressly designated to Abraham, when God says, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in *their* generations, and I will be *their* God. (Gen. xvii. 7, 8.) Secondly, it is implied in the promise, that God will multiply his seed as the stars of the heaven, as the sand upon the seashore, and as the dust of the earth, (Gen. xv. 5; xvii. 2, 4; xxii. 17; xxviii. 14; xxxv. 11;) which places evince that *multitudes* are contemplated, and not the one individual Christ. And, thirdly, it is evident in that the apostle declares: viz. that all who are mystically *members* of Christ are accounted as the seed, and heirs according to the promise. (Gal. iii. 29.)

2. The second particular of this covenant is *the inheritance* promised. The *locality* of this inheritance is more immediately PALESTINE, in its fullest extent, "from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates." (Gen. xv. 18—21.) Now it is important to notice who are the parties who shall inherit this land, according to the full meaning of the terms of the grant. Many are wont to limit the promise to the posterity of Abraham, who were led into Canaan by Joshua. Such an interpretation, however, will not, for many reasons, answer to the terms of the covenant. The promise of the land is, in the first instance, to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, personally and individually. To Abraham the Lord said, "I am the Lord, that brought thee out of Uz of the Chaldees, to give *thee*—*this* land—to *inherit* it." (Gen. xv. 7.) "And I will give it unto *thee*, AND to *thy seed* after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." (Gen. xvii. and xiii. 14, 15.) To Isaac the promise is similar: "Unto *thee* AND to *thy seed* I will give all these countries." (Gen. xxvi. 3.) And so to Jacob: "The land *whereon* thou liest—to *thee* will I give it—AND to *thy seed*." (Gen. xxviii. 13.) "The land which I gave to Abraham and Isaac, to *thee* will I give it, AND to *thy seed* after thee will I give the land." (Gen. xxxv. 12.) When the Lord afterwards appeared to Moses, he referred to the land as specially granted to all three of these fathers, together with their seed: "And I appeared unto Abraham,

unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty: but by my name *Jehovah* was I not known unto them; and I have established my covenant with *them*,—to give *them* the land of Canaan,—*the land of their pilgrimage wherein they were strangers.*” (Exod. vi. 3, 4.) It is difficult to conceive language more explicit and precise, to signify that these patriarchs were severally *themselves* to inherit that land as possessors and not as pilgrims, than the passages which are here brought forward. Had Abraham received the promise in the first instance without any mention of his seed, and the promise had been referred to ever after as relating to his seed, without mention being again made of him, it might then more plausibly have been inferred, that the original grant never contemplated any other possessors; but the careful repetition to each of the patriarchs of his own name, *together with* his posterity—“*to thee and to thy seed*”—puts it beyond a reasonable question. No lawyer would ever think of interpreting such a title deed to their exclusion, otherwise than by arguing from the fact, that they had all died without ever having received the promise, and therefore the inheritance was not apparently designed for them. This, however, is made a ground of argument in scripture, that they *are* to inherit the land; only it is by means of a resurrection. For as Abraham was, we are assured, persuaded, that God would have raised up Isaac from the dead, and have restored him, had he actually sacrificed him on Mount Moriah, (Heb. xi. 17—19;) so it appears from the scriptures, that he and the other patriarchs looked forward to the day of Christ, as the period when these promises should ultimately be fulfilled, (John viii. 56; Heb. xi. 10, 11;) and with Daniel they enjoyed the assurance, that they should stand in *their* lot at the end of days.

The circumstance that they are spoken of as *pilgrims and strangers*, in respect to this very land, is of itself worthy of particular remark, considering that the land is nevertheless so expressly promised to them. When Isaac sends Jacob to Padan Aram he uses these words: “And God Almighty bless thee, &c., and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee, that *THOU* mayest inherit the land wherein thou art a *stranger*, which God gave unto Abraham.” This same Jacob afterwards declares himself before Pharaoh to be only a *pilgrim*: “The days of my pilgrimage are one hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers, in the days of *their* pilgrimage.” (Gen. xlvii. 9.) The Lord, speaking of them to Moses, says (as we have seen) that he established his covenant with them,



to give *them* the land of Canaan, the land of their *pilgrimage*, wherein they were strangers. (Exodus vi. 4.) Stephen notices that though God promised to give the land to Abraham for a *possession, and to his seed after him*, yet that he gave him none inheritance in it—no, not so much as to set his foot on. (Acts vii. 4, 5.) And how does St. Paul argue from all this? Why, “that these all died in FAITH, not having *received* the promises, but having *seen them afar off*, and were PERSUADED of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they *seek* a country.” (Hebrews xi. 13, 14.) His words before Agrippa plainly evince his expectation to have been that this promise should be fulfilled to the patriarchs, by a resurrection: “And now I stand and am judged for the *hope of the promise* made of God unto our *fathers*; unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come,—for which hope’s sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, *that God should raise the dead?*” (Acts xxvii. 6–8.) Here the promise to the fathers, and the resurrection from the dead are both evidently in the mind of the Apostle, as connected together: and what was this promise to the fathers? There is no express mention to *them* of a resurrection; and though several things are included in the promise to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; yet is there not one of them which requires a resurrection from the dead to fulfil it, excepting the promise of the *land*. It was this, therefore, which must have led Paul to couple the promise to the fathers with the resurrection from the dead.

There are not wanting plain and explicit references to the subject in the New Testament. To give an example or two, Zacharias prophesied at the circumcision of John the Baptist, that Jesus was raised up “to perform the mercy *to\** our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant, *the oath which he swore to our father Abraham,*” &c. And that the performance of this mercy to them respects the resurrection is evident from Matt. viii. 11. “Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, in the kingdom of heaven:” which *kingdom* will hereafter be shown to be the kingdom of Christ. It was this kingdom, concerning which the disciples asked him, after his resurrection, “Whether he would at that time restore it unto Israel,” (Acts i. 6.) But it

\* In our version the word “*promised*” is supplied, which, though giving a good sense in itself, diverts attention from the *resurrection*. It is not merely the mercy *promised* to the fathers that Jesus came to perform; but more directly to perform the mercy *to* them, which in due time he will effect.

would be anticipating the subject of a future chapter, to enlarge upon this point here.

It may nevertheless be objected to this view, that the possession of Palestine, by the *posterity* of Israel, from the time of Joshua until the captivity, and again till their final dispersion, is a fulfilment of the promise. Now it is plain, if a correct view has been taken of the sentiments of St. Paul and others, that *they* did not consider this as a fulfilment of the original promise; but there are further considerations which require notice on this head. First, it must be observed that the inheritance of the land under Joshua is expressly promised to Abraham, in the first instance, as a token and pledge that *he* should inherit it,—for he asks: “Lord God, whereby shall I *know* that I shall inherit it?” That is, he requires a sign or token in the way of assurance; then the Lord directs him to take an heifer of three years old, a she goat, &c., and divide them; and after they are disposed in order, according to the form of entering into solemn covenant, a horror of great darkness comes on Abraham, and the Lord informs him that his seed should be a stranger in a land not theirs, and that afterwards God would judge that nation and bring them out with great substance; that in the meanwhile Abraham should go to his fathers in peace; but in the fourth generation his *posterity* should come hither *again*. And after this is seen the burning lamp, the symbol of the Lord’s presence, passing between those pieces; and it is immediately added,—that in the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham saying, “Unto *thy seed* have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates,” &c. (Genesis xv.) This is the frequent manner of God, (as will be shown more at large in the fourth chapter of this volume) to grant a sort of inchoate fulfilment or prelibation of a promise, as the token and pledge of a more complete one. Thus he promises to Sarah a child at a “*set time* appointed,” (Gen. xvii. 21; xxi. 2,) as the pledge that in her seed all nations should be blessed: whilst yet we see that the chief burden of the promise is sustained and carried forward to a seed yet to come; in that the promise is afterwards renewed to *Jacob*, the *son* of that seed given as a pledge to Sarah, that in *his* seed should all nations be blessed. So that the birth of *Isaac* would be an event for believers afterward to look back upon, and encourage themselves from it in regard to the future. And in like manner the possession of Canaan under Joshua would serve in the way of retrospect for the faithful in after ages to strengthen themselves in the persuasion, that there remaineth still a rest for the people of God; even as the Lord subsequently holds out to them, by his Spi-

rit in the Apostle.\* And as the great deliverance of the people from Egypt and their occupation of Canaan under Joshua, were but as an antepast of that greater deliverance and subsequent occupation which Israel shall hereafter experience; so, consistently with this appointment, it is intimated that the time would arrive when this former deliverance should *no longer* be reverted to, or come into mind, being forgotten or cast aside, like all other mere types and shadows. For the prophet twice declares: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be said, The Lord liveth, that brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth that brought up the children of Israel from the land of the north and from all the lands whither he had driven them; and I will bring them *again into their land that I gave unto their Fathers.*"†

Now it is the general character of a merely inchoate fulfilment, that in some eminent particulars it falls short of the terms of the promise. For example, the land in the present instance is covenanted from the river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates; which the Israelites did at no time, under Joshua, possess. Nor did they ever at any other period possess it to this extent, unless indeed we except a short period under Solomon: though this does not answer to the terms of the grant, since the territory surrounding Judea was not held *absolutely* by displacing the Canaanitish or other heathen inhabitants, but by subjecting them to tribute.‡ Again, it is promised—"To thee will I give it, and to thy seed *for ever*: (Gen. xiii. 15.) And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, all the land of Canaan for an *everlasting possession.*" (Gen. xv. 8.) Now it would be trifling with the verity of God, who declares that not one *jot* or *tittle* shall pass away of all that he hath spoken, to allege that a merely temporary, and limited, and constantly interrupted\* occupation of the land, like that of Israel from the time of Joshua to Titus Vespasian, could possibly be the accomplishment of the promise here made in its proper and complete sense. It must, therefore, have a respect to that future occupation, of which the prophet Amos says:—"They shall no more be pulled up out of the land." (Chap. ix. 15.)

\* See the argument of the Apostle. Heb. iv. 8, 9, &c.

† See Jer. xvi. 14, 15, and xxiii. 7, 8. The parallel might be carried out further; for the circumstance that Isaac was a child of *promise*, is declared to be typical of all believers; and the horror of great darkness which Abraham experienced, as it indicated the affliction which his posterity was to experience just prior to their deliverance in Egypt, so was it further significant of the time of Jacob's trouble, that "great tribulation" to be experienced by the Church just before the time of its final deliverance.

‡ See Joshua xvi. 10; xvii. 13. and 1 Kings iv. 21, 24; ix. 20, 21.

In discussing, however, this promise, as made to the *seed* of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, it must again be borne in mind, that Christ is pre-eminently **THE** seed. Consequently the promise of the inheritance must respect **HIM**, as well as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the other children of the promise: for indeed “all the promises of God are in him yea, and in him Amen.” We consequently find, that the land of Palestine is specially called “*Immanuel’s* land,” in connexion with the promise to Israel, that a virgin should conceive and bear a child to be called Immanuel.\* We shall, indeed, upon more close investigation, find a length and breadth in this part of the covenant, beyond what we have yet noticed. For the promise of Palestine, in the extent already pointed out, is after all, but as a splendid enclosure within a much more vast inheritance—a *sanctum sanctorum*, standing in relation to the whole world, like ‘as Goshen did to the rest of Egypt. For the Apostle says, “that the promise to Abraham was, that he should be heir of the *world*,” (Rom. iv. 13;) and this cannot, apparently, be gathered out of the original grant, excepting from the fact, that he should be the father of *many nations*, and that out of him should come that *company of kings* who should be *rulers over all other nations*; (Gen. xvii. 4; xxxv. 11;) just as it is interpreted by the Psalmist, that they should be “princes in *all the earth*.” (Psalm xlv. 16.) In the repetition of these promises to Sarah, the reading of the Septuagint and Vulgate is remarkable. The English is—“And I will bless her, and give thee a son *also* of her; (mark the word ‘*also*’ here, as showing that this is not the seed primarily intended,) yea, I will bless *her*, and *she* shall be [a mother] of nations; *kings of people* shall be of **HER**,” (Gen. xvii. 6.) But the Septuagint understand the latter part of the verse as relating, not to Sarah, but to the *Seed*, viz.—και ευλογησω ΑΥΤΟ [το τεκνον] και εσται εις εθνη, και βασιλεις εθων εξ ΑΥΤΟΥ εσονται—“And I will bless him, and he shall be for the nations (or Gentiles) and kings of nations (or Gentiles) shall be of him.” Grounded, therefore, on this portion of the covenant was the expectation, in regard to Christ, that he should “rise to reign over the Gentiles,” (Rom. xv. 12;) thus also expressed by the Psalmist—“Arise, O God, judge the earth; for thou shalt inherit all nations.” Psalm lxxxii. 8.

3. The third particular of the covenant yet remains to be considered.

The great and only real source of happiness to the creature is *the enjoyment of God himself*. Without this, none can be truly blessed; and the more open and unclouded is the mani-

\* Compare Isaiah vii. 14, and viii. 8.

festation of the Deity to the spiritual man, the more abundant is the blessedness enjoyed. That the immediate enjoyment of God forms part of the happiness promised to Abraham and his seed, may therefore be inferred from the mere fact that God *blesses* him, and declares, that "in blessing he *will* bless him;" (Gen. xxii. 17;) for the possession of the world, and of a countless offspring, and the having a numerous company of kings proceed out of his loins, were, in itself, a *vanity*, unless the enjoyment of God accompany the gift.

But we are not left to deduce so important a conclusion from inference only. The Lord expressly declares, "fear not, Abraham, *I am thy shield*, and thy **EXCEEDING GREAT REWARD!**" (Gen. xv. 1.) And again: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a **GOD** unto *thee*, and *thy seed after thee*:—and I will be **THEIR** God," (Gen. xvii. 7, 8.) "Behold, *I am with thee*, and will keep thee in all places whithersoever thou goest," (Gen. xxviii. 15;) "and thy seed shall possess the gate of *his* enemies." (Gen. xxii. 17.) In these promises is comprehended all spiritual blessings. Here is protection against enemies, in that God is "to be with" his people, and "to compass them about as with a shield;"—here is the assurance of victory over all their enemies, "that they may serve without fear before him;"—here is their present and final bliss, in the enjoyment of God as their exceeding—**EXCEEDING great reward!**

These things necessarily *imply* the personal sanctification of the people of God: for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" nor can God walk with any, or prove a reward to them, until there be in them a certain meetness of spirit, to enable them to delight in God. But these things may be more *directly* inferred from the express terms of the covenant. When Isaac prays, in the behalf of Jacob: "God give thee the *blessing* of Abraham, to thee, and to thy seed after thee, that thou mayest inherit the land," it is inferable that this blessing is needful, in its spiritual bearing, to enable any to be made meet to be partakers of the inheritance with the saints in light; and that, except they are thus blessed, they cannot inherit the land.\*

\* The same thing is implied in the apostolic command, "Children obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right. Honour thy father and thy mother, (which is the first commandment with promise), that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth," or land, (Ephes. vi. 1, 2.) The apostle here points out the connection between the *obedience* of faith and the possession of the land. That he refers to the promise to Abraham in the words, "that thou mayest live long on the earth," is evident, first, in that length of days was by no means enjoyed by the most holy of the primitive Christians, whether old or young; and, secondly, in that the Jews were immediately about to be ejected from that land.

So it is to be inferred from the rite of circumcision then established. For we know, from other scriptures, that "circumcision is of the *heart*," (Rom. ii. 29;) and therefore that, in its original institution, it was not designed merely as a seal, but as a perpetual sign and admonition, that they should "circumcise the foreskin of the heart." (Deut. x. 16.) In this light it seems to be, that Abraham is assured, "that the uncircumcised shall be *cut off* from his people," (Gen. xvii. 14;) for as we do not find this sentence to have been fulfilled either by the magistrates, or by divine judgments, on Israel after the flesh, it must have had a reference to their being excluded or cut off from that general assembly of the saints and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.

And *this* part of the covenant must likewise have a reference, as all the rest has, to the *seed*, "which is Christ." Does God covenant to be the *God* of Abraham and his seed?—so Jesus speaks of him expressly to his disciples as "*My* God and *your* God." (John xx. 17.) He it is whom the Lord specially covenants to be with, and to keep him in all his ways, lest at any time he dash his foot against a stone. (Psalm xci.) He it is who comes as the seed of the woman, to bruise the serpent's head, and "to speak with *his* enemies in the gate." And he it is, most pre-eminently, who proves a blessing to *others*, (Gen. xii. 2, 3,) and through whom the blessing flows to all families of the earth. Believers in general prove a blessing, as being the salt of the earth, and the light of the world, and in that out of their belly flow rivers of living water; but all that they have, which is gracious and profitable, they have received out of *Christ's fulness*; and the pardon of sin, and all direct spiritual aid, can only proceed to them through him.

Now that the view here taken of the covenant throughout is not strained; but that the Spirit of God did in subsequent ages explicate and set it forth to his church agreeably with this interpretation, will be evident by an appeal to the prophets; for they constantly couple the time of great deliverance and redemption with a return of Israel to Palestine, a regeneration of their hearts, a renewal of the earth, and the fact that the tabernacle of God shall be with men. For the present two or three quotations must suffice, which plainly and unequivocally treat of the *New Covenant*; which covenant it has been shewn, can be no other than this covenant of promise to Abraham.

Deut. xxx. 3—6, affords an instance that the possession of the land ultimately intended was to be accompanied by the circumcision of the heart, and therefore no occupation of the land hitherto enjoyed can be the one intended. "Then the



Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations, whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine be driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee: and the Lord thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it: and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. And the Lord thy God will circumeise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live.”

Jeremiah, in chapters xxx. and xxxi., descants at length on the return of Israel to their land, their possessing it, and its great fertility at that time; and then at verses 31—34 declares, “Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord: but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.”

In the following chapter (xxxii.) the same is repeated with some circumstances of enlargement as to the spiritual blessings of “the everlasting covenant,” which again can only be that made with Abraham. “Behold, I will gather them out of all countries, whither I have driven them in mine anger, and in my fury, and in great wrath; and I will bring them again unto this place, and I will cause them to dwell safely: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God: and I will give them one heart, and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them: and I will make an everlasting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.”

Ezekiel shews the same in chap. xi. 17—20, “Therefore say thus: ‘Thus saith the Lord God; I will even gather you from the people, and assemble you out of the countries where ye have been scattered, and I will give you the land of Israel.

And they shall come thither, and they shall take away all the detestable things thereof, and all the abominations thereof from thence. And I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh: that they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them: and they shall be my people, and I will be their God."

And again the same prophet, in chap. xxxvi. 24—28, has much to the same purport.—“For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them. And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.” After which follows a promise (v. 35,) that the land shall become like the garden of Eden; and the waste and desolate and ruined cities become fenced, and inhabited.

That the preceding extracts refer to the *Christian* covenant is evident from the circumstance, that some of them are brought forward by the apostle when arguing that the covenant of works is superseded. See Heb. viii. and x. This covenant, therefore, is not to be arbitrarily divided or limited by us; we are not at liberty to select those only of its particulars, which may commend themselves to our minds; but it must be received in that circumstantial fulness in which we find it to be understood and dilated upon by the prophets.

At the same time, however, that the terms of the covenant are insisted on, I cannot but admit that there is a difficulty, in my apprehension, in clearly distinguishing *in all cases* between what relates to Israel after the flesh, who shall then be nationally restored; and what relates to the *spiritual* Israel, who will rise from the dead at that time. Most of the passages just now cited, relate evidently to Israel, after the *flesh*, who shall then be alive; because their hearts are only then to be regenerated: whereas the departed saints of the Israelitish nation, and all that election from among the Gentiles, “who shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *and the resurrection from the dead*,” have had their hearts previously sanctified by the Holy Spirit. Some are of opinion that the saints will not be mingled at all with men, in the flesh in the resurrection; or, at least, that they will only be *occasionally* manifested to them,



and therefore will not be continually dwelling on the earth. I know of no decided Scripture authority for the opinion; whilst yet, I confess that, judging by the reason of the thing, there appears some degree of plausibility in it. In the mean while it is evident, from the terms of the covenant we have reviewed, that *Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob* are again to dwell in the renewed earth; and as *they* will be of the resurrection, there seems no just reason why the rest of those who sleep in Jesus should not dwell on it likewise. It is also evident from Gal. iii. 29. Rom. iv. 16. Ephes. ii. 11—22, and iii. 6, that the elect Gentiles are made partakers of the covenant of promise, without any distinction of nation, or any limitation as to its provisions. And it is further evident, from Psalm xxxvii. 9, 11, 22, 29, 34, and Matt. v. 5, that the *meeke* shall inherit the earth,—a promise that seems especially to regard those, who in all times have, for the Lord's sake, been followers of peace. I conclude, therefore, that the resurrection saints will undoubtedly dwell on earth, and “have power over the nations;” (Rev. ii. 26.) though they will probably be nearer to God, and continually behold his glory, in a manner that will not be enjoyed to the same extent by men of flesh and blood. But these subordinate details must be left till the Lord's advent, when all difficulties and obscurities will be cleared up. Most of them arise from our *little faith*, and our inability, through inveterate prejudices, to apprehend in many instances what is plainly revealed.

---

### CHAPTER III.

#### THE VOICE OF THE CHURCH.

It will perhaps be admitted by all Christian readers, that the prophets certainly speak of a time of restitution of all things; seeing that the Apostle Peter has plainly declared they do. Acts iii. 19—21. And it will perhaps be further conceded by the generality, that the passages of scripture, brought forward in the previous chapter, do, at first view, seem to wear the aspect there contended for. And yet, because this system of interpretation does not fall in with the pre-conceived opinions of many, and has been directly contradicted in latter times by excellent and able Christians, therefore a question will arise in the minds of some, whether after all, the view here given be

not more plausible than just, and a mere modern innovation on the generally received and supposed orthodox method of interpretation.

In this respect it appears of moment to inquire into the opinions and the system of interpretation maintained at different periods by the Church of God, and to notice also the circumstances which have at any time tended materially to warp or prejudice its judgment. For the voice of the mystical members of Christ's body is surely the voice of "the Spirit and the Bride;" and that voice will not therefore pass unheeded by those who desire to understand the voice of God himself. And it is the more needful to insist on this point, seeing that men have at all times been disposed to disparage the voice of the Church, when its sound has happened to be in opposition to their own opinions; and instead of showing a becoming diffidence of going counter to that voice, except for weighty and constraining reasons, have betrayed an utter recklessness of it altogether, as if our pious forefathers had been given up to follow cunningly-devised fables. The opinions of the orthodox *Jewish* writers have been in this manner cast aside, and confounded with the rubbish of anti-christian rabbins; as if, because a man were an Israelite, he could not possibly have been guided into the truth of God, and the Church before Christ had been absolutely without direction from above. The sentiments of the primitive fathers of the Christian Church have been in like manner at once discarded, whenever they have seemed to contradict more modern theories. And, in the present day, there is a growing disposition to treat the views maintained by the fathers of the Reformation—views which in some particulars have been substantially coincided in by the whole protestant body, as the result of ingenious prejudice and antipathy against their papal enemies.

First, for the sake of perspicuity, the subject of inquiry may be divided into seven different periods; the first comprehending the voice of the Jewish Church; the second, from the time of the Apostles to Constantine, embracing the history of the purest period of the Christian Church; the third from Constantine to Jerome, and that period of twilight, or neither light nor darkness, which preceded the passing of the Church into the night of popery; the fourth, what are usually called the dark ages: viz. from Justinian to the Reformation; the fifth, the first century of the Reformation; the sixth and seventh, the two centuries after the Reformation, which brings us down into our own times.

1. The Jewish testimony up to the time of Christ is but scanty, as regards any point, if we except the writers of the

Old Testament; to quote whom would be considered a begging the question; since our object is rather to bring forward the expositions of uninspired writers, to prove the correctness of the view which has already been taken of passages quoted from the Scriptures. Little, however, as we have on this point, it is quite enough to sanction the interpretation here given.

The first is from the Targums.\* The Babylonian Targum on Gen. xlix. 10 says: "*Christ* shall come, whose is the kingdom, and him shall the nations serve." How this was understood by the Church will further appear presently. The Jerusalem Targum on the same Scripture says: "The king *Christ* shall come, whose is the kingdom, and all nations shall be subject unto him."

Rabbi Eliezer, the great, is supposed to have lived just after the second temple was built. He, referring to Hosea's prophecy, (Chap. xiv. 8.) applies it to the pious Jews who seemed likely to die without seeing the glory of Israel, saying: "As I live, saith Jehovah, I will raise *you* up, in the time to come, in the *resurrection* of the dead; and I will gather you with *all Israel*."†

The Sadducees are related to have asked Rabbi Gamaliel, the preceptor of St. Paul, whence he would prove that God would raise the dead. Nor could he silence them till he brought against them Deut. xi. 21, "Which land the Lord sware that he would give to your *fathers*." The Rabbi argued, that as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had it not, and God cannot lie, therefore they must be *raised from the dead* to inherit it.‡

The period in which the writer of the Book of Wisdom lived is doubtful; but certainly he must have been a Jew of high antiquity.§ In chap. ii. 7, 8, he says of the dead, "In the time of their *visitation* they shall shine, and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble: they shall *judge the nations*, and

\* The *Targums* were paraphrases of the law, supposed to have been first used in Ezra's time; (See Nehemiah viii. 7—9.) but there is no authentic *written* paraphrase or Targum before the time of Onkelos and Jonathan, who are supposed to have lived about thirty years before Christ. Writers indeed differ about the antiquity of the Targums, some making them later, and some earlier. The *Jerusalem Targum* is supposed to be a fragment of a much more ancient paraphrase. These Targums may be seen in Buxtorf's Hebrew Bible. Basil xvi. 10.

† See his *Capitula*, chap. xxxiv.

‡ Rabbi Simai, though of later date, argues the same from Exodus vi. 4, insisting that 'the law asserts in this place the resurrection from the dead—to wit, when it is said; *And, also I have established my covenant with them, to give them Canaan, &c.* for (he adds) it is not said to *you*, but to *them*.' He only, however, follows herein the earlier commentators. See this whole testimony in Mede's Works, Book iv. Ep. 43. Also the Gemara Sanhedrim, cap. ii.

§ Grotius supposes him to have lived between the time of Ezra and Simon the Just.

have dominion over the peoples, (*Vulg.*) and their Lord shall reign for ever." But whosoever this writer was, he likewise only gives the current opinion of expositors of his own age.\*

The sentiments of the writer of the book of Tobit are to the same purport. After describing the first captivity, and the return from it, together with the rebuilding of the temple, he says: "Then shall they again go forth into a captivity, by far the greatest they ever were in. But the blessed and holy God shall remember them; and gather them from the four quarters of the world. Then shall Jerusalem, the holy city, be restored with a beautiful and excellent structure, as also the temple shall be built with a famous structure, which shall not be destroyed nor demolished for ever, as the prophets have said. Then shall the Gentiles be converted to worship the Lord, &c. The horn also of his people shall be exalted before all nations, and the seed of Israel shall celebrate and glorify his great name."† However some passages in this book may prove, that it is not entitled to be admitted into the inspired canon; it nevertheless shows what were the religious sentiments prevalent at a very remote period of antiquity. Good critics (as Dr. Gray) have contended, that it was written in Chaldaic during, or soon after, the first captivity, and the early chapters even prior to that time.

Besides the foregoing statements, which are mostly advanced as the direct exposition of scripture texts, there are likewise various *traditions* of the early Jewish church, which are entitled to attention from the general respect shown to them in all ages: though they cannot be urged in the light of direct testimony. Among these is the commonly received opinion, that the world was to last, in its present state, during 6000 years; and that in the seventh millenary it was to be renewed, and all the promises of God made to the fathers accomplished at that time. This tradition, however, does not appear to rest upon any foundation, derived from the word of God, that is of a character sufficiently evident to satisfy a rigid inquirer; whilst yet it is remarkable how very generally it has been entertained, by the Jews, the primitive fathers, and the reformers. They seem to have deduced it chiefly in an analogical way from the fact of God's having created the world in six days, and appointing the seventh for a *sabbath*; and also from the appointment of the sabbatical and jubilean years. But no *direct* testimony of scripture is brought for it (that I am aware of),

\* See Mede to Meddus, Book iv. Ep. 20.

† See chap. xiv. according to the ancient *Constantinopolitan* copy, written originally in Chaldee, and published by Paulus Fagius. The corruption of the ordinary Greek and Latin copies will be noticed presently.

nearer to the mark than Isaiah ii. 11, advanced by Rabbi Ketina, from more ancient authority: "And the Lord alone shall be exalted in that DAY."\* Nevertheless, so generally was it believed, that, immediately after the destruction of the temple by Titus, when the Christians urged upon the Jews that Messiah must certainly have appeared, since the sceptre had now passed away, and the oblation and sacrifice were ceased, the latter deemed it quite sufficient in reply, to point to the fact, that the world was not yet 6000 years old.† It was not, however, agreed among them in which of the seven millennia-ries of the world, Messiah would come. Some thought it would be the beginning of the fifth, some of the seventh, and some the latter end of the sixth.‡ But the most general one was, that the world was to be 2000 years *void of the law*, 2000 *under the law*, and 2000 *under Messiah*; which opinion was again pressed on them by the christians to prove, that in this case Messiah must be, by their own showing, already come.§ This latter opinion is called, by the Jews, "a tradition of the house of Elias," an eminent Rabbi, who lived before the birth of Christ. The same also taught, that in the seventh millennary the earth would be renewed, and the righteous dead raised; that these should not again be turned to dust, and that the just, then alive, should mount up with wings as the eagle; so that in that day they would not need to fear, though the mountains (quoting Psalm xli. 3.) should be cast into the midst of the sea.||

Now these traditions, though, as before observed, they are not sufficient for direct testimony, as to the view of the Jewish Church, respecting the covenant of promise; are, nevertheless, of use, as indicating *indirectly* what the general voice and expectation of the Church was, without which these traditions could not have been so generally received.

To return, however, to the former testimonies; whatever blindness might have happened to Israel, at the time of their casting off, surely the Church was not blinded throughout the *whole* period, from the return from Babylon to the first advent of Messiah! This were as greatly to *undervalue* the voice of the Church, as the Papists are wont to *overrate* it: and it would be difficult to say on what ground the voice of the Church, at *any* period, unless confirmed by miracles, ought to be entitled

\* See the Talmud, under the head Rosch Haschana.

† See Pezron's Antiq. ch. iv. 37.

‡ See these various opinions in Rabbi Asche.

§ See the Talmud, under head *Shanedrim*, and also *Havodu Zara*. I am chiefly indebted for the authorities in this matter to Bishop Clayton's inquiry, and Ramundus Martinus, to whom he also refers.

|| See this passage at large in Mede, book iv. 951.



to regard. One thing we may, at least, assume, that such interpretations of Scripture, as the Church in the time of our Lord and the apostles was wont to entertain, would be corrected or exploded; for it is quite irreconcilable with all reasonable notions to suppose, that our Lord would constantly observe his pious followers to speak and hope erroneously, on this or any other point, yet never disabuse them of their false conceits; the more especially as he did continually attack the false opinions of the Pharisees and Sadducees. We have, therefore, to inquire next into the views entertained by *Christians* on this head, in the age of the apostles, and in the two centuries immediately succeeding.

2. So far then, as the testimony of the christian fathers, from the time of the apostles down to the time of Origen, is concerned, we have ample proof, in such of their writings as have come down to us, that it is similar to that of the Jewish Church; only more explicit, as might be expected.

The first who may be noticed is *Barnabas*,\* who in Abp. Wake's collection of the Apocryphal Epistles, speaks as if he were Barnabas the *apostle*. This is questionable; but there is no doubt that he was of very high antiquity, and that his epistle was read in the Churches at a very early period. These epistles, however, have been so corrupted in later times, that notwithstanding the purification they have undergone, through subsequent critics, it is necessary to receive with some caution the statements they contain. The passage, however, to which the appeal will now be made, is probably as free from serious objection, allowing for somewhat of obscurity in it, as any which the book contains. For, as will hereafter be shown, the sentiments of the fathers on the point in question were, at a later period, most industriously distorted and falsified.

Barnabas, then, has been speaking of the covenant with Abraham, as having superseded the Mosaic covenant; and he inquires whether God has *fulfilled* the covenant which he swore to the fathers. He then argues that it is so far fulfilled, that God has sent *Christ*, who is to be the covenant pledge for the remainder of it; quoting Isaiah xlii. 6: "I will give *thee* for a covenant of the people, for a light of the gentiles;" and Isaiah

\* Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane, in a work of his against the students of Prophecy, has rashly stated that the principles of Millenarianism were *opposed and rejected*, by almost every father of the church, with the exception of Barnabas, Clement, &c. &c. Now the fact is, that the numerous fathers mentioned by the doctor, as exceptions to his rule, are almost the whole of those whose works have been preserved down to the time of Origen. The doctor may be safely challenged to adduce one single passage in any father, during that period, opposing or rejecting the view; the utmost that can be said of any is, that they do not mention the subject; when they *do* advert to it, they support and maintain the view that has here been given.

lxi. 21: "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed ME to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of restitution." He then goes on: "Furthermore it is written concerning the Sabbath,—'Sanctify the Sabbath of the Lord with pure hands and with a clean heart.' And elsewhere he saith: 'If thy children shall keep my *Sabbaths*, then will I put my MERCY on them;' (alluding to the mercy promised to Abraham;) and even in the beginning of creation he makes mention of the *Sabbath*; 'And God made, in six days, the works of his hands, and he finished them on the *seventh* day, and he rested on the *seventh* day, and sanctified it.' Consider, my children, what that signifies:—'He finished them in six days.' The meaning is this: that in six thousand years, the Lord will bring all things to an end. For with him one day is a thousand years, as Himself testifieth, saying: 'Behold this day shall be as a thousand years:' therefore, children, in six days, (i. e. in 6000 years) shall all things be accomplished. And what is that he saith,—'He rested the *seventh* day?' He meaneth, that when his Son shall come, and abolish the Wicked One, and judge the ungodly, and change the sun and moon and stars, then he shall gloriously rest in the seventh day. He adds, lastly: 'Thou shalt sanctify it with clean hands and a pure heart, [alluding here to circumcision being of the heart.] Wherefore we are greatly deceived if we imagine, that any can now sanctify the day which God hath made holy, without having a heart pure in all things. Behold, therefore, he will then truly sanctify it with blessed rest, when we have received the righteous promise;—when iniquity shall be no more, all things being renewed by the Lord; and shall then be able to sanctify it, being ourselves holy." See Section xiv. xv. Epistle of Barnabas.

The next testimony is that of Papias. Eusebius and Jerome, though opposed to his sentiments, both acknowledge him to have been a disciple of John and companion of Polycarp.\* The former disparages Papias, as being illiterate, and a man of weak judgment, when he has to deal with his testimony on this point; but he speaks of him as being *eloquent and learned in the scriptures*, when he adverts to him on another occasion. But to this I shall presently refer again; in the mean while we have nothing to do in the present instance with the judgment of Papias, but only with his veracity; for his evidence respects, not what he thought himself, but what he heard from others:† and all have given him credit for being an

\* Eusebii Hist. lib. iii. and Hieron. Ep. xxix. 19.

† He states "that what he relates are the very words of the elders, Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, Aristio, and John the Presbyter, as related to him by those of whom he constantly made the inquiry;" and he pledges himself to the "truth and fidelity of what he reports."

eminently *pious and godly* man; one *proof* of which, and also of his wisdom and understanding is, that by the immediate successors of the apostles he was considered qualified to be made bishop of Hierapolis. The works of Papias himself are not known to exist; \* but Eusebius quotes from them the following passage: "Other things also the same writer, (Papias) has set forth, as having come down to him by unwritten tradition—some new parables and discourses of the Saviour, and certain other things somewhat fabulous. Among these he says that there will be a certain thousand years *after the resurrection of the dead, when the kingdom of Christ shall be established corporeally on this earth.*" Hist. lib. iii. sect. 39.

We next come to Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, the contemporary of Papias and disciple of John. His testimony might be considered ambiguous, were it not that Irenæus, whom we shall presently bring forward, speaks of his sentiments on this subject in a manner that shews clearly, that he must have interpreted certain passages of scripture conformably with what has been exhibited. We may be assured therefore, what was the drift and meaning of Polycarp in such passages as the following in his epistle to the Philippians: "If we please [the Lord] in this *present* world, we shall also be made partakers of *that which is to come*, according as he hath promised us, that he will raise us from the dead; and that if we walk worthy of him, we shall also reign together with him."—"Who of you are ignorant of the *Judgment of God*? Do we not know that *the saints shall judge the world*, as Paul teaches?"—"The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, &c. grant unto *you* a lot and portion among his saints, and us with you, and to all who are under the heavens, who shall believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and in his Father who raised him from the dead." "Whosoever perverts the oracles of God to his own lusts, and says there shall neither be any *resurrection nor judgment*, he is the first-born of Satan."

Justyn Martyr is the next. He was born A. D. 89, and suffered A. D. 163;† and must, therefore, have been arrived at man's estate before the death of Papias and Polycarp. Several of his works are extant, in which we have ample proof of the opinions which were held by the church in his days. In his Dialogue with Trypho, he says: "I, and all that are orthodox Christians, are acquainted with the resurrection of the body and the thousand years in Jerusalem, that shall be re-edified, adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and

\* They consisted of five books, called Λογίων Κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεις *a narrative of the sayings of our Lord.*

† Some have placed his martyrdom as early as A. D. 146.



others declare. For Isaiah saith of this thousand years, (chap. lxxv. 17,) 'Behold I create new heavens and a new earth, and the former shall not be remembered nor come into mind; but be ye glad and rejoice in those which I create: for behold I create Jerusalem to triumph, and my people to rejoice, &c.'—Moreover, a certain man *among us*, whose name is John, being one of the twelve apostles of Christ, in that revelation which was shewn to him prophesied, that those who believe in our Christ shall fulfil a thousand years at Jerusalem; and after that the general, and, in a word, the everlasting resurrection, and last judgment of all together. Whereof also our Lord spake when he said, that therein they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage, but shall be equal with the angels, being made the sons of the resurrection of God."

It will be seen, in the preceding extracts, that Justyn speaks of the opinion as being generally maintained by the *orthodox*. In the following passage he unceremoniously classes those who dissented from it among *heretics*: for he introduces the previous remarks, by saying: "I confessed to thee before, that I and many others are of this opinion, &c. And on the contrary, I have signified unto thee, that many, even those Christians *who follow not godly and pure doctrine*, do not acknowledge this: for I have demonstrated to thee, that these are indeed *called* Christians, but are *Atheists* and *ungodly heretics*, who altogether teach blasphemous, atheistical and unsound things."\*

The testimony of Irenæus is equally full and explicit with that of Justyn. He succeeded Pothinus as Bishop of Lyons, about A. D. 171, and was martyred in A. D. 202 or 208.† He wrote, among other works, five books upon the *Heresies* of his times, which books are still extant. He speaks of St. John the apostle as having lived to the times of Trajan, of Polycarp as a hearer of St. John, and of himself as a hearer of Polycarp.‡

The sentiments of Irenæus on the question before us, are

\* The genuineness of this passage will be considered in the fourth section of this chapter.

† See Cave's *Lives of the Fathers*.

‡ In an epistle to Florinus, he says:—"When I was very young, I saw you in the Lower Asia with Polycarp. I can remember circumstances of that time better than those which have happened more recently; for the things which we learn in childhood grow up with the soul, and unite themselves to it; insomuch that I can tell the place in which the blessed Polycarp sat and taught, and his going out and coming in, the manner of his life, the form of his person, and the discourses he made to the people; and how he related his conversation with *John*, and others who had seen the Lord; and how he related their sayings, and the things which he heard of them concerning the Lord, both concerning his miracles and doctrine, as he had received them from the eye-witnesses of the *Lord of Life*: all of which Polycarp related agreeable to the Scriptures,' &c.

principally to be found in the twelve last chapters of his fifth book against Heresies, one or two extracts from which here follows. In the 32nd chapter, having noticed that certain heretical opinions on the subject, arise from ignorance of the arrangements of God, and of the mystery of the resurrection and kingdom of the just; therefore (he says) it becomes needful to speak of them. Then he proceeds:—"For it is fitting that the just, rising at the appearing of God, should in the renewed state receive the promise of inheritance which God *covenanted to the fathers*, and should *reign* in it; and that then should come the final judgment. For in the same condition in which they have laboured and been afflicted, and been tried by suffering in all sorts of ways, it is but just that in it they should receive the fruits of their suffering, so that where, for the love of God, they suffered death, there they should be brought to life again; and where they endured bondage, there also they should reign. For God is rich in all things, and all things are of him: and therefore I say it is becoming, that the creature being restored to its original beauty, should without any impediment or drawback be subject to the righteous. This the apostle makes manifest in the epistle to the Romans: 'For the expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God, &c. for the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.' The promise likewise of God *which he made to Abraham* decidedly confirms this: for he says, 'Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward; for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever,' (Gen. xiii. 14, 15.) And again, 'Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it, for I will give it unto *thee*,' (ver. 17.) For Abraham received no inheritance in it,—not even a foot-breadth, but always was a stranger and a sojourner in it. And when Sarah his wife died, and the children of Heth offered to *give* him a piece of land for a burial place, *he would not accept it*, but purchased it for four hundred pieces of silver, from Ephron the son of Zohar the Hittite; staying himself on the promise of God, and being unwilling to seem to accept from man what God had promised to *give* him, saying to him, 'To thy seed will I give this land, from the great river of Egypt to the great river Euphrates.' Thus, therefore, as God promised to him the inheritance of the earth, and he received it not during the whole time he lived in it, it is necessary that he should receive it, together with his seed, that is, with such of them as fear God, and believe in him—in *the resurrection of the just.*" Ire-

næus then goes on to show, that Christ and the church are also of the true seed, and partakers of the promises, and concludes the chapter as follows: "Thus, therefore, those who are of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham; and the same are the *children* of Abraham. For God repeatedly promised the inheritance of the land to Abraham and his seed; and as neither Abraham nor his seed—that is, not those who are justified by faith—have enjoyed any inheritance in it, *they will undoubtedly receive it at the resurrection of the just.* For true and unchangeable is God: wherefore also he said, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.'"

In the 34th chapter he supports his statements by numerous quotations from the prophets, &c. As it is a matter of great interest and importance to the student of prophecy, to know what was the method of expounding or applying the prophetic scriptures in times so near to the apostles, a brief extract is given as a specimen: "Isaiah plainly declares similar happiness at the resurrection of the just; thus saying, 'Thy dead men shall arise, and those in the tombs shall rise, and they shall rejoice who are in the earth. For thy dew is salvation to them,' (xxvi. 19.) Ezekiel says the same; 'Behold, I will open your graves, and lead you forth from your tombs, in order that I may lead forth from their sepulchres my people, and I will put the Spirit in you, and ye shall know that I am the Lord,' (xxxvii. 12, 14.) And again the same saith: 'These things saith the Lord, When I shall have gathered Israel from the nations among whom they are scattered, then shall they dwell in their land, that I have given to my servant Jacob. And they shall dwell safely therein, and shall build houses, and plant vineyards,' &c. (chap. xxviii. 25, 26.)\* Then follow Jer. xxiii. 7, 8; Isa. xxx. 25, 26; lviii. 14; Luke xii. 27, 30; Rev. xx. 6; Isa. vi. 11; Daniel vii. 27; Jeremiah xxxi. 10—15; Isaiah xxxi. 9; xxxii. 1; liv. 11—14, and lxxv. 18—28, in the order here placed, and applied to the same doctrine.

The next father of any eminence whose sentiments on this head can be ascertained, is *Tertullian*, bishop of Carthage, who wrote his famous 'Apology,' about A. D. 180. In his third book against Marcion, chap. xxiv. he says: "For we also confess, that a kingdom is promised us *on earth*: before that in heaven, but in another state, viz. after the resurrection, for it will be for a thousand years in a city of divine workmanship, viz. *Jerusalem brought down from heaven*: and this city Ezekiel *knew*, and the apostle John *saw*, &c.\* This we say is the city

\* There follows here a passage concerning a vision of a city, which Tertullian asserts was acknowledged by the Romans to have been seen in Judea. But my object is not to bring forward the *extraneous* matter introduced by the

provided of God to receive the saints in the resurrection, wherein to refresh them with an abundance of all spiritual good things, in recompense of those which in the world we have either despised or lost. For it is both just and worthy of God, that his servants should there triumph and rejoice, where they have been afflicted for his Name's sake. This is the manner of the heavenly kingdom."

Besides the testimony above adduced, Tertullian mentions it as a custom of his times for Christians to pray, "that they might have part in the first resurrection." And Cyprian, who flourished about A. D. 220, informs us, that the thirst for martyrdom which existed among Christians arose from their supposing, that those who suffered for Christ would obtain a more distinguished lot in his kingdom. From which we may perceive how highly *practical* that doctrine was, which could make men even court death, and take joyfully the spoiling of their goods, and to suffer torture, not obtaining deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection. Heb. xi.

3. Having brought forward these eminent testimonies from those fathers of the two first centuries who are known to us, or rather whose words have come down to us; the next step in the inquiry will be into the voice of the Church from Origen to Jerome inclusive; for with Origen a new era commenced in the history of prophetic interpretation; and Jerome and Augustine were almost the last of the fathers of any eminence who preceded the authoritative establishment of the papacy. Origen flourished about the middle of the third century: Jerome died about A. D. 420; and the papacy was (as many suppose) firmly established by Justinian in 533: and in the century that intervened between Jerome and this period, there arose no one on the side of genuine Christianity who may not be considered a feeble follower of that father; whilst during the whole of that same century those idolatrous practices and deviations from the true faith, which led on to the maturing of the papal apostacy, had been rapidly spreading and acquiring strength.

As the system of interpretation, which now commenced with Origen, greatly affected the sense of holy writ, and became so popular in the end as insensibly to carry away with it the majority of Christians, it must of course be viewed as having greatly affected *the voice of the Church*; and it consequently becomes an important question, how far the system of

---

fathers into their writings, and which was the fruit merely of their *own individual* judgment; but to exhibit that system of *expounding and applying scripture*, which seems to have been as yet handed down uninterrupted among them.

Origen was compatible with the mind of the Spirit, as exhibited in the holy scriptures.

It is likewise important to observe, that up to the time of Origen, and also in his time, the system of exposition which characterised the two first centuries, was still prevalent. Owing, however, to the great influence of the learning and talents of Origen, his allegorizing system soon began to obtain with many; insomuch that Nepos, a pious and talented bishop of Egypt, was prompted to write a book, entitled 'The Reprehensions of *Allegorizers*,' which was specially directed against those who now began to explain the Millennium figuratively. After the death of Nepos, Dionysius, a zealous disciple of Origen, became bishop of Alexandria; and perceiving that the views of Nepos overthrew the principle of his master's system, he laboured to refute them; and of his success in drawing over one Coraicion, with certain of his followers, in the villages of Arsenoita, Eusebius preserves the account, (lib. vii. c. 22—24.) But he relates also, that Dionysius, in the pursuit of his object, was led to question the canonical authority of the *Apocalypse*; from which a fair inference may be drawn, that he found himself hard pressed by passages in that book. Mosheim, in his Ecclesiastical History, observes, "that long before this controversy an opinion had prevailed, that Christ was to come and reign a thousand years among men, before the entire and final dissolution of this world;"—"that this opinion had hitherto met with *no* opposition;"—"and that now its credit began to decline principally through the influence and authority of Origen, who opposed it with the greatest warmth, because it was *incompatible with some of his favourite sentiments*." (vol. i. p. 284.)

In regard to the system of interpretation struck out by Origen, and which was adopted with modifications and varieties by so many others, the best way of briefly conveying an idea of its general character, and of shewing, that the opinion here expressed of it is not that of an individual writer, will be to bring forward two or three instances, displaying the manner in which it has been reprobated by eminent expositors in subsequent times. Jerome, who had himself, though unconsciously, in a measure imbibed the leaven of it, does nevertheless condemn it; but *his* opinion may be shewn by a reference to Luther's, who says, in his Annotations on Deuteronomy, "That which I have so often insisted on elsewhere, I here once more repeat; viz. that the Christian should direct his first efforts toward understanding the *literal* sense (as it is called) of scripture, which alone is the substance of faith and of Christian theology;—which alone will sustain him in the hour of trouble and



temptation;—and which will triumph over sin, death, and the gates of hell, to the praise and glory of God. The allegorical sense is commonly *uncertain*, and by no means safe to build our faith upon; for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only, on which, if a man lean, he will find it no better than the Egyptian reed. Therefore, *Origen, Jerome*, and similar of the fathers, are to be avoided, with the whole of that Alexandrian school, which, according to Eusebius and Jerome, formerly abounded in this species of interpretation. For later writers *unhappily following their too much praised and prevailing example*, it has come to pass, that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the word of God to the most extravagant absurdities; and, as *Jerome complains of his own times*, they extract a sense from Scripture repugnant to its meaning: of which offence, however, Jerome himself was also guilty.” Ann. in Deut. cap. i. fo. 55. Dr. Mosheim observes: “After the encomiums we have given to Origen, &c., it is not without deep concern we are obliged to add, that he also, by an unhappy method, opened a secure retreat for all sorts of errors, which a wild and irregular imagination could bring forth.” And after noticing that he abandoned the *literal* sense, and divided the *hidden* sense into *moral* and *mystical*, or *spiritual*, he adds: “A prodigious number of interpreters, both in this and the succeeding ages, followed the method of Origen, though with some variations; nor could the few, who explained the sacred writings with judgment and a true spirit of criticism, oppose with any success the torrent of allegory that was overflowing the Church.” Ch. Hist. cent. iii. part 2. sect. 5. 6. Milner, in his Church History, says somewhat similar:—“No man, not altogether unsound and hypocritical, *ever injured the Church of Christ more than Origen did*. From the fanciful mode of allegory, introduced by him, and uncontrolled by scriptural rule and order, there arose a vitiated method of commenting on the sacred pages; which has been succeeded by the contrary extreme,—viz. a contempt of types and figures altogether. And in a similar way his fanciful ideas of *letter* and *spirit* tended to remove from men’s minds all just conceptions of genuine spirituality. *A thick mist for ages* pervaded the Christian world, supported and strengthened by his allegorical manner of interpretation. The learned alone were considered as guides implicitly to be followed; and the vulgar, when the *literal sense* was hissed off the stage, had nothing to do but to follow their authority, wherever it might lead them. Vol. i. page 469.

A very considerable number, however, of Christians, *decidedly the majority*, did nevertheless continue, sometime after Origen, to maintain the millennarian view. So difficult indeed

is it to depart consistently, and all at once, from a beaten track, that even Origen himself is now and then betrayed into statements, which are only reconcilable on the millenarian system of interpretation. Take, for example, the following passage against Celsus, (lib. iii.)—"We do not deny the purging fire of the destruction of wickedness, and the renovation of all things." And again, in his thirteenth Homily on Jeremiah, he says: "If any man shall preserve the washing of the Holy Spirit, &c. he shall have his part *in the first Resurrection*; but if any man be saved *in the second resurrection only*, it is the sinner that needeth the baptism by fire. Wherefore, seeing these things are so, let us lay the Scriptures to heart, and make them the rule of our lives; that so, being cleansed from the defilement of sin before we depart, we may be *raised up with the saints, and have our lot with Christ Jesus.*"

Of those fathers from Origen to Jerome who *decidedly* took the millenarian view, the most eminent was *Lactantius*, who flourished in the time of Constantine the Great, about A. D. 310. He was considered the most learned of the Latin fathers, and his works abound with testimonies to the matter in hand. A specimen is here given from his book, *De Divinis Institutionibus*; which example is selected in preference, because there will, by-and-by, be a further use for it. Speaking of the coming of God to judge the world he says: "But when he shall do that, and shall restore the just that have been from the beginning unto life, he shall converse among men a thousand years, and rule them with a most righteous government. This the Sibyl elsewhere proclaims, saying, *Hear me, O ye men, the eternal King doth reign*, &c. Then they that shall be alive in their bodies shall not die, but by the space of those thousand years shall generate an infinite multitude, and their offspring shall be holy and dear to God. And they that shall be raised from the dead shall be over the living as judges. And the Gentiles shall not be *utterly* extinguished; but some shall be left for the victory of God, that they may be triumphed over by the just, and reduced to perpetual servitude. About the same time the prince of devils, the forger of all evil, shall be bound with chains, and shall be in custody all the thousand years of the heavenly empire, under which righteousness shall reign over the world." Chap. xxiv.

*Methodius*, bishop of Olympus, who suffered martyrdom under Decius about A. D. 312, says, in his book on the resurrection, written against Origen,\* "It is to be expected that at the

\* The book is not known to be extant, but the passage here quoted is cited, with others, by Proclus in Epiphanius. See the Paris Edition of the Works of Methodius, by Combèsis, 1644.

conflagration the creation shall suffer a vehement commotion, as if it were about to die; whereby it shall be *renovated*, and not *perish*; to the end that we, then also renovated, may dwell in the renewed world, free from sorrow. Thus it is said in Psalm civ: 'Thou wilt send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou wilt *renew* the face of the earth,' &c. For seeing that after this world there shall be an earth, of necessity there must be inhabitants; and these shall die no more, but be as angels, irreversibly in an incorruptible state, doing all most excellent things."

*Epiphanius*, who flourished about A. D. 365, mentions the doctrine being held by many in his time, and speaks favourably of it himself. Quoting the words of *Paulinus*, bishop of Antioch, concerning one *Vitalius*, whom he highly commends for his piety, orthodoxy, and learning, he says: "Moreover others have affirmed that the venerable man should say, that in the first resurrection we shall accomplish a certain millenary of years," &c.; on which *Epiphanius* observes: "And that indeed this millenary term is written of, in the Apocalypse of *John*, and is received of very many of them that are godly, is manifest." Lib. iii. 2.

But the most important testimony, in regard to the prevalence of this doctrine during the fourth century is, the countenance given to it by the council of Nice, called by *Constantine the great*, A. D. 325. This council, besides their definition of faith and canons ecclesiastical, set forth certain *διατυπώσεις* or *forms of ecclesiastical doctrines*. Some of these are recorded by *Gelasius Cyzicenus*, (*Hist. Act. Con. Nic.*) among which is the following, on the last clause of the Nicene Creed, "*I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come.*"—"The world was made inferior (*μικροτερος*) through foreknowledge: for God saw that man would sin; therefore we expect new heavens and a new earth, according to the holy scriptures, at the appearing of the great God and our Saviour *Jesus Christ*. And as *Daniel* says: (*Chap. vii. 18.*) *The saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom*. And there shall be a pure and holy land, the land of the living and not of the dead; which *David* foreseeing with the eye of faith exclaims: *I believe to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living*,—the land of the meek and humble. *Blessed*, saith *Christ*, (*Matt. v. 5.*) *are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth*. And the prophet saith: (*Isaiah xxvi. 6.*) "*The feet of the meek and humble shall tread upon it.*" Thus the majority of the Church must, at the period of this council, have still held to the primitive method of interpretation.\*

\* Dupin, in his Ecclesiastical History, whilst he admits the existence of the



Later in the period from Origen to Jerome, now under consideration, there is evidence that millennarian opinions were held by Gregory of Nyssa, and by Paulinus, bishop of Antioch. And Jerome informs us, that it was likewise held by Victorinus, bishop of Pettaw, by Apollinaris, bishop of Bituria. Augustine however and Jerome himself now demand attention, and with the mention of these, the account of this period shall be closed. These eminent men were contemporaries; Jerome dying in A. D. 420, Augustine in 430. *Augustine* thus expresses himself on this point, in his remarks on Rev. xx. 6. "Those who have supposed from these words, that there shall be a first *corporal* resurrection, have been moved among other things chiefly by the number of the *thousand* years; as if there ought to be, among the saints, a *sabbatism*, as it were, in a holy vacation, after their six thousand years of trouble. Which opinion would indeed be tolerable, if it should be believed that *spiritual* delights should redound to the saints in that sabbath, by the presence of the Lord; for we also were ourselves formerly (*aliquando*) of that opinion." De Civ. Dei. Lib. xx. c. 7. Now, if *Augustine* had been formerly of that opinion, it is plain that he must first have received it as the most plain and obvious view of the subject; and that he was not induced to look shy

---

twenty *canons* of the council of Nice, contained in *Gelasius*, questions the 'acts,' related by him as of that council, to be genuine. He says: "Neither *Ruffin*, nor *Socrates*, nor *Theodoret*, nor any other ancient historian, has either seen or known these *acts*. *St. Jerome* says, that *he* had read the acts of the council of Nice; but he means by this form of expression, the *canons* and *subscriptions*. The *acts* which *Gelasius* attributes to *Dalmasius*, were made subsequent to the council, and taken out of *Eusebius*, *Theodoret*, *Socrates*, and other historians." There is no need to enter into the reasons which *Dupin*, who was a Roman Catholic, had for controverting the testimony of *Gelasius*: the reader is requested only to observe, that so far as the point in hand is concerned, it is not affected by the doubt which he endeavours to cast upon it. For, suppose it to be true, that *Gelasius* compiled these things from the sources named; and suppose, as another Romish historian has asserted, "that he was a compiler without method, collecting at random all he could find;" it shakes the credit of *Gelasius*, as an original and discreet writer, but the *later* in date any of the authorities are, which may be pirated by *Gelasius*, the more useful they are in the present instance; for they prove the prevalence of the doctrine at so much later a period. There is reason however to question, whether the *διευρωτικα*, &c. be not different from what *Dupin* means by the 'acts,' and greater reason still to question, whether *Jerome*, when he mentions *acts*, did not fully understand his own form of expression, and *mean* acts. Certainly more has come down to us, as authentic, of the proceedings of that council, than the rules for ecclesiastical discipline, contained in the twenty canons acknowledged by *Dupin*. For the drawing up these canons was the last thing the council did; the first business that occupied them, and for which they specially assembled, being the Arian controversy, which produced the *Creed*, known by the name of the *Nicene* creed; and another thing we know to have been debated by them was,—the time for keeping Easter. (See *Cave's Lives of the Fathers*.) And though *Dupin*, and others after him, may contend *against* the authenticity of the acts; yet *Lindanus*, who is of the same church, as eloquently contends *for* it. (*Panopl. lib. 2. c. 6*.)

at it, till he was given to understand that some held it carnally. And for this '*ou dit*' there appears to be no trace but in Eusebius, from whom Ludovicus Vives declares Augustine had it. Eusebius was prejudiced against the doctrine, for reasons which will be presently considered.

We finally come to *Jerome*. He was a vehement adversary of the doctrine; but whatever his own prejudices may have been, he nevertheless lets fall a very important admission as to the number of divines who continued to hold it, in his days. In his commentary on Jeremiah xix. 10, he says, "that he durst not *condemn* the doctrine, because many ecclesiastical persons and martyrs affirmed the same."

Thus the sentiments of the earlier fathers were not so entirely corrupted, during this period, but that a very considerable number of Christians, and among them, as we have seen, many very eminent ecclesiastics, still maintained the same; whilst the adversaries of it make very important concessions.\*

4. We next have to consider the voice of the Church, during that long period of darkness which elapsed from the time of Jerome to the Reformation; a period which is important and interesting, as regards *prophecy*, not from its supplying us with evidence in behalf of the primitive mode of interpretation; but from its showing how that evidence, which previously existed, has been tampered with and thrust aside.

We have already seen, that a new character was given to the system of Scripture exposition, in the time of Origen; and that this new allegorizing system very materially affected the prophecies. But another circumstance occurred in the century following, which shortly after began to exercise a far more considerable influence upon the interpretation of prophecy; an influence which kept gradually but rapidly increasing, till in the age of Jerome, and downward through the papal ages, it prompted men to resort to various wicked artifices, in order to get rid of the primitive millennarian doctrine. This event was *the conversion of the Roman emperor to the Christian faith*.† It was the *uniform* and *constant* opinion of the church, previous to this period, that Rome would become the seat of ANTI-

\* The reader will find copious quotations from the fathers on this subject in the works of Mede, Dr. Homes his contemporary, Dr. Whitby and Dr. Burnett. If he cannot obtain the larger works, he will likewise find much of them extracted in a modern little treatise, 'Thoughts on Millenarianism,' by the Rev. W. W. Pym, and in some other writers. I have thought it needful, however, in this instance, to refer to the works of the fathers themselves, and to adduce, in some instances, passages which are more directly applicable to the particular point in hand, than those which are to be met with in the above writers.

† The date of Constantine's conversion is variously placed at A. D. 306, 312, 326 and 337. Gibbon is disposed to date it from the the Milan edict, in favour of Christianity, somewhere between A. D. 306 and 312. Vol. iii. chap. xx.

CHRIST; that the empire would, by a revolution, be first divided into ten kingdoms, that then Antichrist would be revealed and prosper for a time, and that, after the reigning power should have suffered a signal discomfiture, the dominion should be altogether taken from "the eternal city."\* Such a notion could not be palatable to the Roman emperor, if known to him; and the less so if it was further understood, that some, in times of pagan persecution, had already mused in their hearts, whether the emperor himself for the time being were not personally *the antichrist*. These things must have been very perplexing to those ecclesiastics, now mingling with the court, who were of a compliant and secular spirit: which may be judged of, when we find an honest and bold, and godly man, like Lactantius, now expressing himself with avowed *reluctance* on these topics. He says: "The Roman power which now governs the world—(my mind *dreads* to declare it; yet I *must* speak it, because it will surely come to pass!) the Roman power will be *taken away* from the earth, and the empire will return into Asia, and the east will again have the chief dominion, and the west will be in subjection." De Instit. cap. xv.

The convenient explication, however, was soon afterwards discovered, and adopted by many, that Antichrist was *Pagan Rome*, and that from the date of Constantine's conversion the *millennium* commenced. And though the advocates of such an opinion were obliged to maintain, that *Satan was bound* during the time of the rancorous dissensions and persecutions which arose in the Church on the Arian controversy; and notwithstanding those daily *other* evils, temptations and deceits constantly experienced during the supposed thousand years, and of which Satan must necessarily have been the author; yet able men were found to maintain such an interpretation! yea, even *protestant* writers, such as Grotius and his followers, have, at a much later period, adopted the opinion; notwithstanding the immensely greater improbability with which *they* have had to contend, viz., that of considering the darkest period of papal history, the one of greatest light and glory to the Church!

Among those who in the reign of Constantine may be justly suspected of time-serving, was Eusebius the historian, bishop of Pamphylia, who boasts of his conversation with that monarch; and as from him appears to have originally sprung the obloquy which was cast upon the *Chiliasts*, (as they were now called,) it is necessary to bring him first in order under notice. He does not directly attack the doctrine itself; but raises questions on the canonical authority of the Apocalypse, and on the sup-

\* See Jerome's Commentary on Daniel vii. wherein he declares the uniform testimony of the fathers on this head, and was persuaded of it himself.

posed author of the millennial doctrine. His statements, however, on this head are contradictory and absurd; for in one place he seems to attribute the invention of it to the heretic Cerinthus, and to insinuate that the early upholders of the doctrine were Ebionites;\* but in another place he distinctly says that *Papias* was its author, and that by the generality, (*πλειστοις*) of ecclesiastics following it was afterwards received, owing to the *antiquity* of the man. (lib. iii. sect. 39.) Now *Papias* was no ancient to his *own* generation; and though *Irenæus*, in the age immediately following, speaks of him as having declared certain things on this subject, which he heard from the apostle *John*; yet he by no means intimates that he adopted the doctrine from him; nor could *Irenæus* indeed be moved by the *antiquity* of a man who flourished only about fifty years before him. Neither is there a shadow of evidence that any orthodox ecclesiastics in the first two centuries did *otherwise* than hold it. Moreover, when *Eusebius* is speaking of the Millennial doctrine of *Papias*, he calls him, (as we have before noticed,) a man of very weak intellect, and supposes therefore that he must have *misconceived* the doctrine; but when he refers to him in another part of his works for other objects, he can admit him to have “enjoyed great fame and celebrity,” and to have been “a man most eloquent in all things, and skilful in the Scriptures.” *Hist. of Euseb.* iii. 32.

Further, it is not a little matter that *Eusebius*, besides having disparaged the authority of the *Apocalypse*, and insinuated that it was perhaps the work of *Cerinthus* the *Ebionite*, was decidedly tainted with the *Arian heresy*, which renders his views liable to suspicion on this point in more respects than the one named. The *Magdeburgensian* centuriators thus treat of him: “Being now about to say some few things concerning the doctrine of *Eusebius*, we first give this admonition, that *Jerome* every where holds him forth, suspected of the error of *Arianism*. For in his apology against *Ruffinus* he says of *Eusebius*, ‘that he was indeed a most learned man, but not a *Catholic*; [i. e. according to the usages of the word in those times, not *orthodox*,] and throughout six of his books did continually declare that *Origen* was of the *same faith* with him,—i. e. of the *Arian falsehood*.” *Hist. Eccles.* cap. x. sect. 3. Bishop *Jeremy Taylor* in his ‘*Liberty of Prophesying*,’ not only says of him, that he entertained *Arian sentiments*; but that he is not clear of a suspicion of having endeavoured to corrupt and

\* For a learned and able refutation of *Eusebius* on this point, shewing that *Cerinthus* actually never did hold the true millennial doctrine, and that the carnal notions really held by him were not held by *Justyn*, *Irenæus*, &c. see *Medes’ Works*.

falsify the Nicene Creed, (fol. ed. p. 954,) which will account for what Scultetus says of him, that though immediately after the council of Nice he seemed to have returned to his right mind, he never did *cordially* believe the co-equality of Christ with the Father. Now a man who can be disingenuous enough to insinuate that Origen was of the same faith with him; who can go about to falsify a document of such importance as the Nicene Creed; and who can apparently veer round in his opinions on an important doctrine, and yet in heart remain of the same opinion still; may justly be suspected of having been influenced in his change of sentiments by the opinion of the *emperor*, who, in the council of Nice, took decidedly against Arius. And yet, it is on the credit and judgment of such a man, that the whole weight of an objection, insignificant in itself, is rested.\*

When the Christian *bishop* of Rome came, in progress of time, to be elevated to the high rank which he attained under the papacy, the inconvenience of explaining Rome to be the capital city of the Antichrist, and the '*Babylon*' and '*Harlot*' of the Apocalypse, was more sensibly felt than ever: because it could not be asserted without giving occasion for the very obvious conclusion, that the bishop of Rome would some day apostatize, together with the church in general over which he was the head. Accordingly, from the time of Justinian, efforts were both openly and clandestinely made to get rid of the doctrine altogether, by removing or corrupting the evidence in its favour, or by affixing to it the stigma of heresy. Pope Damasus endeavoured peremptorily to put it down by a decree. And some works of the Fathers, which were in favour of it, (such as the works of Papias, the Treatise of Nepos already adverted to, several of the more direct works of Irenæus on the subject, Tertullian's treatise on *Paradise*,† and various others,) were successfully suppressed; and in regard to those which could not be so well withdrawn, a system of interpolating, or otherwise altering the text, commenced, which in some instances has affected only a portion of the manuscript copies that have come down to us, and in other instances the entire of them.

\* The reader who wishes to see other authorities in proof of the Arianism of Eusebius, may consult—'The Resurrection Revealed,' by Dr. Homes. See the revised edition of 1833, p. 37; also the works of Le Clerc and Mosheim.

† Some of these treatises, by showing that the saints are not perfectly glorified at death, but wait for the time when the Lord shall take to him his great power and reign, were found also to conflict against the growing heresy of the invocation of saints and angels, so profitable to the Romish church in after times: and Bellarmine admits (*de Beat. Sanct. Ord. Disput.*) that the notion of the saints going immediately to heaven on their death, was the foundation of it.



A specimen shall be given first from the works of Justyn Martyr. That passage in his Dialogue with Trypho, which has already been in part adduced (see sect. 2.) was originally as follows: "I am not such a wretch, Trypho, as to say one thing and mean another. I have before confessed to thee, that I and many others are of this opinion: [viz. that Jerusalem shall be rebuilt, and the saints enjoy a happy life on earth with Christ:] so that we hold it to be thoroughly proved that it will come to pass. But I have also signified unto thee, on the other hand, that many—even those of that race of Christians who follow not godly and pure doctrine—do not acknowledge it. For I have demonstrated to thee, that these are indeed called Christians; but are atheists and impious heretics, because that in all things they teach what is blasphemous, and ungodly, and unsound, &c. If, therefore, you fall in with certain who are called Christians who confess not this [truth,] but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in that they say there is no resurrection of the dead, but that, immediately they die, their souls are received up into heaven,\* avoid them, and

\* The condition of *separate spirits*, between the period of death and the resurrection, has so important a bearing upon the Millenarian doctrine, that I must be excused if I here notice it more at large. I have shown, in another work, (*Abdiel's Essays*, p. 93.) that the believer enjoys at death a conscious blessedness, which renders it better for him to depart and be with Christ, than to remain in the body; but it is equally clear from scripture and from the fathers, that the believer does not at death "ascend into the heavens," any more than did David; (Acts ii. 34.) or than Christ did between his death and resurrection; who went to paradise, and had not even *after* his resurrection yet ascended unto the Father. John xx. 17. It is very plain, from the testimony of Justyn, that in the primitive church they held those not to be Christians, who maintained that souls are received up into heaven immediately after death. Irenæus ranks them, in his work against Heresies, (lib. v.) as among the *heretical*; and the testimony of the church is *uniform* on this point, (if we except some questionable passages in Cyprian) down into Popish times: and it was indeed the general opinion of the Greek and Latin churches, down to the Council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV. in 1439. A passage from bishop Taylor's 'Liberty of Propheying,' (sect. viii.) will set this matter in a clear light. When shewing how doctrines of antiquity were sometimes contradicted in subsequent ages by councils, or by some ecclesiastic of power or popularity, he says, "That is a plain recession from antiquity, which was determined by the council of Florence—*piorum animas purgatas, &c. mox in celum recipi et indueri dare ipsum Deum trinum et unum sicuti est; (that the souls of the pious, being purified, are immediately at death received into heaven, and behold clearly the trine God just as he is:)* for those who please to try may see it dogmatically resolved to the contrary by Justyn Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Arethas Cæsariensis, Euthymius, who may answer for the Greek church. And it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek church, by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine Council, where the Latins acted their master-piece of wit and stratagem,—the greatest that hath been till the famous and super-politic Council of Trent. And for the Latin church, Tertullian, Ambrose, Austin, Hilary, Prudentius, Lactantius, Victorinus, and Bernard, are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditiis receptaculis et exterioribus atriiis*, where they expect the resurrection of their bodies and the glorification

esteem them not Christians. But I and whatsoever Christians are orthodox (*ορθολογικους*) in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned, and enlarged, according as Ezekiel, Isaiah, and other prophets have promised." Now the above passage, had it been left untouched, must have remained so signal and obvious a testimony to the orthodox faith in his days, that the Romish church must at once have been convicted of having departed from the primitive belief in this matter. Accordingly, the passage in italics has been altered, and the first '*not*' omitted. Thus it appears in the *printed* copies of Justyn, and thus it was in most of the manuscripts extant in the seventeenth century; but *not in all*. For Dr. N.

---

of their souls; and though they all believe them to be happy, yet that they enjoy not the beatific vision before the resurrection."

The stratagem employed by the Romanists, to which bishop Taylor alludes, is, I suppose, the fact recorded in the History of this Council by Creighton, who wrote in 1660, and in Geddes' *Introductory Discourse to Vargas's Letters*; who state, that the pope first inveigled the patriarch of Constantinople, and some of his clergy, to meet him at a Council at Ferrara, which he then adroitly adjourned to Florence; and when the Greek ecclesiastics pleaded inability to bear the charges, he actually defrayed all their expenses himself. The patriarch died at Florence, and the Greek church (according to Gaspar Penceus) not only disowned the acts of the clergy present, but excommunicated them, and denied them Christian burial.

The early Reformers maintained the primitive faith on this point, plainly perceiving that the object of the Papists was to help forward the doctrine of *purgatory and invocation of saints*. Thus Tyndal, disputing with the Papists, says: "If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? and then, what cause is there of the resurrection?" p. 324, Works by Fox. And afterwards, in reply to More, who objects against Luther, that his doctrine on this point encouraged the sinner to continue in sin, seeing it so long postponed the ultimate judgment, Tyndal says: "Christ and his apostles taught no other, but warned to *look for Christ's coming again every hour*; which coming again, because ye believe it will *never be*, therefore have ye feigned that other merchandize."

Calvin also, in his *Psychopannychia*, replies thus to another objection against this doctrine: "I answer that Christ is our Head, *whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared*. If the members were to go before the head, the order of things would be inverted and preposterous. But we shall follow our Prince then, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit upon the throne of his majesty." p. 55.

It is greatly to be lamented that the Protestant church of a later period should have fallen into the errors of the Papists on this subject, (abating the distinct acknowledgment of purgatory; errors, the adoption of which has done more than any other thing perhaps, towards withdrawing from the Church the lively expectation of Christ's Advent.

I am indebted for what concerns the Council of Florence in the above statement, (excepting the extract from Bishop Taylor,) to an anonymous work entitled—"An historical view of the Controversy concerning an intermediate state, &c. between death and the resurrection;" a work written with no great honesty in behalf of the extreme opinion that the soul is in a state of unconsciousness and perishes at death: for the view which the fathers maintained on this particular point is carefully kept back. The reader who desires to see more of the testimony of the fathers may consult the learned work of Dr. Burnett, *De statu Mortuorum et Resurgentium*.

Homes, in his work on the Resurrection, testifies to having seen some without it. Fortunately, however, the omission of the word, (though in that single sentence it alters the meaning, and makes some deniers of this truth followers nevertheless of "godly and pure doctrine,") has the effect of giving to the whole passage so forced, abrupt and obscure an aspect, that none can read it with attention without perceiving how contradictory it is.\* For how could any be followers, in the estimation of Justyn, of *pure doctrine*, and persons of *sound judgment*, who received not this, which he says, all who are *orthodox* received? And how can that next sentence: "*for I have before demonstrated to thee, that these are indeed called Christians, but are really atheists,*" &c. apply (as it evidently does, if the *not* be omitted) to followers of that which is *godly and pure*?

There is apparently another suppression. Justyn alludes twice in this passage to his having *before* expressed his belief on this point, and also demonstrated the ungodliness of those who denied it: but the place in his writings where such a passage occurs, is not to be found. The author of "Eruvin," (p. 190—193.) supposes, and with great probability, that the *deniers* of the doctrine, whom he speaks of as having pointed out, are the heretics mentioned in a passage immediately previous: but there is no mention in *that* passage of the *things* concerning which Trypho puts the question, and to which Justyn replies:—"I told you before, that I and many others (as indeed you well know) believe that *these things* will take place; and I *also* stated," &c. The probability then is, that his sentiments were so plainly expressed in that instance, that they could not be made to speak a contrary opinion, merely by the eliding some convenient monosyllable; and therefore the passage has been got rid of entire. At any rate it must be viewed as a particular providence, that, owing to circumstances which we cannot now trace, the sentiments of Justyn should have been preserved to such an extent as they have been: an extent still sufficient clearly to demonstrate the voice of the church to have been millenarian in the earliest Christian times.†

\* The extract just given from Justyn is as literally translated from the Greek as I can give it; two parenthetical sentences only being left out, that in no way affect the argument. The translator into Latin of the Parisian edition of Justyn's works, labours hard to give a sense which may comport with the omission of the word *not*; but it is in several instances not justified by the Greek. It is amusing also to observe, how puzzled the translator is, in his notes, to account for *obscurities* which appear in his translation; and how astonished he is at the harshness of *Irenæus*, for going further than Justyn apparently does in this matter, and condemning those as *heretics* who were not millenarians; whereas they actually both do the same thing.

† It was apparently with a fraudulent intention that a book, entitled "Ques-



It may appear surprising, that the work of *Irenæus* should have come down to us in the condition it has. Some of his writings, which are more directly on this subject, are lost altogether; and much of the original Greek is gone from that which we possess: but still there is in his book "on Heresies" matter as clear and tangible to the point, as any that may have been suppressed in Justyn. The fact, however, is, that this work actually *was* consigned to darkness, during the long period of papal supremacy, and was supposed to be lost, the same as his other works; but at the era of the Reformation, a copy of it was discovered by Erasmus, and given to the world. And herein the providence of God is again remarkable; for had a decided Protestant, or a Millenarian, have found and published it, somewhat of suspicion might have attached to the circumstance, so far as the passages which affect this question are concerned; but Erasmus continued in communion with the Romish church, and yet had that thirst for literature, and that looseness in his opinions in many points of popish doctrine and practice, that he could do things without a scruple, which a more rigid or more consistent Papist would not have resolved upon.

A slur, however, is thrown upon *Irenæus*, in consequence of a passage in his book, said to be a tradition handed down by Papias,—a passage which is made use of by the opposers of millenarian doctrine, at once to impugn the judgment both of *Irenæus* and Papias himself. It is as follows:—

"The elders who saw John, the disciple of the Lord, have mentioned, that they themselves heard of him, after what manner the Lord was wont to teach concerning those times, [i. e. of the Millennium,] and to say: 'The day shall come when vines shall be produced each with ten thousand branches, and in each branch ten thousand shoots, and on every shoot ten thousand sprigs, and on every sprig ten thousand bunches, and on every bunch ten thousand grapes, and every grape being

---

tions and Answers to the Orthodox," was during the dark ages incorporated with the works of Justyn, and imputed to him as its author. But critics of later times have so far done justice to him, that in most instances the work is now separated from the writings of Justyn; the circumstance that the author, whoever he was, advocates the Nestorian heresy, being too flagrant an anachronism to pass with any who are at liberty to think at all. It is but justice, however, to the anonymous author of this work, to observe, that there are marks in it which lead to a justifiable suspicion of its having been greatly corrupted. The form in which it is presented of questions and answers on independent subjects, afforded an easy opportunity, and therefore a great temptation, in those times, to interpolate any thing; and the circumstance that some of the objectionable passages are written in a feeble and irrational style, whilst others exhibit great penetration into the meaning of Scripture, shew that the opportunity has not been lost.

pressed shall yield twenty-five metretæ of wine. And when one shall have laid hold of a bunch, another shall cry out, *I am a better bunch, take me; by me bless the Lord.* In like manner also that a corn of wheat should yield ten thousand ears, and every ear should have ten thousand corns, and every corn ten pounds of fine clean flour; moreover also that the other kinds of fruit and seeds and herbs should in a like manner according to their nature do the same. And that all animals living on the fruits of the earth, should become peaceable, and one in harmony with another, being subject to men with all subjection.\* Moreover, Papias also, an ancient, who was an hearer of John, and a companion of Polycarp, bears further testimony to these things, writing in his fourth book; for there are five books which he composed, and he (the Lord,) added saying, *Now these things are worthy of belief unto the believing.* And when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked, How then are such things to be effected, the Lord answered, *They shall see who shall come to those days.*

On this passage it is first of all to be remarked, that the works both of Polycarp and Papias have been withdrawn from the light; so that it cannot be proved to be genuine, neither corrected, from their actual writings: nor have we the Greek, in this instance, of Irenæus. A recent author, in a learned and very able work on the parables,\* surmises that in the original, the word translated *decem millia* was *μυριας*; (vol. i. p. 296,) in which case the meaning is not of necessity to be understood definitely as *ten thousand*, but in that indefinite sense, in which we adopt it from the Greek and use it, when we say *myriads*.† This is a highly probable conjecture, and takes away from the passage that appearance of absurdity which has excited the profane scoff of Doctors Whitby and Middleton.‡ When we

\* See an Exposition of the Parables, and of other parts of the Gospels, by Edward Greswell, B. D., Fellow of C. C. C. Oxford.

† Jude v. 14, would be more in the spirit of the original, if the word *μυριας* were retained in the translation, and rendered, "Behold the Lord cometh with *myriads* of his saints;" The original is literally "with his holy *myriads*," and at the least it should be rendered "with ten *thousands* of his saints," in the plural; as the definite term *ten thousand*, in the singular, conveys an idea quite foreign from the original.

‡ The latter of these writers furnishes an instance that the art of interpolating and corrupting the text of an author, when the subject before us is concerned, has not been confined to papal times. In "Dr. Middleton's Inquiry, &c." page 26, he represents Justyn Martyr as saying: "that all the saints should be raised in the flesh, and reign with Christ in Jerusalem, enlarged and beautified in a wonderful manner for their reception, *in the enjoyment of all sensual pleasures, for 1000 years before the general resurrection.*" On which Bishop Newton observes: "But in the original there is no such clause as that, *in the enjoyment of all sensual pleasures*; it is an addition and interpolation of the doctor's own, in order to depreciate the venerable father. And he could not possibly have made it by mistake; he must have done it designed-

are informed by the word of God, that the land of Canaan, even in the present deteriorated world, has produced vines of such an amazing magnitude, that a single cluster of their grapes was obliged to be borne between two men on a staff, \* (Numbers xiii. 23.) we may readily conceive, that in that renewed state of the earth, in which the prophets declare "that the mountains shall drop down new wine, and the hills flow with milk," (Joel iii. 18.) the increased productiveness will be so prodigious, that were our Lord now to declare it in the most precise and definite terms, it would exercise the faith of many a believer. And even supposing the original to agree with the Latin translation which we possess of Irenæus, and that we are disposed to view it merely as an *hyperbole*; is it more extravagant than that made use of by St. John in regard to the actions of Christ, "that if they were all written, he supposes that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written?" John xxi. 25.

Having mentioned that the above saying, attributed to our Lord by Irenæus, was also said by him to have been recorded by Papias, this opportunity may be taken of mentioning that passage in Eusebius, already referred to, (page 61.) in which he speaks of Papias as a man "most eloquent in all things and skilful in the scriptures," has been omitted in many manuscript copies, and consequently is not to be found in some printed editions of his works which have been copied from such manuscripts; but it is to be found in the more ancient manuscripts, and in the more accurate printed copies, and, consequently, there can be no probable reason assigned for its omission in any; excepting, that as it was a testimony in favour of that venerable father, so it appeared to be in favour of the doctrine which he has handed down.

We come next to Tertullian, whose testimony it has been attempted to weaken, by casting upon him the slur of *Montanism*, he having been a follower of Montanus. But what is Montanism? According to some, it is an error comprehending every species of indefinable theological evil, that the imagination of man can apprehend; but, according to others, it was more immediately the heresy of "commanding to abstain from meats," as being unlawful to be eaten. Now Bishop

---

ly; for he has cited the original as far as to that clause, and there stopping short has concealed the rest, with an "&c." Vol. ii. page 370.

Dr. Archibald Maclaine, likewise, the translator of Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, makes him apparently give to the anti-millenarian work of Dionysius, written against Nepos, the title of "*learned and judicious*;" words which have no existence in the original, and which the translator certainly did not add from his actual knowledge of the book of Dionysius itself.

\* But see note in Pictorial Bible on this verse.

Taylor, in his *Liberty of Prophecy*, brings forward this identical case of Montanus, in order to illustrate a point which he has in hand; viz. to show the obscure and very unsatisfactory grounds of accusation, against some who were considered heretics. He says: "This is remarkable in the case of Montanus, the scene of whose heresy lay within the first three hundred years, though it was represented in the catalogues afterwards; and possibly *the mistake concerning it* is to be put upon the score of Epiphanius, by whom Montanus and his followers were put into the catalogue of heretics for commanding abstinence from meats, as if they were unclean, and of themselves unlawful. Now the truth was, *Montanus said no such thing*; but commanded *frequent* abstinence, enjoined dry diet and an ascetic table, *not for conscience sake*, but for discipline: and yet, because he did this with too much rigor and strictness of mandate, the primitive church disliked him, as being *too near* the error of those, who by a Judaical superstition, abstained from meats as from uncleanness, &c. They therefore reprehended Montanus for urging such abstinencies with too much earnestness, though but in the way of discipline: for that it was no more, Tertullian, who was himself a Montanist, and knew best the opinions of his own sect, testifies. And yet Epiphanius, reporting the errors of Montanus, *commends* that which Montanus *truly and really* taught, and which the primitive church condemned in him, and therefore represents that heresy in another sense; and affixes that to Montanus which Epiphanius believed a heresy, and yet which Montanus did *not* teach." Sect. ii. 18. In regard to other errors imputed to Montanus, Lee in his *History of Montanism*, (chap. vii., as republished by Dr. Hick,) shews that he was grossly aspersed and misrepresented; and the eminent John Wesley observes in his *Journal* 15th Aug. 1750: "By reflecting on an old book which I had read in this journey—(*The General Delusion of Christians, &c.*) I was fully convinced of what I had long suspected, that the Montanists in the second and third centuries were *real scriptural Christians*." It is farther worthy of remark, that the apologies of the Montanists, (excepting what is contained favourable to them in Tertullian,) have not been permitted to come down to us; and after the evidence above adduced we may well pause before we brand them with the name of heretics. And as for Tertullian, Cyprian it is said never passed a day without reading some portion of his works; which, at least, shews the great estimation in which *he* was held: and whatever were his errors, we know that he at least drew after him the fairest portion of the Christian church.

As Tertullian has been charged with holding the heresy of Montanism, so Lactantius was also accused in the dark ages, by the adversaries of millenarian doctrine, of holding the heresy of the *Manichees*; of which, however, he has been most satisfactorily cleared by Dr. Lardner, in his *Credibility of the Gospel*, vol. vii. He has also been charged with holding sentiments on the prophetic point in hand, most incompatible with his piety and talents, viz. "that the saints shall, in the millennium, have a great enjoyment of carnal and corporeal pleasures." The accusation, however, rests in this instance, not upon any corruption of the text of his works, but on a false representation of his opinions given by Jerome. The words of Lactantius are as follow:—"Then they which shall be *alive in their bodies* [meaning those persons who shall remain in the flesh, and unchanged at the coming of the Lord] shall not die, but shall generate for the space of those thousand years an infinite multitude; and their offspring shall be holy and dear to God. *But those that shall be raised from the dead* [here distinguishing the *resurrection* saints] shall rule over them that are alive in the manner of judges." The same doctrine is set forth by Irenæus, and we will therefore hope, in justice to the character of Jerome, that he did not *understand* the sentiments of Lactantius; whilst the opponents of the doctrine in later times have blindly reiterated the charge from Jerome, without ever candidly quoting the real opinions of Lactantius.\*

The learned Joseph Mede asserts, (but I have not discovered his authority for it,) that the writings of Victorinus and Sulpicius, who maintained millenarian opinions, were authoritatively suppressed by Pope Damascus. Works, p. 664. And it is but reasonable to suppose, that, when the power of the popes became more absolute, they would exercise it more tyrannically and effectually for the suppression of these opinions. It was but to affix the imputation of heresy, and their writings were immediately seized, and either destroyed, or in some other way abstracted from public view: which sufficiently accounts for the paucity of evidence, either on one side the question or the other, during the middle and dark ages of the church. For these opinions were not controverted by fair and open discussion, but were arbitrarily put down. And thus it happens that in regard to some of those sects which were persecuted in those ages (as the Leonists, the Paulicians; &c.)

\* Mr. Mede indeed states, "that Jerome was a chief champion to cry down this opinion, and a most *unequal relater* of the opinions of his adversaries;" and he adds, "What credit he deserves in this instance may appear by some fragments of those authors still remaining, whom he charged with an opinion *directly contrary to that which they expressly affirmed.*" See his Works, folio, p. 748.



scarcely any more has come down to us than that they were a numerous body of Christians, who were held in detestation by the popes on account of their obstinate dissent from the doctrines of the church of Rome. Now and then indeed, the evidence of what was entertained *privately*, as it were, by Christians, peeps out, even by the admission of Roman Catholics themselves. Thus Lorinus the Jesuit, speaks, in his commentary, of one Tully Crispold, whom he considers a pious man; “but *he marvels to find him*, in his manuscript annotations on the scriptures, which were in the library of the monastery to which Lorinus belonged, expressing himself as expecting Jerusalem to be restored on earth with sacrifices, in the way of commemoration, and expecting also the apostles to be then existing on earth, and Christ appearing, at least occasionally, (*saltem aliquando*) and communing with them,” &c. So, likewise, though great pains had been taken to instil into the minds of the people that antichrist had already appeared, and was now engulfed in the lake of fire, it appears nevertheless from Baronius, Sabellicus, and Platina, all Roman Catholic authors, that in the year 1106 a very general opinion prevailed, that Antichrist was about to appear. Pope Pascal II. was first informed of it at Florence, and contented himself at the time with reproving the bishop, and treating the whole with derision; though Baronius asserts that it was an opinion entertained by men of no ordinary stamp; instancing Norbert a man of first eminence for piety and talents. Pascal, however, was presently after annoyed by finding the opinion in various other places during his journey; which was the more confirmed (as Sabellicus states) by the extraordinary natural phenomena and heavenly signs which then appeared.\*

In this manner was the doctrine of the millennium, and all that immediately concerned the revelation of Antichrist (so immediately connected with it,) corrupted, misrepresented, slandered, or suppressed. On which Bishop Newton, in his xxvth Dissertation on the Prophecies, has some observations so pertinent and judicious, that they will serve admirably for a conclusion to this section. He says, “In short the doctrine of the millennium was generally believed in the three first and purest ages; and this belief, as the learned Dodwell has justly observed, was one principal cause of the fortitude of the primitive Christians; they even coveted martyrdom, in hopes of being partakers of the privileges and glories of the martyrs in the first resurrection.†

\* See more in Mede, lib. iii. p. 887.

† Jam in millennii regno primam fore resurrectionem corporum crediderunt primævi Christiani. Et ut justorum propriam eam crediderunt resurrectionem,

“Afterwards this doctrine grew into disrepute for various reasons. Some both Jewish and Christian writers have debased it with a mixture of fables; they have described the kingdom more like a sensual than a spiritual kingdom, and thereby they have not only exposed themselves, but, (what is infinitely worse) the doctrine itself to contempt and ridicule. It hath suffered by the misrepresentations of its enemies, as well as by the indiscretions of its friends; many, like Jerome, have charged the millenarians with absurd and impious opinions which they never held; and rather than they would admit the truth of the doctrine, they have not scrupled to call into question the genuineness of the book of the Revelation.\* It hath been abused even to worse purposes; it hath been made an engine of faction; and turbulent fanatics, under the pretence of saints, have aspired to dominion, and disturbed the peace of civil society. Besides, wherever the influence and authority of the church of Rome have extended, she hath endeavoured by all means to discredit this doctrine; and indeed not without sufficient reason, this kingdom of Christ being founded on the ruins of the kingdom of Antichrist. No wonder therefore that this doctrine lay depressed for many ages; but it sprang up again at the Reformation, and will flourish together with the study of the Revelation. All the danger is, on one side, of pruning and lopping it too short; and, on the other, of suffering it to grow too wild and luxuriant. Great caution, soberness, and judgment are required to keep the middle course. We should neither, with some, interpret it into an allegory, nor depart from the literal sense of scripture without absolute necessity for so doing. Neither should we, with others, indulge an extravagant fancy, nor explain too curiously the manner and circumstances of this future state. It is safest and best faithfully to adhere to the words of scripture, or to fair deductions from scripture; and to rest contented with the general account, till time shall accomplish and eclaireise all the particulars.”

5. When Bishop Newton asserts, and truly asserts, that the doctrine of the millennium was revived at the Reformation, something must nevertheless be offered in the way of explana-

---

*ita martyrum in ea portionem longe esse præcipuam. Hæc cum ita crederentur, dici nequit quantum martyres illius ætatis martyrii studio inflammantur.* [The primitive Christians believed that the first resurrection of their bodies would take place in the kingdom of the millennium. And as they considered that resurrection to be peculiar to the just, so they conceived the martyrs would enjoy the principal share of its glory. Since these opinions were entertained, it is impossible to say how many were inflamed with the desire of martyrdom.] Dodwelli Dissert. Cyprian. xii. De Martyrum fortitudine, sect. 20, 21.

\* See Mede's Works, b. 5. chap. 5. D. Hieronymi Pronunciata de Dogmate millenariorum, p. 897.

tion, lest the reader should, in some respects, misapprehend his statement.

So far as regards the belief in the period of "the *thousand years*" triumph of the church, mentioned in the Apocalypse, it does not appear that the earlier reformers did generally maintain it: for the papacy had succeeded, by mis-representing the fathers, and by imputing to them the carnalities of Cerinthus, in making the words *chiliast* and *millenary*, an effectual object of terror.\* The attention however which was given at this period to the pure word of God, and the beams of divine truth which now, in consequence re-illuminated the christian church, necessarily brought the essentials of prophetic doctrine, contained in the covenants of promise, before the view of the saints of God: and it is a remarkable fact, therefore, that whilst the single tenet of the thousand years was, by the generality, carefully avoided, all the important truths connected therewith,—as the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, to set up a glorious kingdom on earth, in which all the saints should partake, the dead being raised and the living changed; the literal restoration of the Jews, to the literal Canaan, the earth being then renewed and Jerusalem rebuilt; and the previous manifestation and destruction of antichrist;—were almost universally entertained by the reformers.

In consequence of their partial misapprehension of the subject, as regards the thousand years, it often happens, that the earlier reformers warmly deprecate *chiliasm* in one page of their writings, whilst in another they will avow what, in the present day, would generally be considered decided millenarian doctrine. An instance shall be given from the works of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, who though a writer of a somewhat later period, very well serves to illustrate the point in hand. In section ii. of his "Liberty of Prophecyng," he observes "that the doctrine of the *millenaries* was *in the best ages* esteemed no heresy, but *true catholic doctrine*: though since then it hath had justice done it, and hath suffered a *just condemnation!*" Yet in his Sermon on 1 Cor. xv. 23. he decidedly argues from these words, "every man in his own order," &c., that there is to be a resurrection of the just, prior in time to the resurrection of the wicked and to take place at the advent of Christ; and that though this place speaks directly and explicitly only of the resurrection of the *just*, (i. e. of "those that are Christ's,") yet, because it also says, there shall be an *order*

\* The reader will pardon my explaining here, for the benefit of the unlearned, that *chiliast* is a Greek word, signifying one who believed in the *thousand years* of Rev. xx. 4. as yet future; and *millenary*, or millenarian, is a latin word (or rather compounded of latin and greek) of similar import.



for "every man," and yet every man does not belong to Christ, therefore, indirectly, it likewise implies "the more *universal* resurrection unto judgment, wherein the wicked *also* shall rise to condemnation." Now to admit a distinction in the resurrection to the extent here conceded, is to admit a cardinal point of millenarian doctrine, such as it is fully understood in the present day cannot be maintained, without leading to the reception of the remainder. And how are we, therefore, to account for the apparent contradiction in so acute a reasoner as Bishop Taylor, between the language of this sermon and the words which have been quoted from the former work? It will explain itself by the fact, that in the fifth section of that work he ranks *Origen* among the decided millenarians, as indeed some others have likewise done. He adduces no *proof* of it; but it is doubtless because Origen lets drop his expectation of the renovation of all things in the *seventh millenary* of the world.

In regard to the *national restoration of the Jews*, a belief of this important feature of prophecy was retained, even during the period of the *decline* of millenarian doctrine, by many of those ecclesiastical men who had become prejudiced on other points. But though this tenet also, cannot be consistently held by those, who deny the resurrection of the saints to a reign on earth; yet it is not so immediately discernible, that to hold the one opinion is, of necessity, indirectly to admit the other: to which circumstance it is perhaps owing, that this portion of divine truth has had the good fortune to escape the odium attached to other millenarian tenets, and never to have been controverted, at any time, by any considerable party in the church. Lorinus, the Jesuit, noticed before, says (in his comment on Acts i. 6.) that Cyprian, Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophilus, Alexandrinus, Augustine and Bede, understood this place to refer to that literal restoration of the Jews, mentioned in scripture; though these fathers are either neutral or opposed, as regards other tenets.\* Cornelius Alapide, another popish writer, mentions, in addition to those enumerated above, Hugo and Lyra, as likewise holding it. Dean Prideaux, who was anti-millenarian, both as regards the thousand years and the personal reign, maintained, nevertheless, the literal restoration of the Jews;

\* It may here be observed, that Lorinus has himself the wit to perceive the tendency of such an opinion. For he says, in the same place, that "he could tolerate this error in the *disciples* of Christ, but not *then* (at the period when he was writing;) because it leads to the heresy of *chiliasm*, which Pope Damascus had condemned in Appollinaris." It is not, therefore, because he can disprove this opinion, that he will not tolerate it; but because millenarian tenets had been condemned by the pope. Perhaps it is the testimony of Lorinus, on which *Mede* states that Pope Damascus condemned these opinions. See page 71.

and cites as authorities the farther testimony of Hilary, Ambrose, Aquinas, Scotus and Cajetan, of those who were his predecessors; and among more modern writers and contemporaries, Peter Martyr, Grinæus, Beza, Pareus, and Dr. Willet.\* Similar evidence is to be found in Rivet and Zanchy, on Hosea, and in many others; but sufficient has been adduced amply to prove, what the Voice of the Church has been, in regard to this point, in all ages; which is farther important, as illustrating likewise, in a striking manner, how the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob must have been understood by this "cloud of witnesses."†

Next, in regard to the expectation of a future glorious kingdom of God on the renewed earth, and the reign of Christ and his saints therein; which are most important and principal features of the millenarian view of prophecy, quite independent of the single question of the thousand years; let us observe the testimony of the early reformers on this point.

The quotations given at page 65, (see *Note*,) sufficiently testify of Tyndal, Luther and Calvin, that they, at least, looked for the reward of the righteous to be given at the Lord's advent, and denied that they had, as yet, been made partakers of the promise. This is important, if not as proving their expectation of a personal reign of Christ on earth, yet as showing that they postponed the time of the manifestation of the *kingdom* of Christ until his appearing; in opposition to the modern dogma which has so generally obtained, that the believer enters into his rest immediately at death. And it appears strictly in harmony with the reasoning of St. Paul in Heb. xi. compared with 1 Thess. iv. For in the former place, lest any should suppose that the Jewish saints are now with their Lord in the enjoyment of the kingdom promised, (in which case it were plain, that the saints now on earth would for the present be excluded from it,) he prevents such a conclusion by asserting, that "these *all*" (instancing by name Noah, Abraham, Moses, David, and others) "having obtained a good report (that is, *borne witness*, μαρτυρηθεντες) through faith, received *not* the pro-

\* See his Inaugural Oration. Prideaux was of the next century; but his testimony on this point belongs to the *whole* period of the history of the church.

† Mention may be made likewise of the eminent Dr. J. Owen, because his works abound with passages which are taken in a spiritual sense, in opposition to the literal acception of them by millenarians. In the headings, however, to Powell's Concordance, which, with the preface are attributed to Dr. Owen, it is admitted, "that the Jews, being restored to the faith of Christ, shall be formed into a state, and have judges and counsellors over them as formerly; the Lord Christ himself being their king, who shall then also be acknowledged over all the earth," "that Jerusalem shall be rebuilt, and after the full restoration of the Jews shall never be destroyed, nor infested with enemies any more;" "that a little before the time of the call and conversion of the Jews, there shall be great wars, confusion, and desolation throughout all the earth."

mise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." And in the latter place, lest it should be supposed that those saints only who shall be alive at the commencement of the Millennium are to enjoy the promise of the kingdom, (in which case it were plain, that the *departed* saints, both Jewish and Gentile, would all be excluded,) he assures us, "that those which shall be alive and remain at the coming of the Lord *shall not prevent* them which are asleep, (v. 15.) but that the Lord will then raise them up, and bring them with him.

But there exists more explicit evidence of the general voice of the Church on this point, at the time of the Reformation. In the Catechism published in the reign of King Edward VI. which Burnet declares in his History (vol. iii. book 4.) that Cranmer owned to be his; and which Catechism, whosoever was the author of it,\* was sanctioned by certain chief ecclesiastics of that day,† there are the following passages:—

"2. How is that petition, *Thy kingdom come*, to be understood?

"*Ans.* We ask that his kingdom may come, because that as yet we see not all things subject to Christ; we see not yet how the stone is cut out of the mountain without human help, which breaks into pieces and reduces to nothing the image described by Daniel: or how the only rock, which is Christ, doth possess and obtain the empire of the whole world, given him of the Father. As yet Antichrist is not slain; whence it is that we desire and pray, that at length it may come to pass and be fulfilled; and that Christ alone may reign with his saints, according to the divine promises; and that he may live and have dominion in the world, according to the decrees of the holy gospel, and not according to the traditions and laws of men, and the wills of the tyrants of the world."

"*Q.* The Sacred Scripture calls the end of the world the consummation and perfection of the mystery of Christ, and the renovation of all things: for thus the apostle Peter speaks, in his second epistle, chap. iii. 'We expect new heavens and a new earth, according to God's promise, wherein dwelleth righteousness.' And it seems agreeable to reason, that the corruption, mutability and sin, to which the whole world is subject, should at least cease. Now by what means or circumstances those things shall be brought to pass, I desire to know of thee?

\* Neale states it to have been drawn up by Poynt, afterwards bishop of Winchester; but without giving his authority. Hist. Purit. vol. i. p. 63.

† This is evident from the King's Letter, prefixed to the Latin edition of 1553. "Cum brevis et explicata Catechismi ratio, a pio quodam et erudito viro conscripta, nobis ad cognoscendum offerretur, ejus pertractationem et diligentem inquisitionem quibusdam episcopis et aliis eruditis commissimus, &c."

“*Ans.* I will declare, as well as I can, the same apostle attesting. The heavens, in the manner of a stormy tempest, shall pass away, and the elements, estuating, shall be dissolved, and the earth and the works therein shall be burnt. As if the Apostle should say, The world, like as we see in the refining of gold, shall be wholly purged with fire, and shall be brought to its utmost perfection; which the little world man, imitating, shall likewise be freed from corruption and change. And so, for man’s sake, for whose use the great world was created, being at length renovated, it shall put on a face that shall be far more pleasant and beautiful.”\*

Next may be instanced the views of Bishop Latimer. Having spoken, in his third Sermon on the Lord’s Prayer, of a future *parliament* differing from the parliaments of this world: “A parliament in which Christ shall bear the rule, and not men; and which the righteous pray for when they say, ‘*Thy kingdom come,*’ because they know that therein reformation of all things shall be had:” he presently after has these words, “Let us therefore have a desire that this day may come quickly; let us hasten God forward; let us cry unto him day and night, ‘*Most merciful Father, thy kingdom come.*’ St. Paul saith, ‘The Lord will not come till the swerving from the faith cometh,’ (2 Thess. ii. 3.) *which thing is already done and past:* Antichrist is already known throughout all the world. Wherefore *the day is not far off.* Let us beware, for it will one day fall on our heads. St. Peter saith, ‘The end of all things draweth very near.’ St. Peter said so at *his* time: how much more shall *we* say so? for it is a long time since St. Peter spake these words. The world was ordained to endure (as all learned men affirm, and prove it with Scripture) six thousand years. Now of that number there be passed 5552 years; so there is no more left but 448 years. And, furthermore, *those days shall be shortened;* it shall not be full six thousand years; the days shall be “shortened for the elect’s sake.” Therefore all those excellent and learned men, which, without doubt, God hath sent into this

\* There are some expressions in the Catechism apparently opposed to the personal and visible reign of Christ, which precede the extracts above given. In answer to the inquiry, Why Christ went to Heaven? it is said, “The chief cause thereof was to pluck out of us that false opinion which sometime deceived the apostles themselves; that Christ should in earth visibly reign as kings and ruffling princes of this world.” The true explanation however of this is, not that they did not expect Christ to come *personally*; but that they expected his rule to be one of peace and righteousness, “according to the decrees of the holy Gospel, and not according to the traditions and laws of men, and the wills of tyrants of the world,” as declared in the previous answer of the Catechism.” (See this point discussed in the Investigator, vol. i. page 171.) The Catechism likewise speaks of the impossibility of Christ’s bodily presence being every where on earth; but on the subject of the *mode* of Christ’s manifestation, the ablest Millenarian writers have differed, as indeed might have been expected.

world in these latter days to give the world warning, all those men do gather out of Scripture, that the last day cannot be far off."

Another extract is added from his sermon for the second Sunday in Advent. Having observed again, that the days before the Advent will be shortened, "so that peradventure, (saith he) *it may come in my days*, old as I am, or in our children's days;" he proceeds: "There will be great alterations at that day; there will be hurly burly, like as ye see when a man dieth, &c. There will be *such alterations of the earth and the elements*, they will lose their former nature, and be endued with another nature. And then shall they see the Son of Man come in a cloud with power and great glory. Certain it is that he shall come to judge; but we cannot tell the time when he shall come." Then quoting 1 Thess. iv. to shew that the living saints shall be "rapt up into the air, and so meet Christ our Saviour;" he adds, "All those, I say, who be content to strive and fight with sin, these shall in such wise be taken up into the air and meet with Christ, and so shall *come down with him again.*"—"I pray God, that we may be of the number of those, which shall hear this joyful and most comfortable voice of Christ our Saviour, when he will say, Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom which is prepared for you before the foundation of the world was laid."—"That man or that woman that saith these words, *Thy kingdom come*, with a faithful heart, no doubt desireth in very deed, that God will come to judgment, and amend all things *in this world*, and put down Satan, that old serpent, under our feet."

The martyr, Bradford, on Rom. viii. expresses the same expectation. "This renovation of all things the prophets do seem to promise, when they promise *new heavens and a new earth*. For a new earth seemeth to require no less renovation of earthly things, than new heavens do of heavenly things. But these things the apostle doth plainly affirm, that Christ will restore, even whatsoever be in heaven *and in earth*, (Col. i.) Therefore methinks it is the duty of a godly mind simply to acknowledge, and thereof to boast in the Lord, that in our resurrection all things shall be so repaired to eternity, as for our sin they were made subject to corruption. The ancient writers out of 2 Pet. iii. have as it were agreed to this sentence, that the shape of this world shall pass away, through the burning of earthly fire, as it was drowned with the flowing of earthly waters. These be St. Augustine's words, &c.—Therefore it is the part of a godly man, and of one that hangeth in all things upon the word of God, to learn out of this place, that whatsoever corruption, death or grief, he seeth in any thing,



whatsoever it be, that (*I say*) he ascribe *that* wholly unto his sins, and thereby provoke himself to true repentance. Now as soon as that repentance compelleth him to go to Christ, let him think thus: But this my Saviour and my Head, Jesus Christ, died for my sins, and therewith, as he took away death, so hath he taken away all the corruption and labour of all things, and will restore them in his time, wheresoever they be, in heaven or in earth. Now every creature travaileth and groaneth with us; but we being restored, they also shall be restored: there shall be new heavens, new earth, and all things new.”\*

Combining the different extracts which have been here given, it will be seen, first, that the Reformers come back decidedly to that important point, the looking for the speedy revelation in glory of the Lord Jesus Christ,—a point of doctrine which we constantly find pressed upon the church in the writings of the apostles, and the postponement of which (by the intervention of an indefinite period of glory in heaven, or by applying to the condition of the believer in the separate state those promises which relate only to the time of the Advent,) has greatly tended to darken the view of the church in regard to prophecy, and to deaden its hope in the resurrection. It will be seen also, that the Reformers do *virtually* set forth the Millenarian hope in this matter: for if they looked not for a *thousand years* of glory to the church on a renewed earth, in company with their Saviour, they did certainly expect such a glory for an indefinite period; and they preached it as immediately at hand, and made, (as may be seen from the short extracts given,) a practical heart-stirring use of it.

There is another important tenet which was *universally* received by Protestants soon after the Reformation: viz., that Antichrist had not disappeared at the accession of Constantine; but on the contrary, that he then only began to be developed, and was manifested in full grown maturity in the papacy, which afterwards sprung up. So general has become the application to the pope, or to the papal system, of the scriptures relative to Antichrist, that it is superfluous to enter into the proof of it: there are few works on prophecy written by Protestants, from the period of Luther's declaring the pope to be Antichrist, which he did in the year 1520, down to the commencement of the present century, which do not thus treat the subject.† And *this* doctrine likewise proved of great practical

\* See Richmond's *Fathers of the English Church*, vol. vi. p. 608.

† Some few considered *Mahomet* to be Antichrist. This will be noticed hereafter, when we come to treat more particularly of those features of prophecy, which are in this historical sketch necessarily but slightly touched upon.

advantage to the Reformers. For they were encouraged to bear up against the abuse and contumely heaped upon them by the Papists, by insisting that Rome was Babylon, and the pope Antichrist, and that God's people were to come out of her; and even at the stake they were supported by the expectation, that he was shortly to be destroyed, and the kingdom of God to be made manifest: \* for they coupled—as necessarily it must be coupled—the destruction of Antichrist, with the revelation of the Lord Jesus Christ from heaven.

Before closing the history of this century, it must be farther observed, (in justification of the statement of Bishop Newton, that *pure Millenarian* doctrine was likewise revived and entertained at the time of the Reformation;) that it certainly *was* then revived; but, as it appears to be the common device of Satan, to bring reproach upon a doctrine which he dreads, by inducing some to profess it who walk not orderly, or by urging those who, in other respects are godly, into some extravagance; so, in this instance, the fanatical sect of the *Anabaptists*, which arose on the continent and quickly spread into England, having embraced millenarian views, but coupled with much error and carnal absurdity, brought the doctrine into great disrepute. It was apparently on this account, that so many stood aloof and alarmed, in regard to the single tenet of the thousand years; whilst in the same articles which accompanied the Catechism drawn up in the reign of Edward VI. and of which mention has been made, one was directly pointed against the *Millenarians*. But whatever were the circumstances which, in 1553, led to the adoption of this article, only nine years afterwards it was *withdrawn*, together with two others, which reduced the total number from forty-two to thirty-nine, with scarcely any alteration in the doctrinal matter of those which remain. The withdrawal of this article must have arisen either from the increase of millenarian principles at this time; or at least from the conviction that they were not to be confounded with the extravagances of Cerinthus or of Munzer.†

6. We have seen what the voice of the church was during the sixteenth century, or era of the Reformation:—a voice giving not altogether an *uncertain* sound, though not so clear and distinct as in the first three centuries of christianity; nor,

\* The reader will find some striking testimonies, that the Reformers held the papacy to be Antichrist, in the appendix to Mr. Cuninghame's tract, "The Church of Rome the Apostacy, &c.;" likewise in his "Strictures on the Rev. S. R. Maitland's four pamphlets on prophecy."

† It does not appear that the arguments or discussion which took place at the time the articles in question were withdrawn, have ever transpired. All we know is, that they were struck out with the *red lead pencil* used always by Archbishop *Parker*. See Strype's *Annals*, c. xxviii. p. 288, and Bennett's *History of the thirty-nine Articles*.



as it afterwards sounded out at a more advanced period of the Reformation. At the latter end, indeed, of this century, several individuals of eminence are known to us as having professed millenarian sentiments on prophecy; among whom may be named John Piscator, Alphonsus Conrade, Carolus Gallus, Tycho Brahe, Dr. F. Kett, Abraham Fleming, Hugh Broughton, and Anthony Marten. In the *seventeenth* century, however, there arose a constellation of learned students of prophecy; and, with the careful study of prophecy, millenarian doctrine shone out again once more with clearness and with splendour. The absurdity maintained by Grotius, Prideaux, Whitby, Hammond, and some others, that the Millennium commenced with the conversion of Constantine, was at length fairly driven out of the field and exploded:\* so that the *whole church* has, by means of the flood of light then poured upon prophecy, since become millenarian in the literal sense of the term; there being very few in the present day who do not look forward to a *millennium*.† A remarkable revolution has indeed been effected in this matter since the era of the Reformation; the anti-millenarians of the present day, being now persons who are ardently looking forward for a period of rest and glory to the church, which is to last a thousand years; whilst they deny the resurrection of the saints to participate in it, the restoration of the Jews, and the appearing of the great God and Saviour, Jesus Christ. Whereas the anti-millenarians of the former period rejected solely the expectation of the thousand years, but held all the latter tenets. Even such anti-millenarians as Bishop Taylor, and Dr. Whitby, who were of a later period, held sentiments which would now be deemed of a millenarian complexion; which has been already shewn in regard to the former; (see page 78,) and may be seen, as respects the latter, by a reference to his Commentary on 2 Tim. iv. 8.‡

The essentials, however, of millenarian doctrine were doomed to undergo much opposition, and even persecution, in

\* Archbishop Usher, and some few after him, made the Millennium to commence with the period of Christ's first advent; so that Satan, according to them, must have been bound during the period of pagan persecution, and during those days of which St. John says,—“Now are there many Antichrists.” From the manner, however, in which Archbishop Usher afterwards concurred in much which was submitted to him by *Mede* and others, (as may be seen from his communications published in *Mede's* works,) we must conclude that he afterwards renounced this opinion and became Millenarian.

† It cannot be said, there are *none* but what do; except on the principle, that there is no rule without an exception; for there will ever be found individuals, yea, and *learned* individuals, ready to adopt eccentric or extravagant opinions. Thus Professor Lee, in his recently published work on the Apocalypse, has in our day revived the exploded doctrine of Grotius in regard to the thousand years.

‡ A reprint of it appears in the Investigator, vol. iv. p. 178.

this century; and some curious facts remain to be recorded, affecting the history of prophecy during this period. The circumstances which principally gave rise to them were, the conduct of those fanatics who were called *fifth monarchy men*; and the jealousy of the *dominant party*. The turbulence and extravagance of the former, who were all of them millenarians,\* caused many timid persons to shrink from the doctrine altogether; some fearing the reproach of being confounded with them, and others inconsiderately concluding that there was some necessary connexion between millenarianism and sedition: and thus by neglecting the study of prophecy altogether, or by seeking some allegorical (or, as it is improperly termed, some *spiritual*) meaning for portions of God's word, which were previously understood in their literal sense, they yielded up that very advantage to Satan which he sought. On the other hand, the conduct of the high church party caused this doctrine to be at last maintained principally among the puritans and the dissenters, properly so called; insomuch that to hold millenarian doctrine at all, was at length sufficient to expose a man to the imputation of being a dissenter, and to excite against him the suspicion of disloyalty.

Thus Mede says, in regard to this point, "that papists and episcopal men are loath that we should expect a better time than under them;"—alluding to the millenarian expectation of new heavens and a new earth, wherein should dwell righteousness. On the other hand, Dr. Prideaux, one of the most moderate of the episcopalians, when endeavouring to prove that the thousand years commenced with Constantine, says, "The *dissenters* here object, &c." by which he means the *millenarians*. And, again, insisting that the first resurrection, described in Rev. xx., is to be understood figuratively, he says, "Neither do those things move us, which the *dissenters* object; viz. that souls are here taken synechdochically for souls and bodies united."

Considerable light has recently been thrown upon the sentiments, in this matter, of the majority of the famous Assembly

\* They were called *fifth monarchy men* from the circumstance, that they understood that kingdom mentioned by Daniel, as succeeding to the *four* great monarchies or empires, set forth, first by the colossal image, (Dan. ii. 31-45.) and secondly by the four beasts, (Dan. vii. 17, 18.) of the kingdom of Christ and his saints to be established on earth. In this respect their views were orthodox; for almost all interpreters of prophecy maintain the same opinion. The peculiarity of their views, however, consisted in this; that they expected the destruction of every thing anti-christian, to be effected by the immediate agency of the living saints; and for this purpose, they contended that all power, both civil and military, must necessarily be put into their hands. With truly spiritual and excellent men, such as *Tillinghart*, who continually exhorted their hearers to *patience*, such a notion was harmless; but when adopted by the unsanctified fanatic, who was for anticipating the time and seizing the power, it proved itself a mischievous and very troublesome opinion.

of Divines, held at Westminster in 1643, by the publication in Scotland of the Journal and Letters written at that time by Principal Baillie, himself a determined anti-millenarian, and therefore not likely to be disposed to exaggerate the numbers or respectability of the parties who maintained it. In his letter, No. 117, he says, "Send me the rest of Forbes: I like the book very well, and the man much better for the book's sake. I marvel I can find nothing in it against the millenaries. I cannot think the author a millenary. I cannot dream why he should have omitted an error so famous in antiquity, and so troublesome among us; for THE MOST OF THE CHIEF DIVINES HERE, [meaning the Assembly] *not only Independents*, but others, such as Twisse, Marshall, Palmer, AND MANY MORE, are express Chiliasts."\* In this extract two things are evident: First, that the independents of that day were generally millenaries or chiliasts; which may plainly be inferred from the expression—"not only independents;" as if the person to whom he wrote would take for granted that they were so. And, secondly, it is evident, that the majority of eminent divines there, besides the Independents, were also millenarian; as is clear from his saying, "most of the chief divines here, such as Twisse, (the prolocutor,) Marshall, Palmer, and many more, are express Chiliasts." Besides the three above mentioned, the following members of that assembly are known likewise by their published writings or sentiments, to have been millenarian: viz. Simeon Ash, of St. Bride's; W. Bridge, A. M.; Jeremiah Burroughs, A. M.; J. Carlyl, A. M.; T. Goodwin, D. D.; W. Gouge, D. D.; J. Langley, Prebendary of Gloucester; and Peter Sterry, of London; which is a considerable number when it is remembered, how few divines commit themselves in print, compared with the number of those who never publish their sentiments; and of how many the works are no longer extant. Among the formularies framed by that assembly, and adopted by the Church of Scotland, is the "Directory for Public Worship;" in which it is prescribed that ministers should pray—"For the propagation of the gospel, and kingdom of Christ, to all nations; for the conversion of the Jews; the fulness of the Gentiles; the fall of antichrist; and the hastening of the second coming of our Lord." In the Shorter Catechism is the Assembly's Exposition of the Lord's Prayer; and on the words, "Thy kingdom come" we have as follows: "In the second petition we pray, that Satan's kingdom may be destroyed, and that the kingdom of grace may be advanced; ourselves and others brought into it; and that the kingdom of glory may be hastened:"

\* I am indebted, for being directed to this work, to a short but able Treatise, by the Rev. W. Anderson of Glasgow, called "A Letter to the Author of Millenarianism Indefensible."

which is explained in the corresponding clause of the Larger Catechism thus; "We pray, that Christ would hasten the time of *His second coming and our reigning with him forever.*" When it is admitted by an opponent of the doctrine, that the majority of the chief divines of that assembly were millenarian, it cannot reasonably be questioned that the above sentences were intended to be understood in a millenarian sense; and indeed it is difficult to reconcile them with any other.

What has been adduced above may suffice for the *Puritan and Non-conformist* divines, and for the *Independents*; as regards the *Baptists* (not the *Anabaptists*, from whom the Baptists have been properly distinguished,\*) we have, in addition to the sentiments of the eminent John Bunyan, and some other individual Baptists of piety and talent, the explicit testimony of the Baptist confession of faith, which is preserved in Crosby's history of that sect." We believe that there will be an order in the resurrection; Christ is the first fruits, and then next, or after, they that are Christ's at his coming; then, or afterwards, cometh the end. Concerning the kingdom and reign of our Lord Jesus Christ, as we do believe that he is now in heaven at his Father's right hand: so we do believe, that, at the time appointed of the Father, he shall come again in power and great glory, and that at, or after, his coming the second time, he will not only raise the dead, and judge and restore the world, but will also take to himself his kingdom, and will, according to the scriptures, reign on the throne of his father David, on Mount Zion, in Jerusalem, for ever."†

It must not be concluded by the reader, that *all* episcopalian were anti-millenarian: on the contrary, they numbered in their ranks some able theologians and interpreters, who took, what I will venture to call the *orthodox* view of prophecy. Nevertheless, to hold millenarian views exposed a man to reproach; which was at one period carried to so great an extent, that Bishop Newton states, "it was esteemed a mark that a man was a *puritan*, and a certain obstacle to his preferment, to preach that the pope was Antichrist." Vol. ii. p. 400. In the mean time, the overbearing manner in which direct millenarianism was put down by the dominant party, may be judged of from the following extract from Ephraim

\* Bishop Burnet, speaking of the Anabaptists, says: "Some of them set up a fantastical unintelligible way of talking of religion, which they turned all into allegories: these being joined in the common name of *Anabaptists* with the other, (the Baptists,) brought them also under an ill character." Vol. ii. book i.

† Further extracts, of an interesting character to the student of prophecy, will be found in the Dialogues on Prophecy, vol. ii. p. 267, and in a small work by Mr. Cox, a baptist minister, at Woolwich, entitled "A Millenarian's Answer of the Hope that is in Him."

Huet's preface to his commentary on Daniel; which is only a specimen of the reasons assigned for the tardy or posthumous publication of several works which appeared about that period. The preface or epistle dedicatory is signed by Simeon Ash, Samuel Clarke, and William Overton, eminent divines; and they state, as an apology for its not having been published by Huet,—“that indeed such was the iniquity and injuriousness of those times, that *few works of this nature were suffered to see the light*; especially if they spake any thing freely of those opinions which were so much disliked and *cried down by the prelatical party*, as this doth concerning the glorious calling and conversion of the Jews, which was a principal objection made against it. But the Lord in mercy having sent us a parliament,\* whose first study and care was, to relieve the oppressed, and release the imprisoned; *this* also hath at length obtained its manumission, (principally by the endeavours and favour of that truly noble and heroical patriot, the earl of Manchester,) and is now come abroad into the world; and, as we hope, will prove very serviceable.” The same spirit of persecution against these doctrines passed over to the continent, and exhibited itself there, at a later period of this century, in the suppression of numerous works; among which may be instanced the “*Scriptural Exposition and Demonstration of the Millenarian Reign, &c.*” by Dr. J. W. Peterson, professor at Rostoch in 1677, and afterwards superintendent of Lunenburg; for which publication he was cited before the consistory of Zell and deposed, and his work withdrawn; and likewise a work of S. P. Klettwich, intitled, “*The answer which has been demanded to two curious questions, viz.—‘How long the present world will continue—i. e. whether it will continue for 6000 years?’ and if not, ‘Whether before the end and total consummation of this world, a previous, different, better, and more happy world and times are to be hoped for;’*” which work was suppressed by the consistory of Leipsic.

We may close the account of this century by giving, for the guidance of the student of prophecy, some other names of those, who are known by their sentiments, published within this period, to have been millenarian, viz.: *Doctors* W. Alabaster, W. Allen, T. Burnet, D. Cressener, W. Hakewell, G. Hicks, N. Homes, J. Mather, W. Potter: and the following divines and laymen, abroad and of this country: T. Adams, W. Alleine, J. Archer, E. Bagshaw, T. Beverley, W. Burton, M. Cary, J. Cocceius, W. Deusbery, J. Durant, W. Erbery, G. Foster, T. Gale, G. Hammon, S. Hartlib, E. Huet, J.

\* The preface is dated 1613,—the year in which the assembly of divines met at Westminster.



Hussey, P. de Launay, R. Maton, J. Mede, W. Medley, R. Mercier, C. S. Nuncius, A. Peganius, S. Petto, J. Ranew, W. Sherwin and J. Tillinghast. This list is necessarily very defective; nor is it to be understood that all, who are therein enumerated, are equally millenarian in degree; for some of them contend only for a premillennial resurrection; whilst a few, still conceiving the millennium to be past, look for the appearing and kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be established upon a renewed earth.

7. The history of the voice of the church during the eighteenth century, may be speedily dismissed; for, alas, it became weak and feeble on most points connected with the doctrines of genuine christianity. Yet there are two or three facts worthy of particular remark.

The first is, that wherever we look around and find true piety prevailing, there likewise we may perceive millenarian doctrine springing up and accompanying it.

In Germany, so long back as the latter end of the sixteenth century, Simon Menno, originally a popish priest, but afterwards the founder of a sect called the Mennonites, succeeded in bringing back from their extravagances great numbers of the German anabaptists, and setting before them the true principles of primitive millenarianism; and this sect continued through the next and greater part of the following century to exhibit much real piety; and they are stated by Mosheim in his time to have maintained the "ancient hypothesis of a visible and glorious church of Christ upon earth," (vol. v. p. 497.)

In the English Encyclopedia, under the article '*Cocceius*,' we are told "that he was the founder of a sect called *Cocceians*; who held, among other singular opinions, that of a visible reign of Christ in this world, after a general conversion of the Jews and all other people to the true christian faith, as laid down in the voluminous works of *Cocceius*." This was no other than the eminent John Cocceius, professor of theology at Bremen,—a man continually quoted and applauded by Vitranga for his piety, learning, and ability as an expositor of prophecy. The Rev. H. Horne, speaking in his "Introduction, &c.," of his commentaries, says, "that they abound with valuable illustrations, and will amply repay the trouble of perusal;" and Robinson says of him, that it passed into a proverb, "that Grotius finds Christ *no where* in the Old Testament, *Cocceius everywhere*." He died in 1699, and his followers were known chiefly in the beginning of the eighteenth century.

The *Pietists* of Germany, at the same time that, like the *Puritans* of the former century in England, and the *Methodists* of this present century, they derived a name of reproach founded

upon their strictness in the things of God—a reproach which may truly be said to have been accompanied by the Spirit of glory, and of God resting on them (1 Pet. iv. 14.)—were also in general *Millenarians*, as may plainly be seen, without entering into other proofs, in a work entitled “Useful Information respecting *Pietism*; or a Statement of the real Faith and Doctrine of the so called *Pietists*,” written by the same Klettwich, whose Millenarian work was suppressed by the consistory of Leipsic.

Among the *Mystics*, both of England and the Continent, the same doctrine pretty generally prevailed, which I take on the testimony of the Rev. T. Hartley, Rector of Winnick, Northampton, himself a mystic. The proofs of it are contained in his work called “*Paradise Restored*, or a Testimony to the Doctrine of the blessed Millennium,” published in 1764.†

\* It must be admitted, however, that the mystics held this doctrine with very different degrees of promineney; for indeed their peculiar views led them more to consider the mystery of inward grace or spiritual life in the soul. Among the mystics have been numbered Bishop Taylor, whose views have already been brought forward, Bishop Kenn, Fenelon, archbishop of Cambray; Law, the author of the “*Serious Call*,” and Alleine, the author of the “*Alarm to the Unconverted*.” From the *Life and Letters of Alleine* a specimen is here added of his sentiments. It is contained in a letter, written whilst he was in prison, for preaching the gospel in his own house, after he had been ejected from his living at Taunton, by the act of uniformity. It is addressed to his faithful flock in that town, and is throughout touching and beautiful; but the necessity of being brief, induces me to give only a few passages which afford an evidence of the *practical* tendency of the expectation of the Saviour’s advent, and of the proper mode of handling the subject.—“But now, my brethren, I shall not so much call upon you to remember the *resurrection* of Christ, as the *return* of Christ: *Behold, he cometh in the clouds, and every eye shall see him*—your eyes and mine eyes—and *all the tribes of the earth shall mourn because of him*. But *we shall lift up our heads, because the day of our redemption draweth nigh*. This is the day I look for, and wait for, and have laid up all my hopes in. If the Lord return not, I profess myself undone: my preaching is vain, and my suffering is vain, and the bottom in which I have entrusted all my hopes is for ever miscarried. But I know whom I have trusted: we are built upon the foundation of his sure word, &c. and how fully doth that word assure us, *that this same Jesus that is gone up into heaven shall so return*. Oh, how sure is the thing! How near is the time! How glorious will his appearing be!—What generous cordials hath he left us in his parting sermons and his last prayer; and yet of all the rest these words are the sweetest, *I will come again, and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also*.—And *will he come?* Tremble, then, ye sinners; but triumph, ye saints! Clap your hands, all ye that look for the consolation of Israel. O children of the Most High, how will you forget your travail, and be melted into joy! This is he in whom you have believed; whom not having seen, ye have loved.—O my soul, look out and long! O my brethren, be you as the mother of Sisera, looking out at the windows, and watching at the lattice, saying, *Why are his chariot wheels so long in coming?* Though the time till ye shall see him be very short, yet love and longing make it seem tedious. My beloved, comfort your hearts with these words: look upon these things as the greatest realities, and let your affections be answerable to your expectations. I would not have told you these things unless I had believed them; it is for this hope that I am bound with this chain. The blessing of the Holy Trinity be upon you, &c.” (Letter xxvii. in an old and scarce work, printed 1672.)



Next may be mentioned the sect of the *Jansenists*' existing in the bosom of the Roman Catholic church in France, but holding sentiments which approximate to evangelical Protestantism. The editor of a periodical published in Paris, in 1831, called *The Watchman*, speaking of a society of women still existing there, who were followers of the Jansenists, observes: "But what is very remarkable in the history of this little body, consisting of about a hundred persons, is, that they have received and cherished, from their ancestors, an indubitable persuasion of Christ's second coming to establish his personal reign upon earth. And so evidently do they hold this doctrine to be revealed in the scriptures, that when they heard of the gospel being preached by a valuable and faithful Swiss minister now in Paris, they declined to hear him, because they were informed that he did not believe in the visible and personal reign of Christ upon earth."

Finally may be instanced the *Methodists*, some of the chief leaders among whom, as John Wesley himself, and Fletcher of Madeley, held millenarian views, and doubtless, therefore, they were responded to in this matter by their followers in general. The proof of the prophetic views of the latter may be seen in a highly interesting letter, written by him to John Wesley;\* and those of Wesley himself are contained in his exposition of the Apocalypse, appended to his commentary on the New Testament.

In bringing forward these various bodies of religious professors, it must be admitted, that, among some of them, the truth of the gospel was more or less disfigured by extravagances, (or at least it appears to us, in this day, to have been so, though it may arise from the misrepresentation of enemies;) but we cannot but admit, at the same time, that a serious spirit of piety, and considerable scriptural attainments, and learning, and ability, have appeared among them.

A second circumstance worthy of remark in this century, is the decay of vital godliness among the different denominations of *dissenters*, strictly so called; and with it a growing neglect of the great truths of prophecy. For it cannot be denied, that, in order to attain to any thing like a tolerable apprehension of the prophetic portion of the oracles of God, it is at least necessary to study them, and to become familiar with the text itself. And where the natural taste of individuals is not for study, and it has not been superinduced by the artificial habits of a scholastic education, there is a great disinclination to the labour of entering upon the careful investigation of prophecy, which

\* See his Works, vol. ix. p. 368; it is likewise reprinted in vol. ii. p. 462. of the *Morning Watch*.

is only to be overcome by the stimulus which true piety supplies: and indeed we would put it to the consciences of some pious persons in modern times, whether the apprehension of the *labour* of studying prophecy, has not so prevailed over them, as effectually to prejudice their minds against the subject?

That I may not seem to judge the condition of the dissenting congregations through a prejudiced medium, I would refer to the fact, that an annual sermon was, about the middle of this century appointed to be preached at Great Eastcheap, exclusively on prophecy, for the purpose of preventing the subject from sinking altogether into oblivion. Various sermons preached on this occasion by the eminent Dr. John Gill, a decided millenarian, are in existence; in which he deploras, not only the neglect of prophecy, but the decay of genuine piety. In his discourse (for example) on Isaiah xxi. 11, 12, he observes,—“*A sleepy frame of spirit has seized us; both ministers and churches are asleep; and being so, the enemy is busy in sowing the tares of errors and heresies, and which will grow up and spread yet more and more. Coldness and indifference in spiritual things, a want of affection to God, to Christ, his people, truths and ordinances, may easily be observed; the first love is left, and because iniquity abounds the love of many waxes cold.*”—“If it should be asked, What time it is with us? (the text is on the question, *Watchman, what of the night!*) as a faithful watchman I will give you the best account I can. I take it we are in the *Sardian Church state*,—we are in the *decline* of that state; for there are many things said of that church which agree with us; as that we have a *name*, that we live, and are *dead*—the *name* of the reformed churches—but without the life and power of true religion; and there are few, and *but* a few, names among us, which have not defiled their garments with false doctrine or superstitious worship.”

The frequency with which Dr. Gill was himself called upon to preach this annual sermon,\* seems to indicate the dearth of ministers who took heed to prophecy at all; and the very feeble character of two or three of those productions which have reached us, betray that this branch of theology was, indeed, at a low ebb. Even the sermons of Dr. Gill himself are very superficial and inferior to the other works of that learned expositor on this subject; perhaps arising from the conviction, that the want of information among his hearers in general on these occasions, did not impose on him the necessity of careful composition or elaborate investigation.

The last circumstance to be noticed is, the gradual increase

\* He preached it seven years successively.

during this period of sound prophetic knowledge among members of the Church of England. Several works of great critical research and learning appeared in this century; and with but few exceptions of any eminence, they are directly or indirectly of a millenarian character. The annual Lectures appointed to be preached on prophecy by Bishop Warburton, for which an endowment was left by him, doubtless contributed to the production of numerous able works on prophecy; though the range which the writers of them took was necessarily limited. The lecture was founded for the purpose of proving "The truth of revealed religion in general, and of the Christian in particular, from the completion of the prophecies of the Old and New Testament, which relate to the Christian church, and especially to the apostacy of papal Rome."

It is not intended to be insinuated, that a greater degree of piety existed in the Church of England at this time than among the dissenting congregations: the cause of prophetic studies being cultivated among them is, perhaps, to be traced to the circumstance of the superior education of the clergy, generally speaking, predisposing them, in a measure, to subjects which afforded scope for their learning and erudition. Many, however, of the publications of this century, proceeded from churchmen, whose piety of spirit cannot be questioned; though it would be invidious to particularize individuals, one way or the other.

The following additional writers to those mentioned are among the number of those whose sentiments were millenarian to a greater or less extent, both in the establishment and out of it, both at home and abroad; and whose works therefore tend farther to evince what *the Voice of the Church* was in this century. *Bishops* Clayton, Horsley, Newton, and Newcome;\* *Doctors* P. Allix, G. Frank, S. Glass, J. E. Grabe, S. Hopkins, (of Rhode Island, N. A.) J. Knight, F. Lee, S. Rudd, and E. Wells; among the divines of lesser degree, T. Adams, (of Winteringham,) R. Beere, J. A. Bengelius, C. Daubuz, R. Heming, J. Hallet, R. Hort, R. Ingram, P. Jurieu, J. B. Koppius, C. G. Koch, P. Lancaster, A. Pirie, R. Roach, J. D. Schœffer, A. Toplady, E. Winchester; and among the laity Sir I. Newton, and H. Dodwell, and E. King, Esqs.

VII. We now arrive at the consideration of the Voice of the Church in our own times. A remarkable impetus has been given to the investigation of prophecy by the striking events

\* There are likewise many things in the writings of Bishops Hopkins, Hurd, Lowth, Sherlock, and others, which, though they do not entitle them to be ranked among millenarian writers, are nevertheless wholly incompatible with the views of modern anti-millenarians.

which have accompanied and succeeded to the French revolution; an event which, though occurring at the latter end of the preceding century, belongs more properly, so far as the consideration of its influence on prophecy is concerned, to the present. Many have concluded it to be that great earthquake or revolution mentioned in the Apocalypse, in regard to which Sir Isaac Newton predicted, that when it should occur, a flood of light would be thereby cast on prophecy: and the events which are now daily transpiring and deepening in interest, both in Great Britain, and on the Continent, have tended considerably to awaken in men's minds the expectation, that some most important crisis is at hand; which expectation is not weakened, in the judgment of the intelligent observer, by the circumstance, that there has likewise been a great revival of true piety, among all denominations of Christians, and that unparalleled exertions are being made towards promoting the spread of the gospel, both at home and abroad. For it is to be reasonably expected, if we be approaching to the termination of a dispensation, that the Lord would previously effectually call out his elect remnant, and gather them from the four winds; in the same manner that before the break up of the Jewish dispensation we perceive, that there was a considerable election of grace from among them, insomuch that a great company of the priests was obedient to the faith.\*

The voice of the Church at this time, so far as the students of prophecy and the writers thereon are concerned, has become very unequivocally *millenarian*. It cannot be denied, even by those who are still unfriendly to the doctrine, that the attention of Christians has been greatly excited of late towards the Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ; insomuch that the circumstances of the church resembles much that of the virgins in the parable, awakened by the cry: "*Behold the Bridegroom cometh,*" and arising and shaking themselves from slumber. With the exception of Mr. Faber,† there is scarcely to be found a writer on prophecy of any eminence in the present century, who is not looking for the pre-millennial advent of Christ; and all the periodicals which have arisen, that have been exclusively or chiefly devoted to prophetic subjects, (as the Jewish Expositor, the Morning Watch, the Christian Herald, the Investigator, the Christian Witness, the Christian

\* Compare Rom. xi. 5, and Acts vi. 7.

† Mr. Faber's sentiments, in earlier editions of his work now entitled *The Sacred Calendar*, laid him open to be pressed with millenarian conclusions: his latter work is essentially different in various important conclusions: and is a very unsatisfactory and contradictory work, though entitled to respect, from the learning and piety of its author. For a review of it, see the Investigator, vol. iv. page 293.

Record, the Watchman, the Expositor of Prophecy,) advocate primitive millenarianism. And it is further remarkable, that in almost all the instances of works issuing from the press in this century, directly pointed against millenarian doctrine, the writers themselves have honestly avowed, that they have not made prophecy their study, and are so far incompetent to treat the subject in a satisfactory manner.

Another phenomenon to be noticed, in regard to the present century is, that since attention has been drawn to the expected advent of Christ, it has betrayed the fact, that a complete revolution has taken place in regard to the parties entertaining millenarian doctrine. The advocates of it are now almost exclusively to be found within the pale of the established church; whilst the dissenters, who were formerly the conservatives of the doctrine, are now almost universally either opposed, or entirely indifferent to it. Some *few* eminent exceptions may be mentioned: for example, Robert Hall, formerly of Leicester, who, towards the latter end of his life, was brought decidedly to subscribe to the millenarian interpretation of prophecy; Mr. Cox and Mr. Tyso, both baptist ministers;\* William Thorpe, author of an acute and very seasonable work entitled "The destinies of the British Empire, and the duties of British Christians at the present crisis;" and Mr. Anderson, of Glasgow, already mentioned.† Mr. Cuninghame, an able and distinguished writer, who has advocated these views now for a lengthened period, and Mr. Begg, are likewise to be numbered among the dissenters who have powerfully pleaded this cause.

The genuine truths of prophecy, however, and even the study of prophecy itself, has suffered very materially in the present century: at first from the intemperance of some of its advocates, which was met with corresponding heat and dogmatism by some of its opponents; and secondly, and most materially, from the circumstance, that most of those carried away by the Irvingite error and delusion entertain, or formerly did entertain, millenarian opinions. If the importance of any doctrine may be judged of from the efforts of Satan to prejudice or put it down, then assuredly that which holds up to the view of the church, the hope of the speedy advent of the Lord Jesus, must be eminently calculated to promote personal holiness and

\* Mr. Cox has been noticed before; Mr. Tyso is pastor of a congregation at Wallingford, and has published an able and original work called "an Enquiry after Prophetic truth, relative to the restoration of the Jews and the millennium, 1831, 8vo." He is likewise the author of several pieces in the *Investigator of Prophecy*.

† Mr. Anderson is author of "an Apology for the Millennial doctrine, in the form in which it was entertained by the primitive church;" two parts of which have appeared.



watchfulness; for no doctrine has the great enemy endeavoured more to bring reproach upon. Besides the efforts which have been used to put it down and extinguish it altogether, both by papists and by men of ultra views among the protestants, we have found it charged by Eusebius with the carnalities of Cerinthus; by Jerome, it has been confounded with Jewish fables; the conduct of the anabaptists and fifth monarchy men has brought on it the reproach of having a seditious tendency; whilst the conduct of the Irvingites has induced many to apprehend that it necessarily leads to the delusion and extravagance manifested in their tenets of unknown tongues, immediate inspiration, and an exclusive separating spirit.\* It is, however, now recovering from the shock; and it must not be omitted to be stated, that numerous writers have appeared to support and still continue to advocate the millenarian view of prophecy, whose writings are distinguished for christian meekness, sound judgment and great talent. We have only to mention the names, among the clergy, of Bickersteth, Burgh, Fry, Girdlestone, Hales,† Hoare, Hooper, Hawtrey, Marsh, the Maitlands of Brighton and Gloucester, Madden, M'Neil, Noel, Pym, Sirr, Sabin and Stuart; and among the laity, Frere, Habershon, Viscount Mandeville, T. P. Platt, Granville Penn and Wood, in order to satisfy the unprejudiced reader.‡

It has been objected of late to the study of prophecy, that it has a tendency to lead to *millenarian* opinions, which, in the minds of such objectors, constitute of themselves a species of *delusion*. The writer of this volume fully admits that the study of prophecy *has* this tendency; and that, in proportion as men enter deeply into it, will they become liable to fall into the millenarian view. But he is fully persuaded that the millenarian system of interpretation is *the only true key* to the understanding of the prophecies, and indeed to the unfolding of the sense of many other portions of holy writ, which may not strictly be termed prophetic. It is this conviction, together with a deep sense of the vast practical importance of the doctrine, more especially at the present crisis, that has induced him to enter upon the inquiry, which he has here brought to a conclusion; and he trusts it has now been satisfactorily demon-

\* The fall of Mr. Irving is greatly to be deplored, for previous to it, when he was pursuing the path of a rational christian expositor, his powerful mind threw much light on prophecy; and his earlier works are still valuable to the student.

† See his work on Chronology.

‡ The writer of this volume does not coincide with *all* the opinions of *all* these writers; they are mentioned as having rendered valuable service to the cause of prophecy, to the millenarian view of it in particular. Numerous other publications have issued from the press on this subject, and are continually appearing; but for these the reader is referred to the *Dictionary of Writers on Prophecy*, published in the fourth volume of the Investigator, and also separately.

strated to be *the truth of God*, both from *Scripture*, (as shown in the former chapter,) and also from the concurrent testimony, here brought forward, of *the voice of the Church*.

---

## CHAPTER IV.

### ON THE INTERPRETATION OF PROPHECY.

Having noticed what appears to be the principal design and aim of all prophecy, and confirmed it by a reference to the terms of the *Covenant of Promise*, and to the *Voice of the Church* in the best periods of its history; the next step will be to inquire into *the principles of interpretation*, as regards the terms, and style, and structure in which prophecy is conveyed to us.

This matter is likewise of fundamental importance, and much has been written upon it by the generality of expositors; whilst yet it is remarkable, how very few have subsequently proceeded in their interpretations throughout upon a consistent scriptural principle. Most writers on this subject appear to have caught in the first instance, some particular view of a part or the whole of the prophetic word, and then to have laid down canons of interpretation, which shall fall in with and support their previously conceived system. Mr. Faber's rules, for example, much as he is looked up to by many as an interpreter, are almost all of them formed upon an arbitrary principle, without even a reference to scripture to support them; and though some of them are what one's reason may be disposed to acquiesce in, others of them ought to be viewed with hesitation until they are proved from the word of God. It is the same with all others, whose works I have had opportunity to peruse, if they have entered at any length into interpretation: however speciously they may set out, there is generally something introduced for which there is no warrant, evidently for the purpose of subserving some particular view of prophecy; though, in many instances, the expositor afterwards loses sight of the *origin* of his canon, and refers to it as to a scriptural axiom, when perhaps there is not a shadow of authority for it in the word of God.

The best collection of rules with which I am acquainted are those of the eminent Vitringa.\* They have the advantage of

\* The reader will find a Translation of them in the Investigator, Vol. IV. pp. 153—176.



having been in general composed for the purpose of illustrating a series of lectures on the interpretation of prophecy, which were publicly delivered by him to the students of theology, and in which he was necessarily led to regard the whole scheme and structure of prophecy, rather than any particular portion of it. But even these will be found in numerous instances of an arbitrary character; and the reader, who is acquainted with his works in general, will likewise discover, that many of them are collected thence, and have a special regard to portions of God's word which he had already interpreted.

Such being the case, I should have been tempted to have passed over this portion of our subject, from a conviction of the arduousness of the path which lies before me; were it not that the present state of prophetic investigation appears imperatively to require some notice of it. There is a tendency in the human mind to run into extremes on almost every question that needs the exercise of judgment and patient inquiry. The forsaking the plain path of *literal* interpretation, which is as the polar star of the expositor, has been the means of many having been carried away into an excess of allegory and metaphor; the perception of which absurdities has led others, in attempting to regain the proper track, to fall into a system of *ultra-literalism*, equally calculated to mislead. These two extremes are as the Scylla and Charybdis, which the expositor of prophecy has carefully to steer between.

I shall limit myself, therefore, to the notice of a few principles of interpretation, to which we are directed by *the word of God*; in doing which my object is not to prepare the student for any particular theory subsequently to be advanced; (for that is not the object of the present publication;) but to prevent him from being misled by the specious objections, which are by writers and readers of every shade of opinion brought forward at times against an interpretation, which does not fall in with their views or prejudices: so that he may at least not hastily conclude that an interpretation is wrong, or a conclusion unjustifiable, if there be warrant for the principle on which it is grounded in the holy scriptures. At the same time the reader must be apprized, that what is about to be advanced on this head conveys but a very imperfect notion of all that may be gathered of a like character by a diligent and careful study of the word of God: to commend him to which,—so that he may see the great importance of exploring the mine of scripture for himself, and obtaining thence principles of interpretation which shall be useful to him, not only as regards prophecy, but other subjects likewise,—is one further inducement to my entering on this point.

I. I shall begin first with a broad canon, laid down as a grand fundamental by St. Peter, when he is exhorting us to take heed unto prophecy, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, &c.—“*Knowing this first* (he adds) *that no prophecy of the scripture is of any PRIVATE interpretation:* for 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.” 2 Peter i. 19—21.

Great pains have been taken, by means of hypercriticisms, to make this passage seem to utter an uncertain sound; whereby it has been almost entirely deprived of its practical utility. But the plain and obvious sense of it, as presented to us in our English translation, appears to me to correspond best with the Greek, and with the evident scope and intent of the passage itself; viz. that no prophecy is to be explained as limited to the individual circumstances and interests of any one man or nation prophesied of, nor to any one generation only of the church; but that it has a reference to Christ, in himself, or in his members generally, and to the affairs of the kingdom of God, and the powers opposed to it. A prophecy may appear, from its peculiar phraseology and the circumstances under which it is given, to have a merely individual or local concern; but the very circumstance that those who uttered it “were moved by the Holy Ghost,” ought, when duly considered, to lead us to conclude, that it must have some relation, remote or otherwise, to the general concerns of the church; “the spirit of prophecy” having always for its object to bear testimony to the things of Christ. This is evident, from Rev. xix. 10, where the angel claims brotherhood with John, on account of the testimony to *Jesus*, which he (the angel) had given by the spirit of *prophecy*; which is the more remarkable, seeing that declaration occurs on the close of the setting forth the destruction of the great anti-christian polity, and the final triumph of the saints,\* and which are thus indirectly declared to be part of the testimony of Jesus.

In order to illustrate the force of this prophetic canon, we may turn to the epistles to the seven churches of Asia. Rev. ii. and iii. These are generally admitted to contain in them prophetic matter, as may at once be seen by a reference to them. For to Ephesus it is foretold, that her candlestick

\* Bishop Hurd has remarked, but without resting his observation on any tangible scripture authority, “that prophecy, in general, hath its ultimate accomplishment in the history and dispensation of Jesus,” and that though the *immediate* object was some other, yet it never loses sight of that in which it was ultimately to find its repose.” Vol. i. p. 41, 62. Mr. Faber makes use of 2 Peter i. 20. to a certain extent, translating it thus:—“Now no prophecy is of its own *insulated* interpretation;” by which he appears to mean, that every prophecy is part and parcel of that general scheme which concerns the Church, and is not to be interpreted independently and exclusively of the whole.

should be removed; (ii. 5.) to Smyrna, that they should endure a tribulation of ten days; (ii. 10.) to Thyatira, that the false prophetess, Jezebel, and those who committed adultery with her, should be cast into tribulation; (ii. 22, 23.) to Sardis, that the Lord would come on her as a thief; (iii. 3.) to Philadelphia, that the synagogue of Satan should come and worship before her feet, and also that she should be kept from that hour of tribulation which was coming on all the world. Nevertheless, Bishop Halifax, in his Warburtonian Lectures, (p. 233.) entirely discountenances the idea of there being anything of a generally prophetic character in this portion of the Apocalypse; as also do some others: and we must, therefore, according to these, view the prophetic matter cited above, as limited to the local circumstances of the churches, and seek for no other fulfilment than such as may be pointed to in the historical events of that period, when these churches existed. This, then, is to give to the prophetic matter, clearly contained in the epistles to them, a *private interpretation*; forbidding entirely all notion of these churches sustaining any *typical* character; or that there can be any ultimate and more ample fulfilment of what is foretold of them, to be accomplished in the *general* history of the church.\* Without offering any interpretation of the epistles to these churches, these things are thrown out to illustrate the canon of interpretation now before us.

The apostolic canon, just cited, is of very extensive use, and necessarily leads to the admission of the principle of a *two-fold sense*, or of a *two-fold application*, to be looked for in the generality of prophecy. The majority of expositors have indeed already advocated the principle of a two-fold sense of prophecy, to be looked for in certain instances; † but I am not aware of any who take their warrant for so doing from this precept of St. Peter, or who advance any clear and satisfactory scripture foundation for it as a *general* rule.

1. The common sense view of the matter might direct us to look for a farther fulfilment, when a prophecy, in its *primary* application to events, does not receive an *adequate accom-*

\* Mr. Frere, likewise considers the expression—"the things which are," (Rev. i. 19.) to relate to the condition of those Churches, as they existed in the time of St. John; and seems to view the Epistles to them as having only for their object, "the support and comfort of these Churches, during the period of Pagan persecution." That they had this object *primarily* in view, there can be little doubt; but that this was their *ultimate* scope and object, there is abundant reason to question, independent of the rule now under consideration.

† Vitringa says (speaking of the double sense) this was the mode of interpretation the ancient interpreters and those of the middle ages have in every instance chosen; as also most of those eminent men who aided the Reformation, as Luther, Brentius, Pellican, Bibliander, Bugenhagen, Snouius; and, in the last age, Cocceius and Altingius." De Canon. Verb. Proph. recte Expos. c. ii. and c. xii.

*plishment*; for it is contradictory to the solemn affirmation of Jesus, to suppose that one jot or one tittle shall in any wise pass from the law or the prophets, but that *all* shall be fulfilled.\* Matt. v. 17, 18. Let us, however, turn to Isaiah xlv. where we have a prophecy, which those ultra literalists who follow the method of Grotius consider as referring to the power which Cyrus exercised, in behalf of the Jews, on their return from Babylonish captivity; and though the historical details are greatly deficient, as to any proof of the adequate fulfilment of numerous particulars, it is attributed merely to an inflated and hyperbolical style adopted by the prophets, which carried them out beyond the literal matter of fact. Thus is the church at large deprived of the use of this prophecy: saving that meagre application of it, which consists in the evidence to be derived therefrom to the truth of God in *other* things, contained in other prophecies, which it is imagined *do* concern the church in general.† A reference to the actions of Cyrus in this chapter cannot be disputed, seeing that he is mentioned by name in it; but it happens likewise that verse 23 is twice quoted by St. Paul, as having a reference—not to that limited and imperfect state of prosperity which ensued to the Church, on its return from Babylon; (if indeed that part of the prophecy could then be said to have been fulfilled at all,) but to a period when “*every knee shall bow before the Lord, and every one give account of himself to God.*”‡ Compare Rom. xiv. 11, 12, and Phil. ii. 10: the words, “*for it is written,*” in the former of which places, evidently show that it is quoted from some portions of God’s word; and there is no other, that I am aware of, from which it could be derived.

By the same rule, then, we shall be justified, when we consider the prophecy respecting Babylon, in Jeremiah i. and li. in assigning to it a two-fold sense; the one referring to the taking of Babylon by the Medes, therein explicitly mentioned, (li. 11, 28;) the other referring to the destruction of the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse; at which time we may expect

\* So far as regards the practice of the ancient Church, Bishop Lowth observes: “It seems to have been a *maxim* in interpreting prophecy, received among the Jews before the time of Christ, that wherever they perceived an imperfect completion of prophecy in an historical event, which no way answered to the lofty expressions and extensive promises, which the natural sense of the text imparted, there they supposed the times of the Messiah to be ultimately intended.”

† Daubuz, when speaking of the expositions of Grotius, calls them “*sneaking and mean interpretations* of the holy prophecies, which are, on that very score of their meanness, to be rejected.” On the Revel. page 15.

‡ The manner in which this verse of the prophecy is applied by St. Paul will throw additional light on the promise to the Church of Philadelphia, (Rev. iii. 9.) and justify the inference, that the Epistles to those Churches are those of a general prophetic character.

Israel will be made the Lord's "battle-axe and weapon of war," (v. 19.,) and "the slain of all the earth to fall;" with many other circumstances, which either were not accomplished at all, at the taking of that city by the Medes in the time of Cyrus, or which were but very inadequately fulfilled.

(2.) The next class of prophecies which may be noticed, are those in which the fulfilment is inadequate, not so much from the historical event exhibiting but a slight and very imperfect sketch, with much evident omission of detail when compared with the prophetic description; but when the events fulfilled correspond in magnitude with what is predicted, whilst other features of the prophecy have not received a shadow of fulfilment. Thus, in Zechariah xii. 9-14, we have an instance of a prophecy fulfilled only in one single circumstance, at its primary accomplishment. The prophecy relates to the destruction of the nations which shall come against Jerusalem, and the spirit of supplication and penitence which shall be manifested by Israel; who shall then *look on him whom they have pierced, and mourn*. Now verse 10. is pointed to by St. John (chap. xix. 37.) as fulfilled at the crucifixion; and so it was most literally, so far as the piercing Jesus then took place; but there was no national mourning then of the Jews, neither any destruction of the nations coming against Jerusalem. This prophecy therefore does not so much regard a twofold *sense*, as a twofold *period*; and the piercing Jesus must consequently be regarded as but an *inchoate* fulfilment, whereby he is already pointed out to the church, as the Shepherd of Israel and the equal of God, mentioned in the 13th chapter of Zechariah, who was to be smitten. And notwithstanding the long gap between the fulfilment of the one part of the prophecy and the other, we must nevertheless look for a period when Israel shall nationally look on him and mourn, and inquiring, "What are these wounds in thine hands?" be informed, that they are "those with which he was wounded in the house of his friends," (v. 6.) when "he came to his own, and his own received him not." John i. 11.

Joel ii. 28, is likewise another instance of inchoate fulfilment; the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, therein mentioned, having been declared by St. Peter to have been accomplished on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 16-21.) But instead of the Lord "in those days and at that time," bringing again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, and taking vengeance on the nations, (Joel iii. 1-17.) Judah *went into captivity*, and the Gentiles have trodden down Jerusalem unto this day.\*

\* The expression "*afterward*," in Joel ii. 28,—"*And it shall come to pass afterward*" (יְהִי אַחֲרָיִם *Heb.* μετὰ ταῦτα *Sept.*) that I will pour out my spirit,"—



(3.) In like manner a key will be found to the understanding those prophecies, in which the first and second advents of the Lord Jesus are involved. In most instances they apparently refer to a twofold *period* only, and the particulars which apply to each may be readily separated. Thus Mr. Mede, on Isaiah ix. observes: "That the old prophets (for the most part) speak of the coming of Christ indefinitely and in general, without that distinction of *first* and *second* coming, which the gospel out of Daniel hath more clearly taught us; and so consequently they spake of the things of Christ's coming indefinitely and altogether, which we, who are now more fully informed by a revelation of the gospel of a *twofold* coming, must apply each of them to its proper time; those things which befit the state of his first coming, unto it; and such things as befit the state of his second coming, unto his second; and what befits both alike may be applied unto both." (Works, fol. 755.) In some instances, however, the context would lead one, from the inadequate fulfilment of the particulars relating to the first advent, to expect a *repetition* and more *complete* accomplishment of them at the second advent.

An example may be found in Psalm ii. where, besides the "*private* interpretation" of it to the family of David, which was probably understood in his days, we have apparently a twofold reference to the times of the Messiah. For it is quoted, Acts iv. 25, as having received a fulfilment in the gathering of Herod and Pilate against Jesus. But the scope of that Psalm points (as do most of the prophecies,) to a period of judgment on the ungodly *coalition* therein described, for which there was no precedent in the times of the apostle. For the judgment which fell on the Jews by the instrumentality of Titus is inadequate, seeing it was inflicted, not on *both* the parties who formed this monstrous coalition, but by one of the parties on the other. So that what was then transacted was but a partial fulfilment of

the context of which would lead one to expect this outpouring after the great day of the destruction of the northern army and other enemies of Israel, has induced many interpreters to view the outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, as only an inchoate *effusion*, and that we may expect another in the great and terrible day of the Lord: so that while he pours out of the vials of his wrath on his enemies, he will shed abundantly from the vials of his mercy on his church. This expectation is thought to be further justified from verse 23, and from Zech. x. 1, where mention is made of a "former and latter rain;" to which St. James is supposed to refer, chap. v. 7, and to allude to a second effusion of the Spirit. I offer no opinion on this expectation: I would only further point out to the reader, as worthy of observation, that when St. Peter quotes this, he changes the expression "*afterward*" to "*last days*," without any warrant either from the Hebrew or Greek texts; though doubtless he was moved by the Spirit so to do. And again it should be remarked, that St. Paul quotes Joel ii. 32; (see Rom. x. 13.) as applicable to *his* generation; showing that *one* event of the prophecy being fulfilled, believers might take it as a token to call on the Lord for salvation, in the fullest sense, at all times.



their taking counsel against the Lord, and of their machinations being frustrated, or overruled for good. It remains therefore to be more fully accomplished at the second advent of Christ.

Malachi iv. 5. presents us with an instance in which a two-fold fulfilment of a part of the prophecy is clearly to be expected, at the same time that a portion of it will only receive one fulfilment.—“Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.” The context shows that this great and dreadful day of the Lord is one, wherein the wrath of the Lord shall burn like an oven against all the proud and wicked, who shall be burnt up as stubble, and the righteous shall tread them down as ashes under the soles of their feet. Verse 5 we know, from our Saviour’s testimony, received a primary fulfilment in John the Baptist, who came in the spirit and power of Elijah; and, judging from Matt. xvii. 11,—“Elias truly shall first come and restore all things,” spoken by our Lord before he passed on to speak of John the Baptist—a coming of the actual Elijah is still to be expected. For it would be contradictory in our Lord to speak of it as a thing *future* (“Elias truly *shall* first come,”) and as of a thing *past*, (“But I say unto you, that Elias *is* come already,”) in the same breath. Certainly the fathers of the primitive Christian Church, down to the time of Jerome, looked for a coming of the actual Elijah; and under any view of the prophecy, the scope of it already pointed out was not fulfilled; neither was there any *restitution of all things*, as stated by our Lord there should be, in his mention of Elijah quoted above.

2. Another important principle of interpretation, intimately connected with the canon of the apostle, and indeed flowing from it, comes next to be noticed. There is evidently, from what has already been instanced from the prophecies, especially from Joel and Zechariah, a period arriving, when the affairs of the church of Christ shall be brought to a grand crisis. Previous to it, the carnal enmity of all mere professors will be made manifest by a universal spirit of apostacy, in which the form of godliness shall alone be seen, and none shall be valiant for the truth; (see 2 Tim. iii. and numerous places in the Old Testament:) and this will bring on a period of great tribulation and peril to the church, and to the Jews in particular; but out of it there will be a marvellous deliverance and exaltation of the Lord’s people, with a great destruction of his enemies, accompanied, or immediately followed, by the resurrection from the dead and the commencement of the millennial dispensation.

Now this crisis is continually regarded in the prophecies: I

may indeed with safety assert, that it is *always* regarded when judgment and vengeance are spoken of.\* For this rule of St. Peter, in order to be applicable to every generation of the church during its time state, necessarily requires the period of judgment to be so far procrastinated, as that the *last* generation of believers shall be able to make practical use of it: otherwise, it would still be to that generation of the church of private or limited interpretation, excluding them from any direct concern in it. This will be found a useful clue to the right understanding of the Psalms; in which the constant allusions to the actions and spirit of the ungodly,—to their triumphing for a time, and to their punishment at last,—however they may primarily refer to the spirit of insubordination exhibited in David's time, have a more direct reference to the proceedings of the ungodly in the latter days, to the complaints thereupon of Christ in his members, and to the rising up at length of Jehovah to avenge them, and to set them at liberty from him that puffeth at them.

Another proof of *crisis* being regarded in prophecy, is the circumstance of a promise, which apparently has respect to something that has been afterwards fulfilled, being nevertheless sustained and carried forward beyond the period of fulfilment, even though we can find no circumstances from which we can clearly and expressly infer that the fulfilment was inadequate. An instance may be taken from Psalm xcv.: "Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said, It is a people that do err in their hearts, and they have not known my ways: unto whom I swear in my wrath, that they should not enter into my rest." This appears clearly to refer in the context to that generation of Israelites whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, they not being permitted to see the promised land; and this circumstance decidedly fixes the primary application of the *rest* spoken of to the land of Canaan. But to *limit* the application of it to Canaan would be to make the prediction of "private interpretation;" and accordingly we find the apostle still applying it in his days to the generation in which he lived; and he argues, that as the psalmist had done the same to the men of his generation, so long after the rest into which they were led by Joshua, therefore there must yet "remain a rest to the people of God. Heb. iii.

But it is not only matter of a directly *prophetical* character

\* This looking of all prophecy toward crisis has not been unobserved in this particular by Bishop Lowth, who, on Isa. x. 20, observes, 'that it is usual with the prophets, when they foretel some extraordinary event in or near their own times, to carry their views farther, and point at some great deliverance which God shall vouchsafe to his people in the latter ages of the world.'

that it is thus deferred to the period of crisis. I may go farther and say, that almost *every* object of religious interest is deferred as to its fulness and completeness to the same time. Is it *rest*?—it remaineth (as we have seen,) and is to be ultimately bestowed on us “when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels.” 2 Thess. i. 7. Is it *grace*?—though given now, still, as to its consummation, “it is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” 1 Pet. i. 13. Is it *salvation*? in numerous instances it is described as “ready to be revealed *in the last time.*” 1 Peter i. 5. And to the same crisis, allusion is repeatedly made by the use of the phrase “*that day:*” and it is highly probable that every portion of scripture shall at that period possess a peculiar utility; so that things which appear now really to be of private application, and to respect local or temporary peculiarities, will then acquire a more immediate practical character; and it shall be found then that “*all scripture is profitable.*” See for instances of this, Matt. vii. 22; Luke x. 12, xxi. 34; 2 Thess. i. 10; 2 Tim. i. 2, 18, iv. 8. And if we are now passing into that crisis, (which all things seem manifestly to indicate,) how important it is that the people of God should diligently study his word, and specially take heed unto prophecy!

3. There is yet another principle of interpretation, which must be mentioned, as connected with the great rule now under consideration; and that is the fulfilment of certain circumstances of a prophecy as a *sign and pledge* of the fulfilment of the remainder. Thus in the prophecies which have already been noticed, the incipient accomplishment of a *part* is a token and assurance to us of the *remainder* being fulfilled at the time of crisis; and those which have been fulfilled primarily in an accommodated sense, or by circumstances inadequate to the express terms of the prophecy, afford us a pledge of a more complete accomplishment ultimately in a sense that can have no imperfect, contracted, or private application. In this view, the piercing of Jesus, and the Pentecostal effusion of the Spirit, are signs and pledges of the future fulfilment of *all* that is foretold in Zech. xii. and Joel ii. iii. The coming of John Baptist in the spirit and power of Elijah, is a pledge of some other great fore-runner as the herald of Christ’s second advent; and the enjoyment of Canaan by the Israelites, is a pledge of the rest that remaineth for the people of God. In the latter instance it appears clearly predicted as such, as I have endeavoured to prove at page 23; the covenant then made with Abraham being intended as the assurance for himself, (see Heb. vi. 16, 17,) for it had in it all the solemnity of an oath; and the subsequent affliction of his posterity in a strange land, and

their ultimate possession of Canaan “in the *fourth* generation,” being designed as a pledge for the church at large.

In like manner it has been shewn, (page 24) that the promise to Sarah of a seed born in a miraculous manner, and at a *set time*, is a sign and pledge of the promised seed of the woman ultimately intended; since the promise is sustained and carried forward after the birth of Isaac. And so the promises made to the seed of David, which were primarily fulfilled in Solomon, are sustained and carried forward by the Spirit after the death of Solomon; (see Jer. xxxiii. 19—22, &c.) whence the ancient church evidently appropriated them to Messiah, and addressed him, when he appeared, as *the seed of David*. See Matt. xii. 23, xxi. 9, xxii. 42, &c.

4. I am aware that the principle which has been contended for is open to the objection, that in some instances the interpretations suggested would seem to make a *three-fold* fulfilment. For, in the last mentioned case, the private and limited fulfilment to the seed of David was in Solomon, who was a sign and pledge of the “greater than Solomon;” and yet when the predictions concerning David’s seed came to be in the second place fulfilled in what Mede calls the *magnalia* of prophecy, they have only an inchoate fulfilment in Christ; there being many things mixed up with the promises (such as that Christ should sit on the *throne* of his father David,) which have even yet not come to pass; so that we must take what was fulfilled in Christ only as an earnest of a future complete accomplishment of all that remains. I would here then, in respect to such an objection, beg the reader to observe, that I am not contending for *so much* as a two-fold fulfilment in some instances; nor would I *limit* the principle to a *two-fold* fulfilment only, even in those instances in which more than one fulfilment is to be sought for.

The great thing to be observed is, that no prophecy is of *private interpretation*. If therefore a prophecy seems at once to refer to that crisis or to those circumstances which must appeal to the hope and expectations of every generation of the church in its time state, I see no need, if there have been no inchoate or primary fulfilment, to insist on one.\* Whereas on the other hand, as the Spirit of God has not *limited* us to a two-fold fulfilment, but only warned us against that which savours of a

\* 2 Peter iii. is a case in point; the prophetic matter contained in which, refers, *in the first instance*, to the crisis which has been spoken of; and therefore no double fulfilment need be looked for. This is no exception to the rule that no prophecy is of private interpretation; but to the *application* of that rule to a *two-fold fulfilment* of prophecy in all instances.

private interpretation, I see no reason to limit the principle out of deference to any system or axiom of man with which it may conflict. God hath held up manifold *types* of Christ, in his characters of prophet, priest and king, as signs and pledges to the church: what prevents him from setting forth manifold fulfilments of more open prophecy, or parts of it, for the same purpose?

It is indeed the very character of the Lord's dealings with his people, to multiply signs and tokens for their comfort or assurance. See, for instance, in regard to the captivity and deliverance of Israel. They first undergo affliction in Egypt, the sign of which to Abraham, when it is foretold, is the horror of great darkness, (Gen. xv. 12.) Without insisting on the intermediate short periods of bondage to the Philistines and others, we may pass next to the Babylonish captivity, of which they were apprised by many signs and types pointed to by Jeremiah and others: among others may be mentioned the death of Hananiah (Jer. xxviii. 12-17.) within a specified time; which not only operated as a punishment upon him for his falsehood, but would prove a signal to the survivors of the certainty that Nebuchadnezzar would prevail.\* Then, thirdly, we have the captivity and dispersion now endured by the Jews, of which those two previously experienced were only types; and which present dispersion will endure till the crisis arrives, or, in other words, till the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. In like manner, the Lord has set forth their *deliverance*. First there was the prediction of the Exodus from the Egyptian house of bondage, (Gen. xv. 14-16.) and when the time of deliverance arrived, God gives to Moses, among other signs, this *prophetical* one, as a token that the whole was of God; viz. that when the people were brought forth, they should worship God in the mount Horeb; (Exod. iii. 12.) and many signs and wonders did God work by Moses, for the assurance of the people, most of which were first *predicted*, though the space between the prediction and the fulfilment was very brief. Now this Exodus is a pledge of another deliverance, not yet fulfilled, so signal in its character, that the former will no longer be spoken of, (Jer. xvi. 14, 15.) but in the meanwhile there was the deliverance from Babylon, which the church of a former generation was likewise encouraged to hope for, on the strength of the deliverance from Egypt,

\* Another sign is given to a remnant who persisted afterwards in going into Egypt. To assure them, that they should nevertheless be consumed, which was then predicted, they are informed, that the king of Egypt should presently be delivered into the hands of his enemies. See Jer. xlv. 29, 30.

(Isaiah lxiii. 10—12;\*) and this deliverance, when it occurred, became a further pledge and token of the ultimate transcendent one.

Isaiah xxxvii. and xxxviii. contain likewise express prophetic signs of the great deliverance; the one sign more immediately for Hezekiah, consisting of the shadow of the sun-dial of Ahaz returning backward, which could only be known to a few individuals, the other being for the whole nation, and of such a character therefore, that none could fail of observing its accomplishment, viz. that they should eat that year such as groweth of itself; and the second year that which springeth of the same; and in the third year they were to sow, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruit thereof, (xxxvii. 30.) And this is further connected historically with a great deliverance from the Assyrians, (v. 36, 38.)

A two-fold sign is also given in Isaiah vii.—ix. of a remarkable character, which is not always clearly seen by interpreters. It is in connection with the eminent promise that a virgin should conceive and bear a son, whose name should be called *Immanuel*, (vii. 14.) who is also expressly given as a *sign*; but to the generations intervening before his birth, and especially to the generation of Ahaz, the son of the prophetess, just then about to be born, is given as a sign; (viii. 1—4.) who is evidently not the same child, as that previously promised, forasmuch as he was not named Immanuel, (viii. 3.) neither was Palestine “his land.” viii. 8.

In Isaiah xlii. the first and second advents of Christ (at least various circumstances to transpire at the two different advents) are described; and in the 9th verse, the Lord, in the anticipatory manner in which the Apostle notes, “that he calleth the things which are not as though they were,” (Rom. iv. 17.) speaks of the former things as already passed, and to be taken as a pledge of the new things, which he then proceeds to declare to them.

6. Enough, I trust, has now been advanced to prove the existence of the two-fold principle of interpretation; examples of which might be multiplied to a wearisome extent.† I

\* I say not, that this place of Isaiah refers principally to the deliverance from Babylon; the context shows the contrary—but the generation which lived between the period of Isaiah and the Babylonish captivity would have been justified in so applying it.

† Some have pointed out a two-fold sense in other portions of Scripture, besides *prophecy*, but to these the rule of the Apostle does not apply, and therefore I am not called upon to notice them. For example: Daubuz in his Commentary on the Apocalypse instances Deut. xxv. 4. *Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, when he treadeth out the corn*; the limited interpretation of which St. Paul scouts, as if God took care for oxen; and insists that it was written to



would only add to the exception, which has been previously mentioned, that when a prophecy comprehends a period of time, reaching continuously from some event of early occurrence, down to "the end" or crisis, the application of the two-fold fulfilment is of necessity excluded. Thus the vision of the great image (Dan. ii.) begins apparently with Nebuchadnezzar, who is the head of gold, and reaches down to the time of the second advent, when the little stone is to smite the image on its feet; in which case it would be impracticable for there to be two fulfilments, unless both were transpiring at the same time. I see not, however, any obvious necessity for excluding a prophecy, or certain features of it, from the application of this principle, *merely* from the circumstance of its being a *chronological* prophecy, provided there be space allowed for the double fulfilment. Thus some have contended for a two-fold fulfilment of portions of Daniel and the Apocalypse; the one, in a period of time, understood mystically of a day for a year, and the other to be accomplished in time, according to the literal acceptation of the terms by which it is designated. I must not be understood as advocating or approving the principle, I only observe that I perceive no *scriptural* ground of objection to it.\*

---

show to the Church at large the care they ought to take of those who labour in the word and doctrine. See 1 Cor. ix. 9. and 1 Tim. v. 18. (page 15.)

Bishop Warburton notices also an instance somewhat more to our point, in Acts xv. in which both senses are exhibited, or practically applied, at the same time.—"What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common." By the vision of Peter, to which it relates, the Bishop justly observes, that there is first shown in the literal sense, that the distinction of clean and unclean meats was now abolished; and in the mystical sense, that the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile is now broken down. (Div. Leg. vol. v. p. 314.) And he afterwards deprecates our disregarding this typical and secondary sense, because fanatical men have yielded to fancy and imagined it never existed; "we may as well (he adds) say, that the ancient Egyptians did not write in hieroglyphics, because Kircher, in endeavouring to explain them, has given nothing but his own visions."

\* Mr. Faber gives us the following arbitrary canon in his Sacred Calendar of Prophecy,—"No single link of a chronological chain of prophecy is capable of receiving its accomplishment in more than a single event or person." (Pref.) This is very questionable; for "the Son of Perdition," spoken of in Psalm cix., was primarily fulfilled in Judas Iscariot; (John xvii. 12; Acts i. 16—20;) and yet the man of sin, of 2 Thess. ii. 3, is declared also to be the Son of Perdition, and has a very conspicuous niche given to him by Mr. Faber in the great chronological prophecy treated of by him. What indeed are *isolated* prophecies in general, but the circumstantial which link on to some larger prophecy, and must fall into some place in its chronological course? Even Mr. Faber himself only six pages onward states, "that the greatest part of the several oracles, which respect the last ages, may, by the instrumentality of marks, which in their own proper texture they themselves will be found to furnish, be mutually linked together in a perfectly abstract synchronical connection."

Mr. Cuninghame adopts a somewhat similar principle with Mr. Faber, but with a further modification. He admits the principle of a *primary and ulti-*

II. We may now pass on to notice another principle to be observed in the interpretation of prophecy; and that is, the *adherence to the literal signification* of the words of the text, in all cases; unless there be some intimation in the text or context, or some warrant from the general use of particular phrases to the contrary.\*

*mate*, a *typical and antitypical* fulfilment, as applicable to the discursive prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, &c.; but does not allow it in the symbolical and chronological predictions of Daniel and John; and with regard to the former, he says, that no two occur in one and the same *dispensation*. Thus he instances the first and second Adam; David and Solomon of the Levitical dispensation, and Christ the true David and Prince of peace; Melchizedec of the patriarchal age, and of the coming age; Babylon, Sodom, Egypt, the Assyrian, and Amalek of the Old Testament, and the same of the new economy. (p. 48, Appx. to church of Rome, the Apostasy.) The following difficulty, however, is here created by Mr. Cuninghame. To make the two Adams, Davids, and Solomons of *different* dispensations, it is clear that he does not consider Christ as having appeared in the end of the *Jewish* dispensation, (see Heb. ix. 26) but in the beginning of the *Christian* dispensation. But we have seen that there are two *sons of perdition*, the one a type of the other, which Mr. Cuninghame himself indirectly admits; (p. 48) when he acknowledges that the man of sin of St. Paul takes his *name* from Judas, and argues that as the one was not an avowed enemy, but betrayed with a kiss, so the other; which is certainly constituting Judas into a type of the latter. If therefore this be so, then there is *type and antitype* of the son of perdition, according to Mr. C.'s own interpretation, in the same dispensation. And if Mr. C. will argue, in order to escape from this dilemma, that Christ appeared in the end of the Jewish dispensation, then we have the two *Davids* in the Levitical dispensation. Nor do I see the force of Mr. C.'s objection to double types and fulfilments in chronological and symbolical prophecies, if they exist in the discursive: unless, as I have intimated, there be not time to enact the same thing twice over.

\* When I speak of understanding words in their *literal* sense, deference to a modern writer of great learning and talents compels me to explain myself, in order to avoid mistake. The Rev. S. R. Maitland of Gloster, when contending that the word *day* in the prophecies of Daniel always signifies a day, argues thus, "Undoubtedly the beasts which Daniel saw were *emblematical*; but nothing can be more *literal* than the language in which he has described them: let it only be admitted (and I cannot conceive why it should not,) that by the word *day* he means *day*, as much as by the word *goat* he means *goat*, and all farther arguments on my part would be needless." (Second inquiry, &c. p. 3.) To me this appears only sophistry, when applied as it is, to disprove the symbolical meaning of the word *day*. It may be fully admitted that *day* signifies *day*, as much as *goat* signifies *goat*; yet if the word *goat* may nevertheless emblematically signify a *kingdom*,—so that a reader of prophecy, aware of this circumstance, attaches to the word, when he meets with it in a certain prophecy, the notion of a kingdom, and dismisses the primary signification of the word *goat*,—what reason is there why the word *day* may not in like manner emblematically signify a *year*, so that the reader, who concludes that it is to have this signification in a certain prophecy, shall be justified in associating the notion of a *year* with it, and dismissing its primary signification of *day*. I say this without any reference in this place to the material question, which yet remains, whether the word 'day' is ever used in an emblematical or enigmatical sense for a larger revolution of time: I only wish it to be understood, that when I speak of the literal sense of a prophecy or of a phrase, I mean, that I understand the words in the *primary* signification thereof, and not in any mystical, enigmatical, or symbolical sense; excepting such ordinary, figurative, or tropical use of them, as would not affect the obvious sense of them at the time they are spoken.

Very important considerations are involved in this matter. It seems to be a device of Satan, when he cannot hope to lead men altogether from the faith of scripture, to become "an angel of light," and in that character to lead them to some subtlety in the way of the interpretation or application of scripture, which virtually renders it useless: and among these modes, is that of setting the ingenuity to work to find out what is called a *spiritual* meaning, in sentences and expressions where the Holy Ghost probably never intended it. Such interpretations may be justifiable in the way of an accommodated and secondary sense, provided they be not allowed in any way to interfere with or to supersede the literal;\* but if they be allowed to become unwarrantably the primary sense, they then have practically the effect of drawing off our attention from the real instruction which the Holy Spirit designs to give us, and thus of rendering void the word of God. And if once the principle is conceded, that men may discard the literal sense, and that it is the sign of superior spirituality of mind to fetch out from the words of scripture some recondite or mystical signification, where are we to draw the line, and how is it possible to lay down any rules to prevent the wit and ingenuity of men from running into extravagance? The Israelite, who, before the coming of Christ, should have imposed a spiritual meaning on those passages of prophecy which foretel, that he should be born of a virgin, that he should ride on an ass, that he should be spit upon, and put to death, would as effectually have diverted attention from the truth contained in those words, as the Cabbalists do, who make the sense to depend on the combination of particular words, letters and numbers. And so likewise if men are to spiritualize the things which regard Christ's *second* coming, what should hinder us from adopting at once the allegorical style of Origen, which is nevertheless so generally spoken against? For all is in such case reduced to uncertainty; it depends upon the liveliness or the dulness of the expositor's imagination; and so

\* Our Lord himself appears to countenance such a use of scripture in those words—"And herein is that saying true, one soweth and another reapeth;" (John iv. 37;) at least, if it be true that our Lord did really refer, as is supposed, to Micah vi. 15,—“thou shalt sow, but thou shalt not reap;” and not to some proverb current among the Jews and not recorded in the scriptures. The primary meaning of Micah vi. 15, is determined by the context to be a chastisement which the Lord should bring upon the people, who, when they should depart from his commandments and do iniquity, should sow their fields, but not reap them. Our Lord's application of the words is to his disciples, who entered into the ministerial labours of their predecessors, the prophets and others;—"other men having laboured and they having entered into their labours." This is evidently employed only in the way of accommodation; as showing that one may sow and another reap in more senses than one, and under very different circumstances.

long as he offers not a sense plainly repugnant to the doctrines of the word of God in general, there appears no sufficient reason why the followers of Origen and the Jewish Cabbalists, should not be just as much admired.

The propriety of adhering to the literal sense is not so much to be insisted on from any explicit canon of scripture, that I am aware of, as from evidence forced upon us by the fulfilment of scripture, the reason and consistency of the thing itself, and the pernicious consequences of a contrary principle being admitted. These evils have been already adverted to. The propriety of the thing is self-evident, in that in all cases we give a man credit for using language capable of being understood, unless he gives us some intimation to the contrary; and there is no reason therefore why we should deal otherwise with prophecy. The usage of scripture is the only point, therefore, that remains to be established; and this it will be found does in general most decidedly confirm the principle of literal interpretation.

The Lord's dealings with his people Israel will afford us a comprehensive example in the way of illustration. In Deuteronomy xxx. 1—4, it is written—"And it shall come to pass, when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath driven thee, &c. that then the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion on thee, and will return and gather thee from all the nations whither the Lord thy God hath scattered thee. If any of thine have been driven out unto the utmost parts of heaven, from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee, and bring thee into the land," &c. This relates, first, to the deliverance and blessing which the Lord should vouchsafe to Israel whilst planting them in Canaan; including the whole train of his "marvellous acts" toward them; secondly, to the evil which should come upon them on their apostasy; thirdly, to an ultimate deliverance, yet to come, on their repentance. Now let us turn to Joshua xxiii. 14, 15, and we find Joshua at a later period thus speaking: "And behold this day I am going the way of all the earth; and ye know in all your hearts, and in all your souls, that *not one thing hath failed of all the good things*, which the Lord your God spake concerning you; *all are come to pass*, and *not one thing hath failed thereof*. Therefore it shall come to pass, that as all *good things* are come upon you, which the Lord your God promised you, so shall the Lord bring upon you all *evil things*, until he have destroyed you from off this good land, which the Lord your

God hath given you; when ye shall have transgressed," &c. Here we see that the *good* had been fulfilled—*literally* fulfilled—*not one thing had failed thereof*: a consistent analogy would consequently require us to expect the *evil* to be fulfilled in like manner, whensoever the people should transgress in the way predicted. Now Jeremiah wrote at a period when that *evil* had in a measure been fulfilled,—so far at least as that the people had been driven out, and Jerusalem laid waste; and no one questions that it was most *literally* fulfilled,—and that since the destruction of their second temple by Titus, the whole of the plagues mentioned by Moses have been most exactly accomplished. But Jeremiah says, (chap. xxxii. 42, 44,) "For thus saith the Lord: *Like* as I have brought *all this great evil* upon this people, so will I bring upon them all the good that I have promised them," &c.; "for I will cause their captivity to return saith the Lord." The conclusion appears irresistible, that as the first blessing hath been literally fulfilled, and then likewise the evil, so the ultimate blessing is to be literally fulfilled also; whilst the fulfilment of the two former parts, in the literal manner it has been accomplished, evinces that it would have been most unreasonable and unlogical to have expected any other from the language of the predictions, than such an accomplishment as should correspond with the plain and obvious sense of the words.\*

A like sense may be shown to attach to the generality of the prophecies, concerning the first advent of our Lord Jesus Christ. Already it has been noticed that his being born of a virgin, his riding on an ass, his being spit upon, and put to death, have been most precisely accomplished; so likewise, might be adduced, his being born in Bethlehem, a fact which the whole Sanhedrim interpreted to Herod, evidently on the literal principle. (Matt. ii. 5.) Again, his being betrayed by one of his followers; the piercing his hands and his feet; the parting his garments, and casting lots for his vesture; his being numbered with transgressors, and having his grave with the rich, and a multitude of other circumstances; were most literally accomplished: and why should it be supposed therefore, and insisted on by some modern expositors of prophecy, that the circumstances relating to the second advent, and which for the most part are to be found combined in the same prophecies which relate to the first advent, are to be fulfilled on a different principle?

\* Mr. Keith, in his very interesting work on "*The Evidences from Prophecy*," has brought forward numerous instances of exceedingly literal fulfilment of predictions, respecting other nations; though in several instances he pushes even the literal principle to a fanciful extent.



2. Having, however, stated the principle, the next thing is to guard against the abuse of it. There are various exceptions and qualifications of the rule, to be discerned by a careful perusal of Scripture, which clearly evince that the literal principle may be carried to excess.

Some have thought that it is quite a sufficient restriction of the rule of literal interpretation to say, that it is only to be qualified by those exceptions which are obvious to common sense; so that it requires no *reasoning* upon the subject, but merely the exercise of a plain understanding.\* Much might be conceded to this view of the matter, were the Scriptures originally written in English, and with a reference to English idioms and habits of thinking and expression; because many things are plain and readily understood by us, though couched in a measure in tropes and figures which a stranger would, nevertheless, be entirely at a loss for, until he became acquainted with our habits and idioms. Doubtless, therefore, many things were clearly understood by the Jews, owing to their familiarity with the figures and expressions used, which are not so obvious to the common sense of those whose language and habits are so entirely different; and, therefore, they require to be studied and carefully observed.

(1.) First may be instanced *tropical* expressions. Such as are, strictly speaking, *tropes*, are too evidently so to require any consideration. The class of words, therefore, more particularly demanding attention, are those which may raise a question in the mind of the English reader, whether they are to be understood in a literal sense, or as *symbols*; but which would not, I conceive, have raised any question of the kind in the minds of those to whom the prophecies were delivered. When we read of the *fatness* of the olive tree, no one of ordinary understanding would doubt its sense; and the promises “to *plant*” the Jews in their own land, and to “*build*” them,† are as plainly understood as if mention were made of planting trees or building houses. But not so to us, when mention is made of darkening the *sun and moon*, or casting down the *stars*, &c. Yet when Joseph’s dream came to be related, the envy which immediately expressed itself in his brethren, and the observations made by his father, show that it was readily understood; the *sun* being taken to represent the head of the family; the *moon*, his bride or wife, and the *stars* his sons. In like manner,

\* See a controversy on the subject of the literal interpretation, carried on in “the Investigator of Prophecy,” between a writer signing himself Trinitarius, and others.

† See 2 Sam. vii. 10; 1 Chron. xvii. 9; Jer. xxiv. 6; xxxi. 28; xxxii. 41; xlii. 10; Amos ix. 15.



the sun may be applied to Christ, as the head by whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, (Ephes. iii. 15.) and the great "Sun of righteousness;" the moon to the Church, which is his bride; (Rev. xxi. 2.) and the stars to his apostles and prophets, or to the sons of the Church, who, like the patriarchs, are to be made *princes* in all the earth. (Psalm xlv. 16.) And thus they are further applied to the visible types of these things: the sun e. g. to the regal power, in a kingdom the moon to the visible Church, commonly identified and associated with the regal power; and the stars to the nobles, or men of influence, both in Church and State. In this sense the symbols are employed, whether the worship established in the kingdom to which they refer, be a corrupt superstition, or a pure religion. Thus in Isaiah xiii. 9—13, 17, they refer to the ruling powers, and nobles, and idols of *Babylon*; in Ezekiel xxxii. 7, 8, 11, to the same powers of *Egypt*; and in Isaiah xxxiv. 2, 5, to the powers of *Idumea*: and I doubt not, therefore, that Matt. xxiv. 29, and Luke xxi. 25, though occurring in a prophecy which is, in the main, literally set forth, refer nevertheless to the powers in Church and State, which shall be existing in those kingdoms that shall be brought within the vortex of the great whirlwind of tribulation mentioned therein. These expressions, therefore, are apparently to be viewed not so much as *symbols*, strictly speaking, as expressions which have become *tropical* from their frequent and familiar use.

Various other phrases fall under this rule; as *mountain, hill, sea, waves, waters, floods, trees*, the *virgin* of Israel, the *daughter* of my people, &c.; without the understanding of which, in the first instance, we cannot arrive at a right apprehension of many passages in the prophets and many of the psalms, in which they are frequently used.

(2.) Sometimes we meet with sentences, immediately following the use of these figures, which sentences are evidently designed to *explain* the trope preceding. These are exceedingly valuable, not only as throwing light on that particular passage in which they occur; but as fixing the sense likewise of those expressions, upon an authority which must carry conviction, and thus enable us to interpret other passages in which they are likewise used. A few instances of these exegetical sentences will serve to illustrate this point.

In Psalm xlvi. 1—3, we have: "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will we not fear, though the *earth* be removed, and though the *mountains* be carried into the midst of the *sea*; though the *waters* thereof roar and be troubled, though the *mountains* shake with the swelling thereof." Now this is explained in the sixth

verse: "The *heathen* raged, the *kingdoms* were moved: He uttered his voice, the *earth* melted." From which it appears that *mountains* are *kingdoms*, and the *heathen* the ungodly or wicked portion of mankind who are the means of shaking and disturbing the kingdoms of the earth. Psalm lxxv. 7. contains another instance: "Which stilleth the noise of the *seas*—the noise of their *waves*—and [or rather *even*] the tumult of the *people*." This is doubly exegetical; for the *seas* in the first clause is explained in the second clause by *waves*; and in the third clause the "noise of the *waves*" is shown to be the *tumult* of the *people*." In Isaiah lxxv. 5. we have: "the *abundance* of the *sea* shall be converted unto thee,—the *forces* of the *Gentiles* shall come unto thee;" the latter of which clauses is evidently the interpretation of the former. So Isaiah xliv. 3, "I will pour *water* upon him that is thirsty," is explained in the same verse by, "I will pour my *Spirit* upon thy seed." Isaiah xxxiv. 1. is also in the one part exegetical of the other, though neither part is obscure: "Come near ye *nations* to hear—and hearken ye *people*:" and again, "let the *earth* hear, and all that is therein, the *world*, and all things that come forth of it." And as the *nations* are here explained to be "the *people*,"\* so in Psalm lxxxv. 8, "*His* people" is distinguished from "the *people*," and explained to be "the *saints*;" for He will speak peace unto *his* *people*, and [or *even*] to his *saints*."†

Sometimes the explanation of particular tropes and figures is not to be met with in the same connexion, nor even in the same book. Thus in Luke xi. 20. the expression, "If I with the *finger* of God cast out devils," might excite inquiry in the mind of an English reader; but we find a precise explanation of it in Matt. xii. 28, where we have the parallel passage, "But if I cast out devils by the *Spirit* of God;" thus evincing how differently two Jews might express the same thing, and yet both be literally correct according to their own habits of thinking. And this further shows how justifiable it is, if we

\* The Septuagint has this rather different: "Come near, ye *nations*, (or *Gentiles*, *ἔθνη*) and hear, ye *rulers*: let the *earth* hear, and *those* in it,—the *habitable* earth, [*καταμυμένη*] and the *people* which is in it."

† The word *and* in our translation appears frequently to require the sense of *even*, which is giving to the Hebrew  $\gamma$  no greater latitude than is constantly allowed to the Greek  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  and the Latin *et*, the former of which is sometimes so translated in the New Testament, and seems to require it in other places. An instance occurs, in Numbers xxiv. 18, of an exegetical clause, in which the translators have not rendered  $\gamma$  by *and*, but by *also*,—"And *Edom* shall be a possession, *Seir* also shall be a possession." A reader, however, unacquainted with the fact, that *Seir* and *Edom* are the same, (Gen. xxxi. 3, xxxvi. 8.) would conclude from the word *also*, that two different countries were intended. It would certainly be nearer the sense if rendered, "And *Edom* shall be a possession, *EVEN* *Seir* shall be a possession."

find the interpretation of a phrase in one part of scripture, to apply it to the like phrase in another part of scripture.

(3.) Another class of tropes or figurative words are those, the sense of which cannot be fixed by *explanatory* sentences, (as in the former instances,) but from their being connected with the Levitical ceremonial, which was typical; and therefore when words are used, which represent things connected typically with that ceremonial, it may be made a *question* whether they are to be understood literally or figuratively; and this may commonly be determined by the context and scope of the passage. For example, when our Lord warned his disciples “to take heed and beware of the *leaven* of the Pharisees and Sadducees,” (Matt. xvi. 6,) he was supposed in the first instance to use the expression literally; (verses 7, 11,) which exposed them to rebuke for not understanding it in its mystical sense. This shows that the ultra-literal rule of qualifying only by the dictates of *common* sense is not sufficient; there must be a *spiritual* sense, to enable men to understand spiritual things, and to compare them with spiritual. (1 Cor. ii. 11—15.) It is apparently on this principle, viz. the typical meaning of the Levitical dispensation, that St. John applies those words as prophetic of what should happen to our Lord—“A bone of him shall not be broken.” (John xix. 36.) No man I think, from the bare inductions of natural sense, would have fetched such a meaning out of Exodus xii. 46. Neither do I wonder that John ii. 19, “Destroy this *temple*, and in three days I will raise it up,” should have been so little understood till after the resurrection of Jesus; for the circumstances under which it was spoken would *naturally* have led to the conclusion that it referred to the great temple at Jerusalem, and not to that temple or tabernacle which St. Paul mystically speaks of, 1 Cor. vi. 19. and 2 Cor. v. 1.\* How likewise was Mary to conclude, by the dictates of common sense, of such a saying as this: “Yea a *sword* shall pierce through thy own soul also?” (ch. ii. 35.) Ordinary sense would rather lead to the conclusion, in this instance, that Mary was really and literally to suffer death by the sword. An acquaintance, however, with such scriptures as Psalm lvii. 4, lxiv. 3; Prov. xii. 18, and xxv. 18, (portions of scripture committed to memory by the pious Jews,) would suggest to Mary that a different sense might be intended; and knowing

\* I must refer the reader, for a full explanation of the phrases—*Mount Zion, holy mountain—house of God, temple*, &c. to AEDIEL'S ESSAYS, pages 42, 51 to 53, and 131. They are phrases quite necessary to be understood in their scriptural sense, in order to a right apprehension of the true meaning of scripture in many places.

this, the words concerning Christ, that he should be “for a sign that should be *spoken* against,” would give occasion for her “to ponder in her heart” whether that which concerned herself was not, that the *reproaches* of them that reproached him should pierce and afflict her.

These things show that there are difficulties to be encountered, arising from the terms in which prophecies are expressed; (to say nothing of the more directly symbolical prophecies of Daniel and St. John;) and to pass these difficulties by, as of no moment, or to conclude that they have no existence, is not the right way to arrive at correct interpretation of prophecy. They are, however, I believe, all of them to be understood by a careful, and devout, and patient study and comparison of God’s word.

(4.) It must further be observed, that whilst words in general are used in the scriptures in so literal a sense, that an argument is sometimes raised on this ground alone;\* there are other words which are frequently, though not always, used in a restricted sense; and an argument therefore drawn from these, as if used invariably in an *unrestricted* sense, would not be just: though it is not unfrequently done, particularly of late, on the prophecies. For example, the word *all*, does not necessarily mean absolutely the whole of the subject of which it is predicated, but must be qualified by its usage in other instances, and its scope, therefore, and context in any particular case. Thus, in Mark i. 5, it is written—“And there went out unto him *all* the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were *all* baptized of him, &c.” A very specious argument might be raised from the meaning of the word *all*, in the latter clause of the sentence, as to its comprehensive signification in the former part; and yet we know that all the land of Judea, and *all* they of Jerusalem, were not baptized of John, neither did *all* go out to him. And this, it is to be observed, cannot be clearly gathered from the context of Mark i. 5; but from a careful comparing of *other* scriptures, such as Luke vii. 29, 30. So in the prophets: Isaiah says, “By fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with *all* flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be *many*.” This would seem to imply an utter destruction; but in verse 19 we read—“I will send those that *escape of them* unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, Lud, Tubal, Javan,” &c.

We have another very remarkable instance, in which even

\* Mr. Haldane, in his treatise ‘*On the Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures*,’ has given examples of this: for instance, when the apostle (Gal. iii. 16) draws an important conclusion from the word “*seed*,”—being used in the *singular*, and not in the *plural* number, (p. 138.)

the apostle argues for the most extensive signification of the word. Quoting Psalm viii.—“Thou hast put *all* things in subjection under his feet,” he reasons; “For in that he put *all* in subjection under him, he left *nothing* that is not put under him; but now we see not yet *all things* put under him.” (Heb. ii. 8.) And yet in 1 Cor. xv. 27, he makes this exception: “But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that *He* is excepted which did put all things under him.” This shews that an assertion evidently incongruous with and destructive of some grand truth contains within itself the exception to the rule.

The case is not altered by a change in the terms or expressions used. In Jeremiah xlv. 14, we read “that *none* of the remnant of Judah, which are gone into the land of Egypt to sojourn there, shall *escape* or *remain*, &c.” Yet, at the end of the verse, it is added, “*none* shall return but such as *shall* escape.” Verse 27 appears, in the first instance, still more sweeping: “Behold I will watch over them for evil, and not for good; and *all* the men of Judah that are in the land of Egypt shall be consumed by the sword and by the famine, until there be *an end* of them.” Nevertheless, it is afterwards intimated—“Yet a *small number* that *escape* the sword shall return, &c.” In John iii. 32—“And *no* man hath received his testimony,” is afterwards apparently contradicted by—“He that *hath* received his testimony, hath set to his seal that God is true;” which is, however, no real contradiction to those accustomed to Jewish idiom, any more than—“He came to his own, and his own received him *not*,” qualified again by an intimation in the next verse, that some did receive him,—“But *as many as* received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.” (John i. 11, 12.) So in Acts ii. 5, it is stated, that there were dwelling at Jerusalem, devout men, out of *every* nation under heaven;” which, nevertheless, could not be the case if the phrase *under heaven*, is to be taken in its fullest extent; but it appears rather to have respect to the nations comprehending the *Roman* earth or world:\* (See Luke ii. 1.) Luke iv. 5, seems to require a similar limitation.

The phrases *for ever*, and *for ever and ever*, are likewise susceptible of great limitation according to the circumstances and connexion in which they are mentioned. An able writer in “The Investigator of Prophecy,” has traced this limitation to the following classes of circumstances:—First, when applied to the existence of man; in which case the phrase signifies

\* The word *heaven* is sometimes used as if synonymous with earth: e. g.—“If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of *heaven*, from thence will the Lord thy God fetch thee,” &c. Deut. xxx. 4.

only the duration of his life upon earth. (See Exod. xxi. 6.) The second is limited to the duration of Jerusalem and the temple. (See 1 Kings ix. 3.) The third class refers to the Levitical law, certain ordinances of which are called "statutes *for ever*." For the numerous proofs adduced, and the arguments of the writer thereon, I must refer to the work itself.\* I only observe further, on this point, how injudicious it is hastily to reject an interpretation, because it may appear at first view to be opposed by some expression, without waiting to inquire whether there may not be sufficient reason to limit or qualify that expression. Unless we thus qualify scripture by scripture, we shall often be compelled to reject scripture itself. The Jews when it was intimated to them that the Son of Man must be "lifted up," answered, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth *for ever*." (John xii. 34.) This was a *sceming* difficulty, but perfectly reconcileable if only *all* scripture were taken into the account. So we find that the world is to be dissolved, (2 Peter iii.) to which it may be objected, we have heard out of the law "that the earth abideth *for ever*." (Eccles. i. 4.) But this is no real contradiction; neither is the circumstance that Christ's *kingdom* is sometimes spoken of as "*for ever*;" and yet, in 1 Cor. xv. 24, as to be delivered up to the Father. All that is required, in regard to the word of God, is time and a patient consideration; when it will be found, in proportion as we become better acquainted with the words thereof, "that they are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge." (Prov. viii. 9.)

III. I shall in the third place throw together a few miscellaneous observations referring to principles of interpretation which are deducible from the word of God.

1. The first I may term the *inferential* or *deductive*. An esteemed and venerable Christian writer, who however has candidly avowed his superficial acquaintance with prophetic subjects, has hazarded the following observation:—"Attempting to establish it [viz. the doctrine of the premillennial advent] on *inferences and deductions*, is building on the sand, and not on the rock of truth. Whatever is an object of faith is always plainly revealed in the inspired word of God."† This is only one among the numerous lamentable evidences which exist of good men, and scriptural men in the main, being on some points so under the influence of prejudice, as to be led to de-

\* See the Letters of Trinitarius, (a writer already referred to,) *Investigator*, vol. i. p. 198, and also a paper on the word *αὐαὶ* in the same publication, vol. iii. p. 321.

† Sober Views of the Millennium, by the Rev. T. Jones, of Creaton, p. 26.



nounce or disparage principles which are decidedly sanctioned by the word of God. Such is the case in regard to *inferences and deductions*: they are employed by the spirit of God to establish some very important points of doctrine on certain occasions; and how shall we therefore presume to make light of them?\*

We have recently had one instance before us in the case of St. Paul, arguing as to the extent and character of Christ's authority in his millennial kingdom, viz., "that when he (the Spirit) saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted, which did put all things under him. What is this but an inference and deduction, drawn from the consideration, that he that delegates a power must still be greater than he to whom it is delegated?"

Another instance is, where our Lord proves to the Sadducees the important doctrine of the resurrection, from the fact that God said to Moses in the bush, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." This is an inference or deduction, to the effect, that as it would be contrary to the majesty and dignity of Jehovah to be the God of those whom death would effectually destroy, so they must be presumed as living unto God, and as eventually to be restored to life in the body. (Matt. xxii. 31, 32.) And this is an argument which the Sadducees were evidently rebukeable for not considering.

A third instance may be taken from the epistle to the Hebrews, relative to that *rest* which remaineth to the people of God. The argument by which the apostle urges it on those to whom he writes, is the circumstance, that in the Psalms the Lord (as has been noticed, page 121,) warns his people not to harden their heart, and reminds them of that generation with whom he was grieved in the wilderness for forty years, and "unto whom he sware in his wrath, that they should not enter into his rest." (Psalm xcv. 7—11.) From the fact that a practical use is made of this "after so long a time," the apostle infers, that it could have no reference to the Sabbath rest instituted at creation, nor to the rest of Canaan into which they were led by Joshua; but to some future rest which must still remain to God's people. (See Heb. chap. iii. and iv.)

One other may be noticed in Matthew v. 12. "Rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven: *for so*

\* I must not be understood as yielding to Mr. Jones, that we have nothing but inferences and deductions to offer for the doctrine of the premillennial advent; neither am I proposing now fully to meet his objection in all its bearings. I apply myself at present only to the principles of inferences and deductions in the abstract.

*persecuted they the prophets which were before you.*" This is given as a reason for rejoicing, in addition to the assurance that there is a reward for the persecuted in heaven. But there is no obvious comfort in the statement, unless we resort to the principle of *inference and deduction*. Then the consideration, that God should have permitted the wicked to persecute and trouble the righteous, leads to the necessary inference, that there must be a day in reserve of righteous retribution, when the Lord will recompense tribulation to them that trouble his people, and to them that are troubled he will recompense *rest*, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven,—evidently that "rest that remaineth." (Rom. ii. 5—10; 2 Thess. i. 6.) The persecutions, therefore, which the righteous endure for righteousness sake, are to be taken as "a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God;" being "an evident token of perdition" to the ungodly, but to the saints a token "of salvation, and that of God." (2 Thess. i. 5; Phil. i. 28.)

It is remarkable, that all the four instances here adduced contain arguments which have a reference to the rest which remaineth to the people of God; the resurrection which is to introduce the saints to the enjoyment of it; the judgment of the wicked and recompense of the righteous therein, and the extent of the power delegated to "that man whom God hath ordained to judge the world." (Acts xvii. 31.)

These, however, are not the only class of topics in respect to which arguments are employed in the way of inference or induction: many others occur in the scriptures; I shall content myself with referring to two or three of a less obvious character, from which, nevertheless, very important conclusions are drawn. The superiority of the man over the woman, and the consequent propriety of the subjection of the latter, is insisted on by the apostle (1 Tim. ii. 11—14) from the circumstances "that Adam was first formed, then Eve; and that Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." The incongruity of *polygamy*, and especially of *divorce*, with the order and law of nature, is asserted by our Saviour on the ground that God in the first instance made man a male and a female, for which cause the man was to cleave to his wife, (Matt. xix. 3—8;) and that divorce, however it might have been winked at, on account of the hardness of the heart of the Jews, was a departure from the order constituted of God "at the beginning," and from which therefore the mind of God was to be inferred. So the duty of setting apart a seventh portion of our time for rest from labour and for the worship of God, is declared from the fact of the work of creation having been effected in six days, and God's having rested

on the seventh day and hallowed it.\* And, once more, it is intimated to the people by Moses, that they ought to abstain from making graven images or other representations of the Deity, on this deductive and inferential ground, that when the Lord spake unto them in Horeb, they saw no *similitude*, but only heard a voice. (Deut. iv. 12—16.)

Now from these examples it is most evident, that the principle of arguing from inferences and deductions in regard to the doctrines of God is most legitimate, scriptural, and important.

2. Another principle to be noticed in regard to prophecy, is, that it does not require the terms of it to be precisely those of *direct prediction*. It may be truly said, that when verbs are in the *future* tense they signify no *other* than future; but the reverse does not hold good: there are other forms of the verb which have a future signification, though to an English ear the idiom may appear strange. We may take first for an example the whole of Psalm cxvii.—“*O praise the Lord, all ye nations, (or Gentiles: praise him all ye people. For his merciful kindness is great toward us; and the truth of the Lord endureth forever: Praise ye the Lord.*” There is nothing in the first aspect of this psalm, which to an ordinary reader would appear prophetic; it seems to contain only an exhortation of the Psalmist to the nations, to render the praise due to God in consideration of his mercy and truth. Nevertheless, it is quoted by St. Paul, in Romans xv. 11, to convince the Jews that they ought not to be prejudiced against the calling of the Gentiles, seeing that it is here declared that they *should* praise him. Every instance, therefore, in which the Holy Spirit, by the mouth of his prophets, thus calls on any imperatively to any act, is a declaration and assurance that they shall do so; and as a first fruits from the Gentiles was given as a token and earnest in St. Paul’s time, so may we be assured that the time shall arrive when *all* the Gentiles shall turn to the Lord, and the whole earth shall be filled with his glory and praise. *When* that time shall be, is declared in another similar prophecy, quoted by St. Paul, on the same occasion: “*Rejoice ye Gentiles with his people.*” Rom. xv. 10. For this is taken from the song of Moses, in Deut. xxxii. 43, and the connection is as follows: “*Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people: for He will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land and to his people.*” (Compare Rev. xviii. 20, and xix. 5.)

\* See this largely insisted on by the eminent Dr. John Owen, in his “*Treatise on the Sabbath.*”

Another instance is Isaiah lxxv. 1, 2. "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, *Behold me! Behold me!* unto a nation that was not called by my name. I have spread out my hands all the day, unto a rebellious people," &c. This is partly in the present and partly in the past tenses; as if some of the particulars of it, (I am sought,—I am found,) had reference to the period in which the prophecy was delivered, and the other particulars (I said, Behold me! &c.—I *have spread* out my hands, &c.) referred to events gone by; the whole being rather in the style of narrative than prophecy. But the whole is quoted also by the apostle, (Rom. x. 20, 21.) as referring to the reception of the Gentiles to be the Lord's people, and the casting off Israel, as witnessed in his days.

These will serve as a specimen whereby to judge of various passages, which may otherwise be lightly passed over; especially those which are couched in the form of prayer and imprecation. Psalm lxxx. will serve as a specimen of the former; Lamentations i. 22. affords an example of the latter; or Psalms cix. and lxxix.—concerning the son of perdition, and the apostate Jews—so often a stumbling-block to the English reader; being viewed as a burst of the revengeful disposition of the Psalmist, instead of remembering that he spake as he was moved by the Spirit of God, and *prophesied*. (Compare Acts i. 20; also Matthew xxiii. 38; and Romans xi. 8—10.)

3. There is another important principle to be noticed in the structure of prophecy, and indeed in the structure of the historical parts of scripture equally, viz. that the facts related or dwelt upon are not always mentioned in their proper chronological order; but a deviation takes place without any notice or intimation thereof to the reader.

There are three modes of deviating from the regular order. The first is by *prolepsis*, when facts are related *before* some other events mentioned, which events they really *follow* in the order of time. The second is by what has been called *episode*, interrupting the regular course of the narrative. The third is in the way of *appendix* of particulars, after the narrative is completed. A specimen or two from the *historical* portions of scripture will best serve to convince the reader, and to prepare him to expect the like in prophecy.

In Genesis x. 5, 20, 31, the division of the earth "*after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations,*" 'is alluded to in the way of anticipation; and not till chap. xi. have we the regular account of that division.

In Genesis xxxviii. 1—5, Judah is described as taking Shuah to be his concubine, and has by her Er, Onan, and Shelah.

Verses 6—10, Er and Onan are severally described as grown to man's estate, and married to Tamar, and both slain of the Lord for their wickedness. Verses 11—24: after this a sufficient time elapses for Shelah the younger son of Judah to be grown up; and Tamar continues sometime after his arriving at manhood, without his being given to her in marriage. And finally, (verses 24—30,) Tamar has two sons, twins, by her father-in-law Judah. Yet, in the preceding chapter, (xxxvii. 2,) Joseph is stated to be only seventeen years of age; and in chap. xli. 46, only thirty years of age. The whole, therefore, of chap. xxxviii. if it be viewed as occurring in regular chronological order, must have taken place within a less period than *thirteen years*, which is quite impossible, and therefore it must be considered as an historical *episode*.

In Genesis i. 27, we have the account of the creation of *woman* in the regular order of narrative: "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him, male and female created he them." In chap. ii. 18—25, the history of creation being concluded, there is appended a separate notice of the particulars of the creation of the woman, and of the cause thereof.

The same principle exists in the historical parts of the New Testament. In Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, we have the relation of many of the saints coming out of their graves *after* the resurrection of Jesus. But it is mentioned in connexion with his crucifixion, and before the resurrection of Jesus has been described; which is not till chap. xxxviii.

John i. 6—18, contains a summary sketch or glance at the whole history of the ministry of Christ, from his coming into the world (v. 9) to his being rejected by his own, (v. 11;) and then it takes up particulars and proceeds more minutely: just as a painter first makes a sketch of his subject, and afterwards makes out a more detailed delineation.

It may be reasonably concluded, therefore, that the same principle applies to *prophecy*, when it contains lengthened description; though, from the comparative uncertainty which hangs over that portion of it which is unfulfilled, it is difficult, in many instances, to determine it. Daniel vii. however, evidently sets forth the general outline of the prophecy of the four beasts first, and then returns, and in the way of interpretation, goes through the whole again, and fills up details.\* In Reve-

\* There is a remarkable instance in the historical part of Daniel, of chronological irregularity in the narrative. In chapter i. 1. Nebuchadnezzar is called *King of Babylon*, and *three* years of his reign are said to elapse (See verses 5, 18.) before Daniel stood before him. Yet chapter ii. states, that in the *second* year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar he had the dream of the great image, which was interpreted to him by Daniel.



lation xi. there is an evident prolepsis: verse 7 describing "the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit, as making war on the two witnesses;" whereas we have no account of any *wild* beast (*θηρίον*) till chapter xiii. and not of the beast of the bottomless pit, till chapter xvii.\* Verses 6 and 14 of Rev. xii. when compared, show the former to be a prolepsis; for there it is said, the woman "*fled* into the wilderness;" whereas in verse 14 she receives two wings of an eagle "that she *might* fly into the wilderness." Many portions of Rev. xvii. partake of the same character; and the whole of that chapter, and of the remaining chapters (and probably portions of former chapters) appear to be an appendix, in which particular subjects of the previous delineation are painted out, as it were, more in detail.

4. A few further observations appear necessary, in the conclusion of this chapter, concerning the alleged *obscurity* of prophecy.

There is a danger, as has been already intimated, in going to an extreme, and concluding obscurity to exist where none is intended; and likewise in supposing that it exists to a greater degree than it does where it really *is* intended. Much of the imagined obscurity exists in ourselves, and not in the prophecy; the medium through which we view divine things is often so darkened and so distorted by carnal prejudices, as entirely to prevent us from recognising the truth, though it be placed before us in the clearest and most undisguised language. What, for instance, could be more plain than those predictions of our Saviour, so often repeated to his disciples, of his future sufferings, and which he desired them to let sink down into their ears? Take this for example:—"The Son of man shall be delivered into the hands of men." This is spoken openly, without any parable or figure, and yet "they understood not this saying, and it was hid from them, that they perceived it not." (Luke ix. 44, 45.) And thus it happens now, that in matters equally plain, men fancy some obscure or allegorical sense, merely because the obvious sense shocks and contradicts their pre-conceived notions of what it ought to be.

In regard to the tropes, metaphors, and symbols, likewise, of Scripture, some persons seem to conclude of them, that there can be no fixed and settled rule for their interpretation; but that they were left to the taste and imagination of the prophet, independent of any control from the Spirit, and are conse-

\* Some indeed have considered the *beasts*, mentioned in chapter vi. 8. to have a reference to the ten and two-horned beasts; in which case the beasts there, would be mentioned in the way of anticipation. But they are called "*beasts of the earth*," whereas there is only *one* beast of the earth afterwards described; the others are from the sea, and from the bottomless pit.



quently, in many instances, superfluous embellishments, or words used in the looseness and with the latitude of poetical figures. This is not only a great mistake, but it contains in it likewise a most dangerous principle. For if we are left at liberty, in the perusal of the word of God, to lower the terms in which the mind of the Spirit is conveyed to us, and to conclude that one jot or tittle can be superfluous, where are we to draw the line? It must, in that case, not only have been left to the taste and style of the prophets, but it must likewise be left to the taste and style of every reader; so that the amount of significaney and of literal accuracy in every part of the Scriptures will depend upon the imagination and notions of every man, thus making it to each individual of "private interpretation." With regard to tropes and figurative expressions, we have seen already that they are often explained; and with regard to symbols, we have seen that in some instances they may be viewed from their frequent and familiar use, as only tropical expressions. In these instances it is evident, that, however they may serve to *embellish*, they are like the polished corners of the temple, which add strength and compactness to the edifice likewise. And as respects the other symbols or hieroglyphics of Scripture, Bishop Hurd has justly observed, that they are "not vague uncertain things, but fixed and constant analogies, determinable in their own nature, or from the steady use that was made of them;" (Vol. ii. p. 90.) and I doubt not but that they may be reduced to as certain principles of interpretation, as the generality of *words*, in any language.

Whilst however it must be contended that prophecy is not that dark and unintelligible thing which many are disposed to conclude of it; but, on the contrary, that it is rather to be viewed as a "*light shining in a dark place*," in order to dispel the darkness; (2 Peter i. 19.) it seems to be going quite as much into the extreme to insist, that there is no obscurity in prophecy whatsoever: and this they do indirectly assert, who allege that it can be at once understood, and its meaning determined. Enough has been already brought forward to prove, that there are at least certain peculiarities and idioms, contained in the very structure of prophecy, which must serve to obscure it in a measure to the superficial reader; and this affords *one* proof, if there be no other, that the patience and diligence of the wise in heart must be exercised in the careful consideration and investigation of these things. Nor has any thing like the whole been brought forward of what might be adduced relative to this point alone. Bishop Chandler has observed, in regard to the genius of the Hebrew original of the prophecies, "that many things are there left, to be supplied

by the quickness of the reader's apprehension, which are with us expressed by proper words and repetitions; particles disjunctive and adversative, significative marks of connection, and of transition from one subject to another are often omitted; dialogues are carried on, objections answered, and comparisons made, without notice in the discourse."\* These things may, indeed, be determined by careful observation, from the context, or by a comparison of the doubtful place with parallel ones; but it is absurd to suppose the meaning in all cases to be so plain as that the poor man, and "he that occupieth the place of the unlearned," shall be equally enabled with the learned to discover.† The education, habits, associations, and, in numerous instances, the intellectual deficiencies of multitudes in the humbler classes, disqualify them from making such observations of themselves. They may be enabled with tolerable acuteness and good sense to perceive the existence and propriety of such things, when pointed out to them by others; but for the discovery, they must lean upon those "helps" in the Church, which God has ever raised up, and appointed for this purpose, not only as regards prophecy, but the general doctrines of divine revelation likewise. (1 Cor. xii. 28.) What poor man, for example, can determine a question of *criticism* for himself? They are indeed dependent, in every line they read of God's word, upon the learned: for they must rely upon the *translation* given to them; and if that be incorrect, they have no means of rectifying it but by resorting to other learned men, on whose testimony they must again be dependent.

But there are likewise obscurities which prove and exercise the understanding of the most learned and intelligent. It must be evident to any one who will consider the character of the greater portion of the prophecies of Daniel and St. John, that the general style and structure of them is different from that of most other prophecies; and so likewise are large portions of the prophet Zechariah, and much of Ezekiel. Notwithstanding the sentences of interpretation occasionally inserted in St. John, or given at greater length in Daniel, they still do not convey a meaning to the reader so obvious, as that the prophecy can be at once comprehended, without diligent and careful investigation and comparison.

It is *clearly* the purpose of God, that, in some instances, prophecies should *not* be understood until the time of the end: of this we have the direct testimony of God himself, in Dan.

\* Defence of Christianity from the prophecies. Introduction, page 11.

† This is, nevertheless, what has been concluded by the writer in the Investigator before alluded to, signed *Trinitarius*.

xii. 4. 9. It may be questioned also, in regard to the matters here said to be "sealed up," whether at the time of the end the wise shall be enabled to look back, and to see that they have been *previously* fulfilled; or if at the time when the said prophecy is about to be fulfilled, the meaning of it shall be first opened to the church. But in either case, there must be a something in the terms of the prophecy calculated to raise doubt and hesitation, as to the precise interpretation to be given them, or the special application to be made of them; otherwise I see no reason why Daniel should not have understood it at the time, just as well as the generation which is destined to understand it. Let us suppose, for example, that when Daniel hears "the time, times, and a half" declared, (chap. xii. 7,) in regard to which it is, apparently, that he says, "I heard, but I understood not,"—that he doubted whether he was to understand three *years* and a half, according to the measure and meaning of a *time* in reference to Nebuchadnezzar, (see chap. iv. 24;) or whether he was to understand the time here symbolically, according to the direction given in one instance to his contemporary Ezekiel, (chap. iv. 6;) this alone would create that precise degree of hesitation in the mind, which would prevent him from deciding with positiveness on the meaning of the prophecy. I insist not that this *was* the cause of Daniel's want of understanding it, though it appears to me not improbable: it is instanced only in the way of illustration of those obscurities, which were probably designed to rest upon portions of the prophetic word.\*

Nor does it appear that a prophecy, if it be delivered under circumstances, or in language, calculated to cast a veil of obscurity over it, must necessarily be understood, even when fulfilled, or in course of fulfilment, with such clearness and force of demonstration, as to excite a general conviction of one only signification. It is plainly declared that "*none* of the wicked *shall* understand:" but if the circumstances were to be such as must produce general conviction, then the meaning must be as obvious to the wicked as to the righteous. It seems, however, to be one method whereby the Lord takes the wise of this world in their own craftiness, that whilst they are despising what appears to them only foolishness, they are often themselves unconsciously helping forward the fulfilment. (Compare Acts iii. 17, 18. and 1 Cor. ii. 8.) Neither, I take it, will a prophecy that is couched in symbol appear so clear to the *wise* after its fulfilment, as to come home to them with

\* Psalm cii. 18, and 1 Peter i. 10—12, appear to refer to prophecies intended to be understood by the generation for which they were especially delivered, and not to have been understood by that generation which first enjoyed them.

the same degree of conviction, as if it were in the undisguised language of history; and it is calculated to prevent that unanimity on this subject among the wise, if we incautiously lead them to expect *too much* in this respect from prophecy. When it is said that the four beasts of Daniel vii. are four kingdoms, it still needs much skill in the interpretation of prophecy, to apply all the various minutæ of those symbols to demonstrate the kingdoms intended; and in the instance of the Little Horn of the same vision, there will always be a latitude of application arising from the obscurity of the symbol itself, and from the likeness which some of the features of it that are described bear to various powers which have already appeared.

A passage in Bishop Sherlock's Dissertations on Prophecy, places the last-mentioned point in a clear point of view. "It will be asked, How comes it to pass, that many of the prophecies are still dark and obscure, and that it requires much learning and sagacity, to show even now the connexion between some prophecies and the events? In answer to this question, we must observe, that the obscurity of prophecy does not arise from hence, *that it is a relation or description of something FUTURE*; for it is as easy to speak of things future, plainly and intelligibly, as it is of things past or present. The same language serves in both cases with little variation. He who says, *The river will overflow its banks next year*, speaks as plainly as he who says, *It did overflow its banks last year*. It is not therefore of the *nature* of prophecy to be obscure; for it may easily be made as plain as history, when he who gives it thinks fit. On the other hand, a figurative and dark description of a future event will be figurative and dark still, even when the event happens, and consequently will have all the obscurity of a figuratively dark description, as well after as before the event. You may observe, then, that the most literal prophecies have received the greatest confirmation and the most light from the event: for the difficulty, in this case, not lying in the darkness or obscurity of the expression, but in the seeming impossibility of the thing foretold, such seeming impossibility the event fully clears: but no event can make a figurative or metaphorical expression to be a plain or a literal one. I have said thus much to show what *sort* of clearness and evidence we ought to expect from prophecies *after their* accomplishment. It is a great prejudice against this argument [from prophecy] when men come to it expecting more from it than it will yield. This they are led to by hearing it often said, *that prophecy, however dark and obscure at first, grows wonderfully plain in the accomplishment*: which in some

cases is in fact true; but is not, cannot be, so in all cases." (Diss. ii. p. 36, 41.)

Thus we may conclude, that things which are enigmatically described, though seen and understood by the wise, are nevertheless "seen in an *enigma* darkly." And whatever question may arise, as to the plainness and *literal* distinctness of prophecy, one thing at least is evident from experience, that some portions of the prophetic word never have been clearly seen, or the signification generally agreed in. It matters not indeed, as regards the practical result, that things *might* have been known: if God has even suffered the *prejudicēs* of men to prevail, so that they have proved as a veil to the understanding, they have operated as effectually in obscuring prophecy, as if he had mystified the word itself. Take, for example, the number of the beast. The early church never pronounced upon it with any confidence. The interpretation given to it by Irenæus was advanced only as a modest suggestion in company with two other words; and the multitude of interpretations which have arisen since, some of them not wanting in plausibility, have prepared the way; even if a better interpretation is hereafter to arise, to induce good men to ponder it well before they decide as to its merits.

---

## CHAPTER V.

### ON THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST.

It may already have been concluded, from the testimonies adduced in the third chapter, drawn from the writings of the early Fathers and the Reformers, that *the second advent of Christ* was a doctrine held very prominently by them, and urged as the great object of hope and expectation on the believer. In the present chapter it is proposed to bring this topic more expressly before the reader, and afterwards to disabuse him of certain modern prejudices and misapprehensions respecting the Judgment of the Kingdom of Christ, which, if he be under their influence, will very greatly embarrass the right apprehension of the Prophecies.

1. No doubt will, it is assumed, arise in the mind of the Christian, in regard to the hope of the Jewish Church: it is well known that prior to the first advent of the Lord, the coming of the Messiah formed the chief and almost only



ground of expectation to the pious Israelite, which expectation had indeed extended beyond the people of Israel, and prevailed among many of the Gentiles. So intimately was the advent of the Christ bound up with the important events which he was to accomplish, that it became difficult for the Jewish mind to separate the one from the other, and some of the very names which he familiarly bore among them when they spake of him, were indicative of the importance which they attached to that event, and the intensity with which they expected it, as *הוא* *the one waited for*, *הבא* and *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, *he that cometh*.\*

While however it will be conceded, that this was the grand object of hope to the church prior to the *first* advent, many are disposed to conclude, that, that advent having taken place, the coming of Christ ceases to be an object of such pre-eminent importance and interest, excepting in the retrospect; and some are even inclined to place the second advent among the non-essential truths of Christianity, which they presume may be neglected or lightly esteemed, without danger or detriment to the believer. Owing to this, and to the opinion that a long and indefinite period is to elapse before that advent can under any circumstances take place, it has come to pass, that it is not by the generality of pious men now pressed upon the notice of their hearers with any earnestness, but is, comparatively speaking, thrown into the back ground. A reference however to scripture will show, that, in thus doing, the church has departed from the apostolical mode of treating the subject.

To cite passages from the Old Testament, in proof of this, may appear to some inconclusive, arising from the impression that they were all fulfilled at the *first* advent of Christ. I shall waive therefore the mass of evidence to be derived from this source; excepting to observe,—that it would be very difficult to select any one entire prophecy from the Old Testament, supposed to relate to this event, which was *in all its principal particulars* accomplished at our Lord's first coming. So far indeed as any importance may be attached to the general expectation of the Israelitish church before that period, scarcely *any* of the things which they looked for and mused upon were fulfilled at the first advent;—the events which *then* came to pass, though declared beforehand in the scriptures, were *not* expected by the generality, but took even the most pious of them by surprise;—whilst the apostles themselves do constantly carry forward and sustain the expectations previously entertained, directing the mind of the Christian church to the *second*

\* See Dr. Lamb, on the *Hebrew Hieroglyphics*.



advent, as the great event which was to be the consummation of the believer's hope.

In the first epistle to the Thessalonians, chap. iv., the apostle brings a very interesting subject before their notice; viz. the special consolation with which he would have them comfort one another, when afflicted by the bereavement of dear friends and relatives in Christ. He declares that he would not have them ignorant concerning the state of such, and sorrow for their departure as those persons sorrow who never hope to see their deceased friends again. (v. 13.) Now would be the time, if it were consistent with the mind of the Holy Spirit, for the apostle, who here speaks expressly "by the word of the Lord," (v. 15.) to dwell upon the blessedness of those that sleep in Jesus in the separate state; to comfort their friends with the assurance that they are now in glory; and to encourage the survivors to hope, that they shall presently be with their friends in heaven. But there is not a word of the kind! He teaches them, that they shall again see their friends *here*;—he reminds them that the resurrection of *Jesus* is the pledge of *theirs*;—and he tells them that *when the Lord comes* he will bring them with him.—"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout," &c. Thus he brings the second advent to bear upon events of such common occurrence and touching interest to the Christian; and I am persuaded, that, where it is thus realized and practically applied in such cases, the consolation it affords is far superior to that which can be derived from any other consideration which the wisdom and ingenuity of man can substitute in its place.\*

We are favoured in the New Testament with the hope entertained by two of the apostles, personally and individually, in the prospect of death; constituting what may be termed their *experience* on the occasion; and it is remarkably to the point in hand. St. Paul says, "I am now ready to be offered, *and the time of my departure is at hand*. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is *laid up* for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the Righteous Judge shall give me *at that day*." (2 Tim. iv. 6—8.) St. Peter, when admonished by the Lord, "that he must shortly put off his fleshly tabernacle," thinks it proper to write an epistle to the faithful, the whole burden of which

\* It will not be denied by the writer of these pages that there is an intermediate state, in which the separate spirits of believers are in a condition of blessed rest and consciousness; enjoying also the presence of Christ, as declared in 2 Cor. v. 8, and Phil. i. 23. This point he has endeavoured to vindicate from the errors of some modern Millenarians in the work called "*Abdiel's Essays*," where he has also set forth the doctrine of *the Resurrection*. See the note likewise at page 52 of this volume.

is to confirm them in the expectation, that these present heavens and earth shall be dissolved, as those in the days of Noah were, and again be succeeded by new heavens and a new earth; that he had followed no cunningly devised fables, when he made known to them the power and coming of the Lord; but had had a visible specimen of it, when he beheld the transfiguration on the mount; and that apostate men would arise in the last days, treating the promise of his coming with scoff. He finally confirms all by the testimony of St. Paul, who (he says) *in all his epistles* makes mention of these things.

In like manner St. Peter, in his first epistle had directed the hope of believers in general to the same object of expectation: "When the Chief Shepherd shall *appear* ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." (chap. v. 4.) And so, in like manner, do the other apostles. St. James encourages not those to whom he writes with the hope of reward at death; but exhorts them to be patient *until the coming of the Lord*. (James v. 7.) And St. John declares, "We know that *when he shall appear* we shall be like him." (1 John iii. 2.)

Now these things are consistent, if the great hope of deliverance and salvation were deferred, as insisted on, till the second appearing of Jesus; and if that were the object chiefly held out to view. We shall in that case not only perceive it laid down in the New Testament as a doctrine of the apostles, but we shall find the primitive church in general impressed with this view of the subject; and either speaking, or spoken of, as looking forward with eagerness to this event. Other marks of grace will be discernible; but this mark in particular, at a time when it is presumed the hopes of the church were bound up in the doctrine of the second advent of Christ, and not in the rest entered into immediately after death, would then be an essential one. The want of it would imply either very gross ignorance of the prevailing tenets of the church, or very great unbelief of those which were perceived. This feature, however, pre-eminently marks the character of the scripture saints, as shall now be evinced by a few passages from the epistles of St. Paul.

In Romans viii. 19, the earnest expectation of the creature is said by him to be *waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God*; and those, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, are groaning within themselves and *waiting for the redemption of the body*. (verse 23.) He thanks God for the Corinthians, because they came behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ*; (1 Cor. i. 7:) which words are so connected as to shew, that the proper and practical tendency of those gifts, and the best evidence of completeness in the Spirit, con-

sisted in the mind's being led to be habitually looking for the Lord Jesus from heaven. So of the Thessalonians therefore the apostle writes, "that they turned from idols to serve the living and the true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven." (1 Thess. i. 9, 10.) To the Philippians he writes: "For our conversation is in heaven, *from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself.*" (chap. iii. 20, 21.) And as the hope of a glorious resurrection is here declared to be the great benefit that he looked for from his Redeemer's coming, so he declares, that the whole powers of his mind and heart were placed on this one thing:—viz. to know Christ, and the *power of his* resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death, *if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.*" In his second Epistle to Timothy the apostle makes the *loving the appearance of Christ* so decidedly a mark of grace, that he appears to limit the reward of righteousness to those only who partake of this desire: "A crown (he says) which the Lord shall give me at that day; and not to me only; but unto all them also *that love his appearing.*" (chap. iv. 8.) Hebrews ix. 28 seems to make the same distinction and limitation: "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and *unto them that look for him* shall he appear the second time, without sin, unto salvation. Finally, "the Spirit and the Bride say, *Come;*" (Rev. xxii. 17,) that is, the Church of Christ, which is the Lamb's Wife, moved by the Holy Ghost which dwelleth in her, longs for the presence of her absent Lord; the ardent desire of her soul being summed up in that single and emphatic expression—COME.

2. But however clearly apparent it may be, that the doctrine of the Second Advent is prominently set forth in scripture and pressed upon the believer,\* yet do many Christian ministers prefer to urge the uncertainty of life, and the probability of death, as being in their estimation better calculated to excite the believer to watchfulness, and to arouse the ungodly to calling upon the Lord. Now it will commonly be found, where truth is in the abstract thus assented to, and yet is practically set aside, either that it is not, after all, cordially *believed*, or that there is something erroneous mixed up with it, which neutralizes it, and deprives it of its power. That defect is believed to be, in the present instance, a mistake in regard to

\* Other instances will be found in Col. iii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 4—7; 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 2; Titus ii. 11—13; Heb. x. 36, 37; 1 Peter i. 13, and 1 John ii. 28.

the imagined *period* at which the advent of Christ may be expected. For if it be admitted, that the church is to expect a second advent of Jesus, and that advent is nevertheless supposed to be postponed until a thousand years shall have elapsed, or to some remote period, it so completely removes the existing generation of believers from any immediate interest in the event, that it at once ceases to exercise upon them a practical influence. It will be useful therefore to inquire, what is revealed in scripture in regard to the *time* of the advent.\*

(1.) It will be obvious to those who carefully peruse the scriptures, that this important event is spoken of as if it were *impending*. For example—"The Lord is *at hand*." (Phil. iv. 5.) "The Coming of the Lord *draweth near*." (James v. 8.) "The end of all things is *at hand*." (1 Peter. iv. 7.) Again St. Paul speaks of himself and others, as if it were probable that the generation in which he lived might be alive at the coming of the Lord: "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that *we* which are *alive and remain* unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep." (1 Thess. iv. 15.) "Then *we*, which are *alive and remain*, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air." (v. 17.) So again, "We shall not *all* sleep, but we shall all be changed," (1 Cor. xv. 51,) would leave the impression that a part of that generation should remain to the coming of the Lord. The same conclusion might be drawn from Peter's mode of stating the doctrine: "Nevertheless we look for new heavens and a new earth; &c."—"wherefore beloved, seeing that ye *look* for such things, be diligent that ye may be *found* of Him in peace, &c." (2 Peter iii. 13, 14,) and there are other similar passages which might be adduced.

To this it may be objected, that the Apostle Paul does nevertheless warn the Thessalonians, whom he had more especially enjoined to watchfulness for the Lord, that notwithstanding what he had led them to expect concerning the nearness of that day, there was a falling away from the faith previously to take place, and "the *Man of Sin* was to be revealed." (2 Thess. ii. 2, 3.) It is true that this interposes a certain event, which must first transpire, before they could ex-

\* The inquiry is here waived into the comparative practical tendency of preaching *the advent of Christ* as an impending event, and *death* as an impending event; under the impression, that it will be sufficient for those, who humbly desire to take their standard of doctrine from God's word, simply to demonstrate to them, what is "the mind of the Spirit" on this head. But should any be disposed nevertheless to think, that looking for *death* must be more practical than looking for *Jesus*, they will do well to read some very forcible remarks on this subject in the Appendix to *Anderson's Apology for Millennial Doctrine*. Part i. pages 79—83.

pect the Lord; but though this had a tendency to lead them to postpone the advent for awhile, yet was it for so short a period, as to affect their general expectation in only a very small degree. For, first, the early Christian Church did not understand the *time, times and a half* of antichrist, of more than 1260 natural days; and, secondly, they were led to expect by the apostle, even in this same place, that the mystery of iniquity was already at work (verse 7) preparatory to his revelation; and by another apostle they were led to conclude, that the spirit of antichrist was already come into the world, (1 John iv. 3,) and that indeed already there were "many antichrists, whereby they might know that it was the last time." (chap. ii. 18.)

Now it is of no use to argue, as some are wont, that the apostles must nevertheless have been persuaded themselves, that the Lord would not come till after an interval of 1800 years, because the event has *proved* that he has not come: it may reasonably be questioned, whether the apostles were not themselves, from the words put into their mouths by the Holy Ghost, to expect the time of the advent to be very near; and, like the prophets of old, they probably "searched *what manner of time* the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify." (1 Peter i. 11.) Be that however as it may: let it be granted, for argument sake, that St. Paul and the other apostles knew privately that a period of 1260 years was to intervene,—yea, and that, after that, another period of a 1000 years was to intervene;—the language which they nevertheless made use of only the more clearly shews, that it was expressly the mind of the Holy Spirit, that in their public ministrations in the church they should keep the minds of God's people in a state of expectation, arising from the uncertainty of the event;—not an uncertainty which left the church at liberty to wait a thousand years, before it should be needful to consider the probability of the advent being near; but an uncertainty, which led them to question whether the event were not even then imminent; and to stand in constant readiness, with their loins girt and their lights burning; and looking at the things of this life with that comparative deadness and indifference which they must feel, who thought that all was about to be dissolved and a new and heavenly state to be introduced.\*

\* It should be noticed in passing, with respect to the language of the apostles, that when they speak of the prospect of their departure, (as in the two instances given at page 120,) they speak *individually*, as of a revelation made to and concerning themselves *personally and exclusively*. Their language then is, "For the time of *my* departure is at hand." "Knowing that shortly *I* must put off this *my* tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ hath shewed *me*." But when they speak of what concerns the whole congregation of believers,



(2.) But the fact is sometimes pointed to, that the church has at various periods been *mistaken* in its expectation of the near approach of the Lord;—that the most pious men have been deceived;—and therefore that it is a hope very delusive in itself and dangerous to entertain;—and that on this account the safer method, and the more creditable, is to urge the approach of death instead. This is a mode of viewing the subject which many in the present day entertain; and it is highly important, therefore, that on a point which is itself so practical in its tendency, and which so materially affects the right interpretation and application of prophecy, the fallacy of the objection here adverted to should be demonstrated.

In the abstract then it is evident, from the Scriptures that have been brought forward, that the mind of the Spirit is—to preach the advent of Christ, rather than to preach the approach of death; and to preach it, as if so uncertain when the event should come to pass, that we ought always to be expecting it, if not day by day, at least within the period of some three or four years. And therefore any scheme of prophetic interpretation, which postpones to a remote period the coming of the Son of Man, is contrary to the whole drift and tenor of God's word, and ought not to be heeded by the Church. As Mr. Faber says of another principle, "it bears upon its very front the stigma of error." It may be that the advent is in the meanwhile postponed; we see in fact that it *has* been delayed, beyond what was in former days expected: nevertheless, it is not the will of God, so far as that will is revealed in the Scriptures, that the church should therefore settle down into the conclusion, that it is an event not to be immediately or quickly expected: on the contrary, we are admonished to conclude, that the Lord is not *slack* concerning his promise, as some men count slackness, but that he is long-suffering toward the vessels of his wrath; and that this long-suffering proves *salvation* toward the vessels of his mercy, who are during the period of delay being gathered together until the number of the elect shall be complete. (2 Pet. iii.)

But, secondly, the mistakes of the church in various ages may be regarded in a very different point of view. I consider it rather as a practical evidence, that God has in all ages overruled *error* even, for the benefit of his church, and thus accomplished by his providence, that his people should be kept continually

---

it is in the first person plural—"We shall not sleep"—"We which are alive and remain." From which it would seem that they viewed the church as a corporate body, which never as it were deceases, albeit some of its members may depart; but it is considered as existing in all generations, and therefore up to the time of the coming of the Lord, and into the very crisis of those awful events which will accompany his advent.



watchful; though he was at the same time waiting, with a merciful reluctance to strike, not being willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. For if he can overrule the *wrath* of man (which we know "worketh not the righteousness of God,") so that it shall nevertheless praise him, by advancing his purposes; there is surely no inconsistency in concluding that he will much more turn to good account those mistakes and failings of men, which savour not of malicious wickedness. Nothing can be permitted by him, but for a wise and beneficent purpose.

When therefore mankind were in error in regard to the supposed chronology of the world, (which was the case in the early ages of Christianity, so that the primitive fathers supposed the 6000 years were just expiring, and the seventh millenary was at hand;) it was overruled to keep believers in the Lord more watchful.\* In like manner, when this period passed over, and chronology was in some measure adjusted, a general impression prevailed that the advent must be at hand, from that break up of the Roman empire, which it was supposed was immediately to precede the Lord's coming. At page 61 it has been shewn, that in the twelfth century a general opinion prevailed that *Antichrist* was about to appear; and it must be remembered that in the primitive church the revelation of Antichrist was supposed to be immediately preparatory to the coming of Jesus Christ, and the only event which hindered it. At the Reformation we have seen that the Protestant divines were generally animated by the expectation that the advent was near at hand; and in the extract from Latimer given at page 67 it is evident he thought it might happen in his days. They considered the millennium to be passed, and that only about 450 years remained to the end of the sixth millenary; and these days they also expected to be shortened; thus bringing the matter within the probability of happening in their own day and generation. When subsequently a new interpretation of the 1260 days was advanced, and they were concluded to be *years*, yet this had not the effect of postponing the probability of those great events immediately coming to pass, which were to usher in the advent: for this interpretation

\* Lactantius says—"Fortasse quispiam nunc requiret, quando ista, quæ diximus, sint futura? Jam superius ostendi completis annorum sex millibus mutationem istam fieri oportere." And again—"Non amplius quam ducentorum videtur annorum." And this period, which seemed to remain, they considered would be "*shortened* for the elect's sake;" so that though they considered there were two or three centuries to elapse before the expiration of the sixth millenary, they knew not how soon Antichrist might precede, and the rapture of the saints. Mr. Greswell refers to numerous passages, in which this expectation is declared, in the first vol. of his work on the parables.

did not obtain until the 1260 years were at the same time supposed to be nearly run out; so that practically it did not materially damp the expectation maintained. Other instances might be cited nearer to our own times: but these are sufficient to shew what has been the general expectation, kept alive by various causes, among the people of God.

Among the various mistakes upon the subject, some have been rashly led to fix the event to a certain year, or even a certain day; a mode of interpretation which does not appear to have any warrant in the word of God; but the contrary. For though abundant is revealed concerning the *signs* which shall precede that event, whereby the believer may know that his redemption draweth nigh; (Luke xxi. 28;) yet of the day and hour of his coming it is not given to any man to know. (Matt. xxiv. 36.) And even in the Apocalypse, which is by some supposed to be a subsequent specification of the times, the advent is nevertheless spoken of as to take place suddenly, and as a thief cometh.

Granting then that many have been deceived by such calculations; and granting likewise, that the whole church has been repeatedly in error on this point, and have indulged in delusive expectations; there is at all events nothing in the objection drawn from previous mistakes on this point, which will not apply with equal strength to the expectation of the advent, let it be entertained *at any period whatsoever*. If there be any force in the argument, it will be as forcible on the very day previous to our Lord's actual coming, as it is now; and there will be just as much reason then as now for deprecating the hope of his speedy appearing.

But if the posture of mind which waits and watches and expects and looks out for the coming of the Lord, or for the events which usher it in, may be thus proved to be justifiable, (even though it may be mistaken as to the time,) because it has the countenance of Scripture; not so that state of mind which would deliberately postpone his coming to a remote period, or which would defer those previous *judgments* which he has threatened. As it is declared to be the error of the sensual and infidel scoffer, to treat the subject with derision, and to say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" (2 Peter iii. 3, 4.) so is it declared to be the spirit of the evil servant to say in the heart, "My Lord *delayeth* his coming." Matt. xxiv. 48. They are also expressly reprov'd and threatened, who say—"The days are prolonged and every vision faileth;"—"The vision is for many days to come, and he prophesied of the times that are far off." (Ezek. xxi. 22, 27.)

Far be it from the writer of these lines to insist, that all

who defer the advent until after the millennium must be evil servants or infidel professors: he is thoroughly persuaded of the contrary of some. But he verily believes them to be in great error in this matter, and encouraging all who hear their sentiments to sit careless and indifferent in regard to an event, which they ought to be looking for and loving; and to be confirming multitudes in a false and fatal security, in regard to the character of the events which are coming on the earth. He is persuaded likewise, that they speak not in this matter after the oracles of God; and it is for them therefore to consider, not only if they be not depriving themselves and others of the influence of a doctrine which has a most powerful effect in keeping men dead to the world and near to God; but if they are not likewise exposing themselves to the danger of rebuke from the Lord.

(3.) There is another view relative to this point, which has been the means also of leading numbers *practically* to disown this doctrine: viz. the apprehension that in some of the most eminent texts, which bear upon this subject, a spiritual or providential coming is spoken of, and not a personal one. It is not intended here to insist that no such thing as a spiritual or providential coming is mentioned in the word of God; neither will the mode in which the Lord may personally manifest himself be here discussed: but it is submitted to the reader, that there ought at least to be some *criterion* by which it may be determined, when a personal advent—in other words, the proper *second advent* of Christ—is really intended. By the method pursued by some of spiritualizing passages which speak of it, there is scarcely a text left in which such will admit, that it really *is* foretold; and thus the hope of it is as effectually neutralized, as if there were no revelation on the subject. Matthew xxiv. 30, for example, is explained by these to relate to the Lord's coming invisibly to destroy Jerusalem; which event, together with the captivity of the people, is likewise supposed to be the *great tribulation* therein spoken of. Unfortunately however for this interpretation, it is "*after* the tribulation of those days" that the advent here spoken of is declared to happen; and in the midst of troubles, which (if Luke xxi. be compared,) follow the termination of the times of the Gentiles. Further, it is at a period in which we may rather expect the *restoration* of the Jews, than their *overthrow and scattering*.

Besides this, however, it may be laid down with tolerable safety as a criterion, that when the original word, by which the coming of the Lord is expressed, is *παρουσία*, *parousia*, it has reference to his actual epiphany and personal revelation. When

the word *ερχομαι* is used, it may be *questioned* how far it expresses a figurative coming; because that expression is applied to the coming of things without life. But the word *παρουσια* does not appear to be in the New Testament ever so applied, unless it be in one instance which will presently be noticed. And even were this the case, the word *παρουσια*, as applied to *persons*, appears always to have reference to the actual *personal presence* or *arrival* of that person.

The following are all the passages in which the word *παρουσια* is used; the word which represents it in our English translation being put in italics. (1) Matthew xxiv. 3, What shall be the sign of thy *coming*, &c. (2) v. 27. For as the lightning cometh (*εξερχεται*) out of the east, &c., so shall also the *coming* of the Son of man be. (3) v. 27. But as the days of Noah, so shall the *coming* of the Son of man be. (4) v. 39. They were eating and drinking, and knew not until the flood came (*ηλθεν*) and took them all away.—So shall the *coming* of the Son of man be. (5) 1 Corinthians xv. 23. Afterwards they that are Christ's at his *coming*. (6) Ibid xvi. 17. I am glad of the *coming* of Stephanus and Fortunatus and Achaicus, &c. (7) 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7. God comforted us by the *coming* of Titus; and not by his *coming* only; but, &c. (8) Ibid x. 10. But his bodily *presence* is weak, &c. (9) Phil. i. 26. That your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my *coming* to you again. (10) Ibid ii. 12. Wherefore, my beloved, as ye have always obeyed, not as in my *presence* only, but now much more in my absence, &c. (11) 1 Thess. ii. 19. Are not even ye [our rejoicing] in the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ at his *coming*? (12) Ibid iii. 13. At the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints. (13.) Ibid iv. 15. We which are alive and remain unto the *coming* of the Lord. (14) Ibid v. 23. I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the *coming* of the Lord. (15) 2 Thess. ii. 1. We beseech you brethren by the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him. (16) v. 8, 9. And then shall that WICKED be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the Spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness (the *epiphany*) of his *coming*: even him whose *coming* is after the working of Satan, &c. (17) James v. 7. Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the *coming* of the Lord. (18) v. 8. The *coming* of the Lord draweth nigh. (19) 2 Peter i. 16. We have not followed cunningly-devised fables, when we made known to you the power and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ. (20) Ibid iii. 4. Where is the promise of his *coming*. (21) v. 12. Looking for and hasting to the *coming* of the day of God; &c. (22) 1 John ii. 28.

That when he shall appear we may have confidence, and not be ashamed before him at his *coming*.

In regard to the above passages it may be noticed, first, that in the examples Nos. 2 and 4 the verb *ερχομαι* is used to denote the coming of the *lightning* and of the *flood*, and that in both those instances the coming of *Christ* therein mentioned is distinguished by the expression *παρουσια*. Secondly, that the only instance in which this latter word seems applied in the New Testament with reference to any other than a *person*, is 2 Peter iii. 12, example No. 21: which is in the original *Προσδοκωντας την παρουσιαν της του Θεου ημερας*. Supposing our translation to be the true reading, it will not affect the inference, that the word *παρουσια* when applied to *persons* signifies their actual presence; but it is evidently susceptible, agreeable to the rules of Greek syntax, of another reading, by understanding *της ημερας* to be in the Genitive, as denoting time, by a preposition understood, (see Parkhurst,) and not as governed by *παρουσιαν*. It will then be "*Looking for and hastening to the PRESENCE [of Christ] in the day of God, when the heavens,*" &c. Thirdly, examples Nos. 6 to 10 are so unequivocal as to render it not at all a question, that the personal presence of the parties spoken of is intended. Nos. 5, 11, 12, 13, 20 and 21 will be equally clear, if the *context* be taken into account; for of what other than the personal coming can the Spirit be speaking, when he declares it to be to raise the dead, as in example 13, or attended by his saints, as in example 12? The remaining examples must be judged of therefore by analogy, from the use of the word in other instances. There can be no sufficient reason assigned, why Nos. 14, 15, 16 (for example) which occur in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, should not be the same as Nos. 11 and 12, occurring in the same Epistles, and which are unequivocal from their evident sense. Nor does there appear to the writer any sufficient reason for disputing any of the others. It may be proper finally to observe, that if this word when applied to Christ signifies a *personal* coming or presence, then by parity of reasoning it must signify the same in 2 Thess. ii. 9, which must refer to a *personal* manifestation and coming of "that Wicked one;" and not merely to the *system* of anti-christian principles of which he is the head or leader.

(4.) In the last place I would remark, in regard to the *time of the advent*, that if those great *events* be considered, which are acknowledged, or may be independently proved, to be pre-millennial, the coming of the Lord will be found declared somewhere or other in Scripture as synchronous with them, and therefore likewise pre-millennial. When I speak of *events*, I mean not the *order* of them, nor do I allude to circumstances



which may be considered rather as *subordinate details* of the kingdom of Christ. Interpreters of prophecy may be mistaken and differ among themselves with regard to some of these particulars; and there are others of them on which it were presumptuous to speak with confidence until events shall enable us to judge of them more clearly. The matters I refer to are events which must in themselves be taken into account by the student of prophecy, and which force themselves on his attention; although he may not be able to speak with precision of every particular of those events.

For example, there is the *destruction of antichrist*, which is to be effected (as has been seen in 2 Thess. ii. 8.) by the brightness, or *epiphany*, of the Lord's coming or *parousia*. Either therefore the Lord's glorious epiphany is previous to the millennium, in order to accomplish this, or antichrist continues throughout the millennium, contrary to all proper notions of that blessed period. The same thing is shewn in Daniel vii. 20—22: the Little Horn, which is admitted to be antichrist, prevails against the saints, "Until the Ancient of days comes, and judgment is given to the saints of the Most High, and the time comes that the saints possess the kingdom."

If again we regard the *dates* of Daniel: whether they be considered as having a mystical signification, or to be understood literally, they are admitted by all to terminate before the millennium.\* But it is expressly declared to Daniel—"Go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot *at the end of THE DAYS*." So that at the end of those days which are to elapse before the millennium, Daniel is to rise from the dead, in order to have his part or lot in the glory then to be revealed. And if a *resurrection* is then to take place, of course Christ must then appear; for when the saints are raised and caught up it is expressly declared to be at the coming of the Lord. Compare 1 Cor. xv. 23, and 1 Thess. iv. 14—17.

Again, if we regard *the restoration of the Jews*, it is written,— "Thou shalt arise and have mercy upon Zion: for the time to favour her, yea, the set time is come: for thy servants take pleasure in her stones, and favour the dust thereof. So the heathen shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory. *When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in his glory.*" Now the restoration of the Jews

\* There is one exception to this admission, viz. Mr. Faber, who in former editions of his work did likewise make all the dates pre-millennial; but in the latter edition of it, in order, apparently, to avoid the conclusions on this head to which his own reasonings would force him, he makes one of these periods very absurdly extend through the Millennium and reach to the final casting of Satan into the lake of fire. See a Review of Faber in the Investigator, Vol. iv. where his numerous contradictions and fallacies are set forth.



and the rebuilding of Zion must be at the commencement of the millennium; for it would be contrary to every thing predicted of the millennial state to suppose, that any people shall be existing who do not recognise the Lord. But then, at this building of Zion, the Lord shall appear in his glory; therefore the Lord shall appear at the restoration of the Jews; as it is written, "There shall come out of Zion, the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." Rom. xii. 26.

But some may deny a literal restoration of the Jews, *as Jews*, at *any* period; and imagine that the building of Zion, spoken of in the Psalm, refers to a future glorious triumph of the *Church*. In this case, however, we must equally place the event at the beginning of the millennium: for what sort of a millennium would that be, in which the *spiritual* Zion, the Church of the living God, should still remain trampled in the dust? Such a notion will not comport with any view of the millennium at present entertained by christians. It clearly follows, therefore, whichever view we take, that the Lord *appears in his glory at the beginning of the millennium*.

This view is farther confirmed by a consideration of *the Feast of Tabernacles*, the antitype of which is to be enjoyed at the final restoration of the Jews, when every man shall sit under his own vine and under his own fig tree. In Zechariah chap. xiv. there is described a great warfare against the nations, which combine together and come up against Jerusalem; and every one of the nations that continues after that warfare, is required to *go up from year to year* to worship the KING the LORD OF HOSTS, and keep *the feast of Tabernacles*. (v. 16.) This description of their going up, and annually, and to keep this festival, shows that the transaction takes place *on earth*. There is afterwards a punishment described, which shall fall upon those nations which neglect to go up,—viz. that they shall have no *rain*. And because in the land of Egypt it never rains, a *peculiar* and distinct plague is threatened, if that nation go not up; which again proves it to be a state on earth. (v. 17—19.) Now *previous to this*, during that very warfare, from the dire effects of which these nations escape, *the Lord appears*, and "his feet stand upon the Mount of Olives." (v. 14.) And not only is the *Lord* declared to come; but—"all the saints with Thee." v. 15.

One more passage shall here be adduced, as corroborating what has been stated concerning the resurrection of Daniel; viz. that which relates to *the marriage of the Lamb*; and as this event is no other than the union of the Lord with his glorified church, who has now put on her glorious apparel, and made herself ready; so the resurrection of the saints must necessa-

rily have taken place, and also the transfiguration of the living saints, and the coming of the Lord Jesus. But the marriage of the Lamb's wife is in Rev. xix. intimately connected with the period of the final judgment on Babylon, (see verses 1—8, and their connection with the previous chapter, and apparently takes place immediately *after* the judgment on the great whore, but *precedes* the judgment on the infidel confederacy that burns the whore: (see verses 11—21.) The armies on white horses, and in fine linen white and clean, are probably, if we compare verse 8, these same risen saints, who receive "*the two-edged sword*"—"to execute vengeance upon the heathen and punishments on the people, to *bind their kings* with chains, and their *nobles* with fetters of iron; to *execute upon them the judgment written*: this honour have all his saints.—*Praise ye the Lord.*"\* But be this as it may, it again makes the resurrection of the saints premillennial; and if their resurrection, so also the advent of their Lord.

The same may be proved from a consideration of what is revealed concerning the *kingdom of God*. But this is an extensive subject, and occupies so prominent a place in scripture, and involves so many other important considerations, that it will afford ample matter for a distinct chapter.

---

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST.

Having treated of the *coming* of Christ, our attention is next directed to the great *objects* of that second advent: viz. the KINGDOM and JUDGMENT of Christ which will then be established.

The *Kingdom* of Christ will with propriety first come under consideration; in regard to which the notion of many is, that it signifies the present visible Christian church, or the Christian religion in the hearts of God's people, or both; and its setting up and establishment in the earth is supposed to be commensurate with the establishment of Christianity, and to have been manifested to the world ever since. This view is not altogether devoid of truth, as will presently be shown; but

\* Compare Psalm cxlix. from which this is quoted, especially the sentences in Italics, with verses 5, 15, 18, of Rev. xix.

it is nevertheless in the main erroneous, inasmuch as it mistakes the means for the end, and substitutes what may be considered as the *preparation* for the kingdom, for the *establishment* and *manifestation* of it. But the reader's patience must be drawn upon, whilst this matter is examined step by step.

1. It will be evident to any one who reads the scriptures of the New Testament, that John the Baptist and our Lord Jesus both make mention of a kingdom which was approaching, or at hand; and that they speak of it, not as a new notion or doctrine introduced by them for the first time, but as an object of expectation familiar to the Jews, and which they would readily understand without the need of Jesus or of John explaining to them what they particularly meant by it.\*

That the Jewish mind was prepossessed with this notion of a king and a kingdom may be shown, first from the exclamation of Nathanael, when brought to believe in Jesus as the Messiah,—“Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the *King* of Israel.” (John i. 49.) When the Lord fed the five thousand in the wilderness, the whole multitude would have taken him by force, and made him *King*, had he not withdrawn from them. (John vi. 15.) When he rode triumphantly into Jerusalem on the ass, the populace shouted, “Blessed be the *King* that cometh in the name of the Lord.” (Mark xi. 10.) “Blessed be the *kingdom* of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord.” (Luke xix. 38.) And this indeed is declared by St. Matthew (xxi. 4, 5,) to have been done in fulfilment of an ancient Jewish prophecy which, among others, gave rise to or confirmed this expectation:—“Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion, shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy *King* cometh unto thee, &c. (Zech. ix. 9.) Nor was this expectation confined to the inhabitants of Palestine alone: when the Magi came from the East to Jerusalem at the time of the birth of our Lord, their first inquiry was, “Where is he that is born King of the Jews.” (Matt. ii. 2.)

It is almost superfluous to show from the Old Testament Scriptures, how very general this expectation was in the Israelitish church prior to the advent of Christ; for there is scarcely any one prophecy, in which it may not be discovered. It probably had its first distinct *origin* from the promise to Sarah, of the seed who was to be *as thou over the Gentiles*, and from whom “kings of nations should arise;”† even as declared by St. Paul,

\* See Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17, 23; v. 3, 10; vi. 10, 33. Mark i. 14. Luke iv. 43. These texts are sufficient for the point in hand: many others might be adduced.

† See this treated of at page 26, where, for Gen. xvii. 6, read Gen. xvii. 16; and for *εὐλογησαν* read *εὐλογησάτω*.

that he was "to rise to reign over the Gentiles;" (Rom. xv. 12.) and the Psalmist also states, "Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children, whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth." (Psalm xlv. 16.) The same expectation was again raised by Balaam in the time of Moses: "There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a *sceptre* shall rise out of Israel," &c. (Numb. xxiv. 17.) The last words of David (2 Sam. xxiii.) were on the same subject; and in numerous other places the king or the kingdom are spoken of.\*

It is however quite *notorious* that the Jews did, in the time of our Saviour, look for a king who should in an illustrious and glorious manner inherit the throne of David, reign over Israel, and obtain dominion and possession over all nations. It is indeed objected to them, by many who interpret the word of God, that they *mistook* the promises of scripture in this respect, and putting a carnal sense upon various passages which relate to *spiritual* things, looked only for a *temporal* kingdom. This objection is however itself founded in mistake, in more respects than one, and does great injustice to the theology and views entertained by the orthodox portion of the Jewish church. The grosser Jews did undoubtedly overlook those exhortations to righteousness and those intimations of the necessity of conformity to God, which are constantly mixed up by the prophets with their predictions of the times of the Messiah; and even the most holy portion of the nation had, at the period of our Lord's ministry, lost sight of the prophecies which relate to the suffering and humiliation of the Messiah, and were most unwilling to have their attention drawn to them; but these things are independent of what relates to the throne, and visible glory, and power of his kingdom. It is not, as some suppose, that they mistook or perverted those passages, imposing a sense upon them which comported with their own views of earthly dominion; nor is it that they were unable to perceive the true meaning of passages which are now thought to be so plain and unquestionable to us. The fact is, they *overlooked* passages which were *really* of the nature here alluded to; but most of those *perversions* imputed to them are *not* perversions; they understood them in their appropriate and harmonious sense, though not perhaps in their *full* sense; and the wonder is, not that they should thus have understood them; but that any among ourselves should understand them

\* The following additional places may be mentioned: viz. Numb. xxiii. 21; xxiv. 7. 1 Sam. ii. 10. Psalm ii. 6; xxi. 1; xiv. 7—10; lxxii. cx; cxlv. 1; cxlix. 2. Isaiah vi. 5; ix; xi; xxv. 8; xxviii. 5; xxxii. 1; xlii. 1; xlix. 6; lii; liii; Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; xxx; xxxi; xxxiii. Ezek. xvii. 22; xxix. 21; xxxvii. 24; lx. 1. Dan. ii. 44; vii. 13, 14; ix. 24—27. Hosea iii. 5; Micah iv. v.; Zech. iii. 8; iv. 12; xiv. 1, 16. Mal. iii. 1.

otherwise; seeing that their primary and most obvious sense is so plainly accordant with the Jewish expectations. And another remarkable circumstance is, that our Lord should never give them any hint of their mistake, in regard to these expectations. He did indeed press upon them the need of being inwardly regenerated and sanctified, before they could see or enter into this kingdom; but many of his allusions to the kingdom were calculated to *confirm* them in their mistake, had it been one;\* and even at the very last, when he was about to leave them, and his disciples put the question to him, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" he does not tell them, "Ye have been all along deceived in this matter;" but gives a reply, which, while it admonishes them, that *they* were not to know the time, would nevertheless strengthen their expectation in the general.—"It is not for you to know the times or the seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power." Acts i. 6, 7.

Another instance in which the Jews are misrepresented in this matter, is in their alleged expectation of a *temporal* kingdom. If by *temporal* is meant a kingdom that was not to be spiritual in its nature, it is to be feared that too many were in error in this respect, as before stated; but if by *temporal* is meant, that it was to be a kingdom of only limited duration, and subject to sublunary changes, like other secular kingdoms, this certainly was *not* their expectation; for they looked for "a kingdom which could not be moved," (Hebrews xii. 28.) and the duration of which should be "for ever and ever." Dan. ii. 44; vii. 27. And the spiritual portion of the Jews would likewise fully understand, that it was to be *heavenly* in its nature and character; the phrase *kingdom of heaven* and *kingdom of God* having been well understood and frequently made use of by their Rabbins.

1. We have next to make inquiry into the different forms made use of in the scriptures to express this kingdom, which are principally three; viz. "the kingdom of *God*," "the kingdom of *Christ*," and the "kingdom of *heaven*." "The kingdom of the *Father*" is so evidently the same as "the kingdom of *God*," and "the kingdom of the *Son of man*" the same as "the kingdom of *Christ*," that it will not be necessary to consider them separately. The other three expressions, when spoken with reference to a future kingdom, or the kingdom proclaimed by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles, may equally be shown to signify one and the same.

\* See for example Matt. xix. 28; xx. 23. Mark x. 37—40, and Luke xxii. 29—30.



For example: that the kingdom of *heaven* and the kingdom of *God* are the same, is evident from a comparison of those passages in St. Matthew's gospel which mention the former, with the parallel places in Mark and Luke. For the phrase "kingdom of *heaven*" is peculiar to Matthew, being never met with in any other part of God's word; unless we except one passage, viz. 2 Tim. iv. 18. where the apostle speaks of the Lord's "*heavenly* kingdom," which can have no other signification. Thus where Matthew has, "Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of *heaven*;" (v. 3.) Luke has, "Blessed be ye poor, for yours is the kingdom of *God*," (vi. 20.) And where Matthew has, "It is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *heaven*." (xiii. 11.) Mark has, "Unto you is given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of *God*." (iv. 11.) Matthew indeed does himself use the two phrases indiscriminately in the following passage: "Verily I say unto you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of *heaven*. And again I say unto you it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of *God*." (xix. 23, 24.)

The formulas "kingdom of *God*," and "kingdom of *Christ*," may be shewn to be the same by a similar process. In his narrative of the transfiguration St. Matthew relates that Jesus said: "Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the *Son of Man* coming in *his* kingdom:" (xvi. 28.) which latter sentence St. Luke has, "till they see the kingdom of *God* come with power." (ix. 27.) In the parable of the tares St. Matthew says, "that at the end of the world the *Son of Man* shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of *his* kingdom all things that offend;" and immediately he adds,—"then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their *Father*;" (xiii. 41, 43.) thus making the kingdom of the *Father* and of the *Son of Man* the same; even as St. Paul calls it, "the kingdom of *Christ* and of *God*." (Ephes. v. 5.) And it is further to be noted, that the parable of the tares, in which the two formulas just mentioned of the kingdom are used, is introduced by the use of the third formula,—"The kingdom of *heaven* is likened," &c. v. 24.

In regard to the *meaning* of these different expressions, "the kingdom of *heaven*" is most frequently used by St. Matthew in the plural number *ἡ βασιλεία των ουρανων* the kingdom of the heavens. This is no other than a Jewish phrase to signify the kingdom of the *God of heaven*: the phrases *heavens* and *God* being both used by Daniel in this connection and sense. Thus he forewarns Nebuchadnezzar,—"Seven times shall pass over



thee, till thou know that the *Most High* ruleth in the kingdom of men; &c. and whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree root, thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the *heavens* do rule." ii. 25, 26. In this passage the *Most High* and the *heavens* are evidently used as interchangeable terms. The phrase therefore of St. Matthew—*kingdom of heaven*—is precisely equivalent, and must have an ultimate reference, as also the phrase *kingdom of God*, to the sovereignty and government of the *Most High*.

The kingdom of the *Son of Man* is the same thing: for this glorious sovereignty is to be administered by him; "that in the dispensation of the fulness of times he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him." Ephes. i. 10. Thus Jesus declared, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth:" (Matt. xxviii. 18.) and he assured his disciples, "I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Luke xxii. 29, 30. In this kingdom Jesus will act the part of Joseph in Egypt, who was a type of him: for as Pharaoh made Joseph ruler over all the land of Egypt, "only in the throne being greater than him," (Gen. xli. 39—44.) so hath God "put all things under Christ's feet; but when he saith, All things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him." 1 Cor. xv. 27. And as Joseph brought every thing in the land into subjection to Pharaoh, and surrendered them up to him; (Gen. xlvii. 23.) so "when all things shall be subdued to Christ, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.

This kingdom of Christ can be no other than that described by Daniel, (chap. vii. 13, 14)—"I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." And the participation of the saints in this kingdom is declared in the further setting forth of the matter at verse 27: "And the kingdom 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, and all dominions

shall serve and obey him." In which two places observe, that the kingdom appointed to the SON OF MAN in verse 13, is called the kingdom of the MOST HIGH in verse 28, and "all dominions serve and obey HIM." Observe, secondly, that as the Son of Man comes in *the clouds of heaven* to receive this kingdom, it must be a visible and personal inauguration that takes place, and at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ.\* And thirdly, it should be observed, that the surrendering up the kingdom to God by the Son, at "the end" of the period during which he reigns, is no *termination* of this heavenly kingdom; it will be an everlasting dominion, passing only into a still more glorious and perfect state.†

3. A very important part of this inquiry is respecting the *time* when this kingdom was to commence; or rather, when the power of it was to be made manifest: for if this can be proved, it will with many determine, in a great measure, what is really to be the nature and visible character of the kingdom itself. For if it shall appear, that it was to be manifested under this present dispensation, then it will be evident that the kingdom was to be nothing more than the propagation of Christ's religion, or his ruling in the hearts of his people, or the usual sovereignty of God manifested in his providential government; but if, on the contrary, it shall appear, that it was *not* in its primary sense to be manifested under this dispensation, and *has not been* manifested, then it determines that its character will necessarily be something far more exalted and different from what has been hitherto witnessed. Though a passage or two, therefore, have already appeared which bear upon this point, I must still beg the farther patience of the reader whilst I enter into it more minutely.

First then, with regard to the kingdom of God being his now reigning by his power and "providence,—over-ruling so much

\* Nothing can do greater violence to Scripture, than to attempt to interpret the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven, of the destruction of Jerusalem! The dominion over *all nations* to be given to Christ was not in any way made more manifest by that event, than it was previously. The coming in the clouds is obviously the same as that in Acts i. 9—12.

† I do not apprehend that the majesty of Christ will be diminished, but on the contrary *increased*, at the end of the millennium, notwithstanding it is said that he then delivers up the kingdom, and lays down all power and authority. It will, I apprehend, be like the surrender up of the crown, or the keys, only to have them returned with increase of honour and glory, by means of the God-head shining forth with still greater effulgence; for he said—"I and the Father are One." So of the saints it is said, in one place, "They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years," which is what all allow to be the millennial period, however they may differ in their views as to the *parties* who reign, and the *manner* of their reigning. But in the description of that more perfect state which apparently succeeds, it is said "they shall reign for *ever and ever*." Rev. xxii. 5.

of the wrath of ungodly men as he suffers to escape, and restraining the remainder of it. Psalm lxxvi. 10. Many lay stress upon this; pointing to the fact, that the Jews unconsciously obeyed God and fulfilled his will, even when they *crucified* the Lord of glory. Now it is admitted, as beyond dispute, by those who believe the scriptures and know any thing of God, that "he is the Governor among the nations;" (Psalm xxii. 28.) "and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can stay his hand or say unto him, What doest thou?" Dan. iv. 35. But a very important consideration here presents itself. The kingdom concerning which we are inquiring is a kingdom which is the subject of *promise*. It was at least the subject of promise, as also its king, in the days of Abraham, Moses and Daniel. But this overruling and invisible government of God has existed from the creation of the world, and never can be said to have had a beginning in any generation since. To make that the subject of promise therefore, which was already enjoyed, would be absurd. Things are sometimes spoken of in prophetic language as done, which are yet future; but never are they spoken of as future, if they are already performed: unless it can be shewn that they are the subject of promise in some more extensive and complete sense than that in which they are already existing. Now it would be no extension of this overruling and invisible government of God, to say, that hereafter he should possess *all* nations; for that he already does. It can only be increased or extended by some visible *manifestation* of it to mankind, in such manner as that all shall see and acknowledge it. And whatever manifestation of it, or establishment of it in the world, may be supposed by any to have already taken place,—if only it can be shewn, that at or subsequent to that time there was still mention made of this kingdom as the subject of *promise*, and that it was regarded as *future*, there is proof that the kingdom did not yet exist in that eminent and special sense intended in the promise.\*

As we must exclude, therefore, on this ground, that reigning of God by his providence, which was exercised by him from the beginning; seeing that during this reigning there was still a kingdom spoken of; so in like manner must the whole period from Daniel to the first Advent of Jesus be excluded, on the further ground, that the kingdom is promised in Daniel to the *Son of Man*, and it was impossible therefore that Jesus could have reigned *as man*, before he was made man.

\* See the *scripture* argument, derived from things being still spoken of as future, treated of at page 91, in the chapter "on the Interpretation of Prophecy."

That the kingdom and glory to be manifested, are specially assigned to him as MAN, is evident from other Scripture testimonies. In Corinthians the Apostle says of him, "that God had put all things under his feet;" (1 Cor. xv. 27.) which saying is indeed a quotation (as is likewise Psalm ii. 5—8,) from Psalm viii. wherein he is thus spoken of,—“What is man that thou art mindful of him? or the *Son of Man* that thou visitest him? Thou madest him a little lower [or, for a little *while* lower] than the angels: thou crownedst him with glory and honour, and didst set him over the works of thine hand. Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet.” Thus Jesus declared, “that authority was given him to execute *judgment* also; *because he was the Son of Man.*” John v. 27. And St. Paul affirms, “that God hath given to him (on account of his obedience and humiliation in the flesh) 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.” Phil. iii. 9—11. He who thought it not robbery to be equal with God, must have previously possessed that sovereignty of the universe which has been mentioned; but this kingdom is the reward of the righteous obedience and humiliation of the MESSIAH; in consequence of which the Father hath determined for awhile to manifest his own glory in HIM, and to put all things under him: HE only being excepted who thus puts all things under HIM. 1 Cor. xv. 27, 28.

A more prevalent notion is, that the kingdom was established at the *birth* of Jesus. Now the best proof to the contrary of this is, that our Lord himself teaches his disciples to pray, “Thy kingdom *come*;” which were inconsistent and contradictory had it already arrived: and, further, he spoke a parable, the express object of which was to correct the views of those, who thought that his kingdom should immediately appear. Luke xix. 11.

The parable just adverted to, in which the Lord compares himself to a nobleman, who had first to go into a far country, and to receive his kingdom, and then *to return*, (in the same manner, that great men of the nations subjected to the Roman empire, sometimes went up to Rome to be inaugurated and to receive the diadem, then went back to their own country and exercised the authority,) is sufficient to show, that this kingdom did not commence (at least was not made manifest) at his *ascension*. He is undoubtedly seated down at the right hand of God, wielding that power in behalf of his people, which it has been already observed Jehovah has exercised from the beginning; but this is not that special kingdom in which he is to be made manifest as King of kings and Lord of lords, and

when all the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. It was this latter sovereignty which the disciples inquired about on the very day of his ascension,—saying, “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” and to which he replied, that it was not for them to know the times and the seasons, &c.; but that they were to be *witnesses* of him to the uttermost parts of the earth: (Acts i. 6—9) just as in another place he declares, that “the *Gospel* of the kingdom must first be preached in all nations as a *testimony* to them.” Matt. xxiv. 14. In the Apocalypse, the Lord clearly distinguishes between that throne on which he is now seated, and the throne on which he shall be hereafter manifested; when he says—“To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my* throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in *his* throne.” Rev. iii. 21.

And if the Lord Jesus has not yet been manifested in that glory which he is to exhibit, when he shall take to “himself his great power and reign,” (Rev. xi. 17,) so neither have the *saints* as yet been made participators of that power and reigned with him. The saints in heaven have not, (i. e. if it be the departed saints who are represented in Rev. v. 9, 10,) for they are described as singing,—“Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we *shall* reign on the earth.” The saints on earth have not; for the Apostle exclaims—“Would to God that ye *did* reign, that we also might reign with you” 1 Cor. iv. 8. No,—they are exhorted “to walk worthy of God, who had called them to his kingdom and glory;”—“to walk, so as that they might be accounted worthy of the kingdom of God for which they suffered;”—they are called “*heirs* of the kingdom, which (it is still said) God hath *promised* to them that love him;”—they are admonished that the “unrighteous shall *not* inherit the kingdom of God;”—they are assured that they shall be “preserved *unto* his heavenly kingdom,” “and that to them an entrance shall be administered *into* it:”\* all which passages, when viewed together, plainly bespeak, that the kingdom was considered as not yet come, at the time when the Apostles wrote these things. Indeed all notion of believers during this present dispensation enjoying this kingdom is excluded by that single declaration—“*flesh and blood* cannot inherit the kingdom of God.” 1 Cor. xv. 50, 53.

It appears indeed highly derogatory to the promises of God and to all just notions of the sovereignty which Christ is to

\* 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5; James ii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; 2 Tim. iv. 18; 2 Peter i. 11.



enjoy in the world, to call this the period of his kingdom. What nation acknowledged him, throughout the time when he and his apostles sojourned upon earth? Even the *Jews* did not acknowledge him: "He came to his own, and his own received him not:" (John i. 11.)—they declared that they *would not have* this man to reign over them; and insisting that they had no king but Cæsar, (John xix. 15) "they crucified the Lord of glory!" He was indeed nothing more than "a *servant of rulers.*" Isaiah xlix. 7.

The same question nearly may be asked even now: at least we may safely inquire, Where is the nation in which the Lord's "glory is *openly shewed in the sight of the heathen,*" and the whole people do manifestly submit to his rule? Isaiah says again, of the adversaries of the Lord,—"*Thou never barest rule over them;*" (chap. lxiii. 19) and if it was true in Isaiah's time, how can it be said in our own time, that the Lord bares rule over his adversaries, in such sense as to comport with the testimony of Scripture concerning Messiah's promised reign. By far the largest part of the world is still heathen in name: and over that part even, which surnames itself with the name of Christ, he cannot be said to bear rule. In our own country, for example, where religion prevails perhaps as much as in any other, our laws are rarely framed and administered in the fear of Christ: to say nothing of the great mass of individuals, who openly gainsay his divinity, his power, or his precepts, or who scoff at and oppose his people, or who in some way or other betray, evidently, that they do not submit to his yoke. I repeat, it is derogatory to the Lord to call this *his dominion over the nations!* There is no king among men but would consider it quite incompatible with his honour, to allow any to live in defiance of his laws, or in habitual rebellion. The question therefore may even in this way be determined, by noticing whether the prince of light, or the prince of darkness have most adherents, in the world, and *whose principles* chiefly prevail. No doubt will then remain that Satan is "the prince of *this world,*" and has a kingdom in it which is wholly at variance with Christ's. The Lord does indeed get himself glory, by "enduring with much *long-suffering* the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction;" (Rom. ix. 22) but, "We see not as yet all things put under him;" (Heb. ii. 8) and even his condition on the throne of his Father is one of "*expectation,* till his enemies be made his footstool," and it shall be said, "Rule thou in the midst of thine enemies." Psalm cx. 1, 2; Heb. x. 13. Then shall the rod of his strength come forth out of Zion; and with it he will dash his enemies to pieces like a potter's vessel; then



shall he have the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven*; (Dan. vii. 27) then “*all* kings shall fall down before him, and *all* nations shall serve him;” (Psalm lxxii. 11) “*all* the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and *all* the kindreds of the nations shall worship before him:” Psalm xxii. 27. “As I live saith the Lord *every* knee shall bow to me, and *every* tongue shall confess to God.” Isaiah xlv. 23; Rom. xiv. 11.

4. There is still a question remains: viz. at what period is the kingdom of Christ to be manifested?—the consideration of which will further tend to clear this matter, and to prove that the kingdom is still *future*, in that sense in which it is the subject of promise. Now this period is evidently the *second advent* of our Lord.

Jesus himself tells us, “When the Son of man *shall come* in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, *then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory;” (Matt. xxv. 31.) and further on he adds—“*Then* shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world.” (ver. 34.) From these scriptures it is evident, that Jesus will be then *personally* on the throne of his glory; and that the *saints* will only then receive the kingdom.

The texts just instanced will also serve to determine the sense of two others, and to fix the period of time mentioned in them. The one is Matt. xix. 28. “*Verily* I say unto you, That ye which have followed me,—in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory,—ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” The sitting of the Son of man on the throne of his glory must be the same in both places; and therefore as the first is at this time of the *advent*, and the latter at the time of the *regeneration*, so the regeneration here spoken of must be at the advent; and can be no other than that mentioned in Romans viii. 18—23, when the earth shall be renewed, and the creature delivered, &c.

The other passage is Matt. xiii. 43. “*Then* shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.” The context shows that the *angels* are sent forth at this time “to gather out of the Lord’s kingdom all things that offend;” (ver. 13.) and the context shows in the former instance, that the *angels* come with our Lord when he sits on the throne of his glory; that a separation is made of the sheep and goats, in the same manner as in this instance of the wheat and tares; that as the goats are bid to depart into everlasting fire, so the tares are bound up in bundles for the burning; and that as the

righteous are in the former instance invited to come and "inherit the kingdom," so in this latter instance they "shine forth as the sun" in it. Both places refer to the same period; and this, (as we have seen by the former parallelism,) is at the regeneration, or millennial era, when the earth shall be renewed and yield its increase;\* the same period again as that in Romans viii. 18—23, viz. "the *manifestation* of the sons of God," when the creature itself shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.

The Lord further connects the period of the advent with his kingdom, first in Luke xii. 32—36, when he declares to his disciples, that it is the good pleasure of their heavenly Father to give them the *kingdom*; and then exhorts them to sit loosely to the things of this world, that they may be as men that *wait* for their Lord, *when he will return from the wedding*. Secondly, in Luke xxi. 25—31, he describes the signs which shall terminate the times of the Gentiles, and usher in the *coming* of the Son of man with power and great glory; (ver. 27.) and when they see these signs begin to come to pass, they are to understand that "their *redemption* and the *kingdom* of God are nigh at hand. Ver. 28, 31.

The *apostles* in like manner connect the advent with the kingdom, an instance or two of which connection will suffice.—

In 2 Tim. iv. 1, St. Paul gives Timothy a solemn charge before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who (he says) shall judge the quick and dead *at his appearing and his kingdom*; thus making the judgment of the quick (or living) and of the dead, together with the appearing and kingdom of Christ, to commence or transpire at the same period. The mention of the *judgment* of quick and dead in this connexion, however it may prove that the *kingdom* is necessarily future, will with some appear to postpone it to a period subsequent to the millennium. This however only betrays, that their notions of the *judgment* are not according to the general tenor of the scriptures (as will hereafter be seen;) and that they must seek for some more just and comprehensive view of that important subject. For the present, it must suffice to bring forward one other passage from St. Paul.—

In 1 Cor. xv. it is revealed, that there is an *order* in the resurrection, viz. 1st. "Christ, the first fruits;" (ver. 23.) with whom may be included that "handful" as it were of saints,

\* To conclude that the judgment described in the parable of the tares is not before the millennium, is to suppose that the tares will grow with the wheat, to the great annoyance of the servants of the Lord, throughout the millennium.

who came out of their graves *after* the resurrection of Christ, (Matt. xxvii. 52, 53,) and who together constituted the *sheaf* of the first fruits of the harvest, (Lev. xxiii. 10.) 2nd. "They that at the coming of Christ belong to him;" (ver. 23.) in which must be included the *dead* in Christ, who are to rise first, and the *living* or quick, who shall be "caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air." The 1st Thess. iv. 15—17, where this is made mention of, evidently relates to the same period spoken of in 1 Cor. xv. for here also it is said, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last *trump*;" and in Thessalonians it is declared to be, when the Lord shall descend, "with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God." But, 3dly, it is stated, "Then cometh the end," or, as it is in the original, "then the end," (ver. 24.) The three periods or epochs in this order of the resurrection are thus distinctly marked "Christ, the first fruits;"—"afterward they that are Christ's, at his coming;"—"then the end." And what is this end? It is declared to be the period "when he shall have *delivered up the kingdom* to God, even the FATHER; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power." Now there must be some period of time, during which the Lord shall reign, and the saints possess the kingdom with him: we have seen that this period cannot be in this present dispensation; but that it is to be at the Lord's *advent*; and we here see that *after* the advent, which closes this dispensation, is to follow *the end* when he shall have reigned. The interval therefore must be *between* the advent and that *end* when he resigns the kingdom unto God, who shall then be all in all. And this corresponds with what is revealed in Daniel vii.; where "the thrones are *cast down*," that is *placed* or *set down* (ερεθισται, Sept.) and *judgment* is given to the saints," and they take away his dominion, to consume and destroy it to *the end*;" at which period of the *expiration* of the fourth kingdom it is, that the kingdom of the Son of man is first spoken of as a kingdom. Compare verses 8, 9, and 21—27. It also corresponds with Rev. xx. 4. "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and *judgment* was given unto them, &c. and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years:" after which the rest of the dead live, (v. 5.) and the books are again opened, and a judgment occurs, not *of* the saints, nor *by* the saints, but upon those only whose names are not found in the book of life, (ver. 12, 15.)

5. It remains only to notice a few of those passages, which may appear, at the first glance, to a person whose mind is pre-possessed with the notion of the kingdom being this present

Christian dispensation, somewhat irreconcilable with what has been stated.

It has been admitted already, that there is in the expression *kingdom of heaven*, or *kingdom of God*, a reference sometimes only to the circumstances of the *religion* of Christ. The passages of Scripture in which the kingdom is mentioned may consequently be divided into three classes. First, those which are so expressly referable to the future glorious kingdom, (as has been the case with most of those already adduced,) that they do not obviously bear any other sense. Secondly, those not immediately applicable to the circumstances of the future glorious kingdom, and which must therefore be limited to the *religion*; as for example, Matt. xi. 15; xxi. 43. Luke xii. 34. The third class (and that a numerous class) may be referred to either, or to both; as Matt. vi. 33. The second class, however, ought not to be considered as contradictory to the others, nor in any way nugatory of them. The Christian religion, with its ordinances, and doctrines, and that invisible spiritual aid promised to the believer, is to be considered only as a means to an end. The publication of these things is that "*gospel of the kingdom*," by which men are instructed, warned, or exhorted, in regard to the only mode by which they can ultimately attain to the glories of the kingdom.\*

But there are, among the class of texts just adverted to, some which speak of the kingdom of God as being *at hand*, (Matt. iii. 2.) as come *nigh* to them, (Luke x. 11.) and as come *unto* and *upon* them, (Matt. xii. 28, Luke xi. 20,) and this during the time of our Lord's ministry. But these may again be explained upon the same principle that is to be applied to the remaining texts of that class. (See page 123.) But besides this it must be observed that there are many things which are in their fulness and final consummation yet future, whilst yet they are frequently spoken of as already enjoyed. I will here instance the *adoption*, which is not made manifest until the *body* is redeemed from death, as declared in Rom. viii. 23; whilst yet, in verse 15, we are said to have received the spirit of adoption. What is said of the redemption of the body shows us further that *redemption* is in its completion a thing

\* This being an admitted sense of the phrase *kingdom of heaven*, independent of its principal signification, it is to be expected that the use of the phrase in such a sense will sometimes occur in the writings of the Jewish Rabbins. Schoettgen and Wetstein instance some of these: but Koppe, in his *Excursus* on the Kingdom of God, (translated and published in the Investigator, vol. ii.) cites instances also from their writings in which the phrase, as used by them, can only refer to the future glorious kingdom expected by them, and shows also how the former passages have been misunderstood by Schoettgen and Wetstein.

future; even as in Ephesians iv. 30. we are said to be sealed by the Spirit unto the *day* of redemption. And yet again, in Ephes. i. 7. it is said, in reference to Christ, "in whom we *have* redemption through his blood." Once more, *salvation* is spoken of as a thing future in the following places, Rom. xiii. 11. 1 Thes. v. 8. Heb. ix. 28. 1 Pet. i. 5.; and yet in the following it is spoken of as already arrived and received, Luke ii. 30; xix. 9. Rom. xi. 11. 2 Cor. vi. 2. Tit. ii. 11. Now the latter texts cannot contradict the former; they must therefore refer to the "giving knowledge of salvation," or to the receiving the grace whereby we are led to embrace the *hope* of salvation, and to become meet for it. And those texts, therefore, which speak of the *kingdom* as already at hand, or as being come, have precisely the same relation, as in the above examples concerning redemption and salvation, to the other texts which postpone it to a future time.

There are however some three or four particular texts yet to be noticed, which seem to oppose a difficulty in the way of this view of the subject.—

There is first the saying of the thief upon the cross—"Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom;" (Luke xxiii. 42.) which conveys an impression, that Jesus entered into his kingdom after his death. It ought not, under any view of it, to be considered as a contradiction to those texts, which plainly declare that his kingdom shall be at his appearing; but the fact is, that the original is, "when thou comest *in* (*εἰς*) thy kingdom:" so that this text, when properly translated is strongly *confirmatory* of the view here taken.

The next is Luke xvii. 20, 21—"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, *Lo here!* or, *Lo there!* for, behold, the kingdom of God is *within* you." The ordinary interpretation given by commentators is,—that the kingdom of God *within* them, must signify the dominion of grace in the heart: which interpretation would not so offend against the general tenor of the word of God, if it were not sought to force a similar sense, by virtue of the supposed meaning of this place, on *all* texts where mention is made of the kingdom. Many difficulties would thence arise: to instance one,—it would imply, that Joseph of Arimathea, who was still *waiting* for the kingdom (Mark xv. 43.) was *without* this inward grace, whilst the Pharisees possessed it. Certainly Joseph could not have been waiting for the kingdom in that spirit of faith and patience, which the mention of him seems to imply, unless the kingdom of God has been *within him* in a spiritual sense. Other commentators would therefore interpret it, "The kingdom of God is *among* you." But it does not appear that the



word rendered within (*εντος*) is ever used by Greek writers of the Old or New Testaments in the sense contended for, and it is extremely doubtful if profane writers so use it.\* And if this *were* the sense of it, how again could Joseph of Arimathea be said to be *waiting* for the kingdom, seeing it was already among them. In the spiritual sense then, the kingdom cometh not with observation; for the Spirit is like the wind, "we cannot see from whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." But in regard to the *manifestation* of the kingdom, our Lord has himself described the signs, by which we *may* observe its approach, and know that the kingdom of God draweth nigh. And he clearly shews that it was not manifested in his days, since (as before has been stated) he spake a parable for the express purpose of correcting the erroneous notions of some, who thought that it was about immediately to appear.

Another text brought forward as an objection by some is John xviii. 36. "My kingdom is not of this world." On this Koppe, whose Excursus on this subject has before been adverted to, observes:—"In fine, John xviii. 36, I cannot see to signify any thing but this (which we learn from the whole tenor of the life and doctrines of Jesus,) that the kingdom of Christ would not be like the kingdom of men; that is, especially, it would not be established by human power, nor by the might of human armies. This was the only thing that was required to be stated by the Roman governor to deliver him from the fear that Jesus might in any degree assail the authority of the Roman empire." In addition to this observation it may be stated here, that throughout what has been advanced concerning the kingdom of God appearing in power and glory in the earth, "it is *the world to come* whereof we speak," and not the world as it now is.

There is however a text which at first view opposes a more formidable objection to the doctrine here advocated; viz. Mark ix. 1. "There be some standing here which shall not taste of death, until they see the kingdom of God *come with power.*" St. Matthew has it, "till they see the Son of Man *coming* in his kingdom." xvi. 28. Certainly these expressions—"the kingdom of God coming with *power,*" and "the Son of Man *coming in his kingdom,*" are as strongly descriptive of the *majesty* of that kingdom, as they well can be; and seeing that this demonstration of the power of it was to be beheld by some of those then standing by, and that it must be superior to that already witnessed by them, (such as the cast-

\* See this point ably treated by a writer signed E, in the Investigator, vol. i. page 99.



ing out devils, raising the dead, &c.) there seems to be nothing to which it can at all answer during the life time of any of that generation, but the destruction of Jerusalem, or the pentecostal effusion of the Spirit; both of which have consequently been called the power and coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, in reference to this place. It happens however, in this instance, that the *context* is entirely overlooked. In all three of the gospels in which this declaration of our Lord is recorded,\* it is immediately followed, without any other matter intervening, by the narrative that Jesus, a few days after this saying, took Peter, James and John up into the mount, and was transfigured before them, and that Moses and Elijah appeared with him in glory. Now the connection of this narrative with the previous saying, in all three instances,—made more strikingly so in St. Luke by his introduction of it; “and it came to pass about an eight days after these *sayings*, he took Peter;” &c.—might lead to the conclusion, that this transfiguration was an exhibition, in the way of pattern, to the Apostles of the power and majesty which Jesus should display, when he should come in the glory of his kingdom: but it is put beyond reasonable question that it is so, by Peter who was one of the three witnesses to it; for he tells us in his 2d Epistle—“We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known unto you the *power and coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye-witnesses* of his majesty;” and he then proceeds to point to this transaction, and to the voice of the Father which came from out of the excellent glory, which they also heard when they were with him *in the holy mount*. 2 Peter i. 16—18. This shews therefore, that our Lord did not allude, in his declaration (Mark ix. 1,) to the period when his power and coming should commence; but to that visible *specimen* and *earnest* of it, which he here gave them.

---

## CHAPTER VII.

### THE JUDGMENT.

A more serious objection will seem, in the minds of many, to lie against the doctrine of the *Kingdom* just propounded, arising from the numerous Scriptures which set forth Christ

\* Matt. xvi. xvii. Mark ix. and Luke ix.

as coming to *judge* the world at his second advent. The seeming difficulty however again consists in the circumstance of our having lost sight of the statements on the subject contained in the word of God; which, when viewed in the general, will be found decidedly to support and confirm what has been advanced.

The single idea entertained of the *judgment* by most persons is, that it will be a great assize, at which the Lord Jesus will preside, and all mankind be put upon their trial. But the characteristics of a *judge*, as given in the Scriptures, are as follows: *to rule and govern as a king; to deliver and avenge his people; and to protect and defend them from their enemies:* whence it follows, that the judgment of Christ must consist, not only in vengeance and punishment, but also in government and rule, and that the Lord must consequently act the *King*, in this his character of *Judge*.

1. In proof of this, the instances may be pointed to of all those, who in ancient times were raised up by the Lord and made judges over Israel,—as Gideon, Sampson, Jephtha and others. In this character they were all of them types of the Lord Jesus, the *great Judge*; and it would appear that, having avenged the people on their enemies, they exercised rule and authority over the nation, during the period that they continued to judge it. And when the nation afterwards demanded a *king*, it was not so much a change in the nature of the *office* which they desired, as a more complete and fixed state of it; for they were unwilling any longer to be dependent on the Lord Jehovah, either to fight their battles, or to *raise them up Saviours*; but they cried, “We will have a *king* over us, that we also may be like all the nations: and that our king may *judge* us, and fight our battles.” Thus the king was still to be the *Judge*: just as St. Paul, (Rom. xiv. 9.) speaking of our all standing before the *judgment* seat of Christ, says—“that to this end Christ both died and rose and revived, that he might be LORD both of the *dead and living*,” the same thing as in parallel places is described as his being the “*Judge* both of quick and dead.” Compare Acts x. 42. 2 Tim. iv. 1. 1 Pet. iv. 5.

The chief prophecies which relate to Christ as a Judge, and to the judgment he will execute, will further demonstrate, that princely rule and government are to be the special characteristics of his judgment, and that it will be a continued office among or over the nations. A few passages will serve to place this matter, as it is hoped, in a clear point of view.

In Psalm lxxii. 1—4, it is written—“Give the KING *thy judgments*, O God, and thy righteousness unto the King’s Son.

He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and thy *poor with judgments*. The mountains shall bring peace to the people, and the little hills, by righteousness. For he shall judge the *poor* of the people, he shall *save* the children of the needy, and shall *break in pieces the oppressor*." Here the parties, whom it is said he shall principally *judge with judgments*, are the *poor and needy*—the very persons to whom the Lord declares, in so many places, he will look with *mercy*, and whose Saviour it is his glory especially to be called. The notion therefore of *their* being visited with judgments in the way of wrath is excluded: his judgments are to *save* them from oppressors, and then to govern them in righteousness; though even they will have to stand before his judgment seat, and give account of themselves to God.

The following sentences from the Psalms are nearly of a similar character, one with the other,—“Arise, O God, *judge the earth*; for thou shalt inherit all nations.” Psalm lxxxii. 8. “For He (the Lord) *cometh*, for he *cometh to judge the earth*: he shall judge the *world* with righteousness and the people with his truth.” Psalm xcvi. 13. “For the Lord *cometh to judge the earth*: with righteousness shall he *judge the world*, and the people with equity.” Psalm xviii. 9. “He shall *judge the world* in righteousness; He shall *minister judgment to the people* in uprightness.” Psalm ix. 8. “O, let the *nations* be glad and sing for joy! for *thou shalt judge* the people righteously, and *govern the nations upon earth*.” Psalm lxvii. 4. In these passages is unanimously declared a righteous *government upon earth*. It is over the *nations* that the judgment is to be instituted, and it is to the *nations* (or “peoples”—the original is *plural*) that it is to be “ministered.” This implies that they will be existing *as nations* at the time when the judgment shall be exercised among them; and their being called upon to *rejoice* shews, that it will prove a blessing to them, and not, as is commonly supposed, a punishment. In some of these sentences indeed, the latter clauses, which are explanatory of the former, or inductions of them, clearly point out what the nature of the judgment is to be. For example, in Psalm lxxxii. “to judge the earth” is explained by *inheriting all nations*. In Psalm ix. “to judge the world in righteousness, is to *administer judgment to the peoples* (*ἔθνη*, Sept.) In Psalm lxvii. “to judge the peoples” (again *plural* in the original) is to *govern the nations* (or gentiles) *upon earth*.” These things are made still more apparent by other prophets. Both Micah and Isaiah declare of him, that “He shall *judge among many peoples*, and rebuke strong *nations* afar off;” (Micah iv. 3. Isaiah ii. 4.) and the fact which immediately follows in both prophets,—that

they are to beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks, and not learn war any more, whilst it proves the *continuation* of his judgment, and that it is in the *earth*, manifests likewise the peaceful blessings that accompany his judgment. Jeremiah also declares, (xxiii. 5.) "Behold! a king shall *reign* and prosper, and shall execute *judgment and justice in the earth.*" The whole of the testimony here brought forward to prove, that the *judgment* of Christ is, principally, his *reigning* upon the earth,—first, delivering his people from their enemies, then ruling them, and likewise the nations, with holy statutes or judgments,—may be summed up in one passage in Isaiah xxiii. 22. "The Lord is our JUDGE,—the Lord is our LAWGIVER,—the Lord is our KING,—He will SAVE us!"

(2.) Another point connected with this subject, and which will further tend to clear and prove the view here taken, is, the participation of the saints in the *Judgment* spoken of; for if the "*Judge of Israel,*" and "*the King of Israel,*" are in the person of Christ one and the same office, it follows that those who are to be "*kings and priests*" with him, and who are "*to sit in his throne,*" are in like manner *judges*; and the scriptures will speak of *their* rule in the same manner that they speak of *Christ's* rule,—viz. as being a *judgment*. There is however abundant evidence to this point.

First, Enoch prophesied, "Behold the Lord cometh with myriads of his *saints*, to execute *judgment* upon all." Jude 14, 15. David says, "that to execute the *judgment* written is an honour which *all the saints* are to have." Psalm cxlix. 5—9. In the vision which Daniel had of the kingdom of our Lord, we have already seen, in the former chapter, that he saw the thrones placed down, and *judgment* was given to the *saints* of the Most High;—"and the time came that the *saints* possessed the kingdom." Dan. vii. And St. Paul declares explicitly, "that the *saints* shall *judge* the world." 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3.

It has indeed been asserted by some, that the word *saints* in these places, and in one or two similar to them in Zechariah, Thessalonians, &c. signifies, not sanctified *human* beings, but the holy and elect *angels*, who are to attend Christ when he comes to sit on the throne of his glory. This is quite inconsistent with the doctrine of scripture in other places: "Know ye not (saith the apostle) that the *saints* shall judge the world?" 1 Cor. vi. 2. The context shews us, whom he means by the *saints*; for he adds,—"*and if the world shall be judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters.*" Yea, he goes further, and adds,—"*Know ye not that ye shall judge angels?*" thus showing, that instead of the saints, who come with Christ

to rule, and who have judgment given to them, being the angels, the angels themselves are the subjects of that judgment. For as Christ our *head* is exalted above the thrones and principalities and powers in heavenly places, (Ephes. i. 20—23) so must the *members* of Christ necessarily be likewise; unless there be a schism in the body when glorified: but no, we are again assured, “that we are heirs of God and *joint heirs with Christ*, (if so be that we suffer with him,) that we may be also glorified together. Rom. viii. 17. It may be further shown, from Matt. xix. 28, that the saints who are to judge are not angels; for there the Lord promises to his apostles in particular, “that in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” Indeed the angels are declared to be “*ministering* spirits, sent forth to minister to those, who are the heirs of salvation.” Heb. i. 14.

The passage in 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3, is so convincing, as to the participation of the saints in the judgment, that most commentators are compelled to admit, that the saints will, *in some way or other*, be joined with Christ in the judgment. But, in *what way*?—If the judgment is to be nothing more than a kind of trial, in which rewards and punishments are to be determined by the Lord, the saints will themselves (as before stated) have to stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and give account of the deeds done in the body; and then the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, and every one shall be rewarded according to his works.” Rom. xiv. 10—12; 2 Cor. v. 10. It is therefore considered by some, that the saints will be first tried and acquitted, and then will take their seat on the bench (as it were) and become assessors in the judgment on the wicked. It is humbly conceived, however, that if the persons disposed to this opinion would but follow out their own hypothesis to those necessary consequences to which it must lead, they would at once be convinced of its absurdity. For how shall the saints be assessors at the trial of the wicked? Is it for them to determine the innocence or guilt, or the *amount* of the guilt, of the parties? or is it for them to award the punishment? Surely Christ needs neither counsel nor advice in this matter; nor would it be in the power of the saints at this juncture to give it. But if we understand the judgment to include also *rule and authority* to be delegated to the saints, in the kingdom of Christ, then these things are perfectly reconcilable: nor can a consistent exposition be given of Luke xix. 17—19, in which one of the faithful servants is declared to be ruler over *ten* cities and another over *five* cities, &c., but upon the principle of interpretation here advocated.

(3.) Little need be said to prove, that a Judgment of this description has never yet appeared among the nations. The history of mankind is little else than a history of despotism, tyranny and oppression on the one hand, and which has often been met by sedition and rebellion on the other hand. Those possessing power have constantly abused it for selfish and ambitious ends; and the very men who have clamoured the most loudly against its exercise, have in turn, when possessed of it themselves, shewn themselves equally incapable of ruling in righteousness. The great desideratum with nations has ever been good government; and it continues to be the desire of all nations still. A David may at times have risen up, and exhibited for a brief space, and within a limited sphere, something like a feeble and very defective type of the king of righteousness; but the effect has been only to make the next generation of mankind more keenly sensible of the general injustice and oppressiveness of power, when lodged in the hands of apostate man; and to cause those who have believed in God to cry—“Arise, O God; judge the earth.” And in these latter days,—in which we witness such prodigious efforts, raised up by the Lord, toward calling men into his heavenly kingdom, and preparing them for his rule of righteousness,—we witness also a new effort made by man to rule himself; which consists in a crusade against kings and those who are elevated to rank and dignity in the world, and an attempt to procure for the people such a power and mastery over their rulers, as that the former may govern the latter, instead of being governed by them. The experience of those states, which have hitherto lived under democracies, does not warrant the expectation, that such a means of regenerating mankind will prove effectual: for whilst they have indeed escaped the rod of one tyrant, it has been only either to place themselves under the despotism of many tyrants, or to be continually torn by intestine broils and strife. The experience of a neighbouring country (France) evinces, that the dominion of the many in place of the few is like breaking the rod of the serpent only to have come forth from his root the cockatrice, and his fruit a fiery flying serpent,—or (as the Septuagint has it) *broods of vipers*. Isaiah xiv. 29.

In this matter likewise, (viz. that the reign of righteousness has not yet commenced,) we have the express testimony of our Lord; so far, at least, as his declining to take on himself the *office* of the judge is concerned. For not only did he withdraw, when the people were about to take him and make him king; (John vi. 15.) but he refused to judge in the case of the woman taken in adultery; (John viii. 3.) and he rebuked another, who wished him to act as arbitrator in his cause, with,—“Man, who



made me a judge or a divider over you." Luke xii. 14. And though he asserts most explicitly in St. John's gospel, "that the Father hath committed all judgment (or sovereignty) to the Son, that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father;" (v. 22.) yet he as expressly tells Nicodemus, in the same gospel, (iii. 17.) "that God sent not his Son into the world to judge\* the world." That is, (as I apprehend it,) he was deceived in respect to the *immediate* object of our Lord's coming at that time; which was to lay down his own life, a ransom for many, that through him all that believe might obtain eternal salvation; and not to take to himself his great power and reign.

And if the *Son of Man* came not at this time to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many, still less is this the period when those who are chosen by him expressly to be *ministers* are appointed judges over the world. They are indeed able to be judges among each other; and in that place of scripture already adverted to, viz. 1 Cor. vi. 1—3, are rebuked for not judging their own matters. But in regard to that judgment which is the subject of promise to them, the Lord warns them: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them: but so shall it not be among you." (Mark. x. 42.) And the context in this place will, if duly considered, serve to fix the meaning of Luke, xxii. 29, 30, which was spoken on the same occasion. In Mark's Gospel it appears, that the strife, as to which should be accounted greatest in the kingdom of God, originated from the request of the sons of Zebedee to sit, the one on the right hand and the other on the left hand of Christ, when he should come in his glory; which roused the indignation of the ten; and the Lord put an end to it by admonishing them, that as *he* had come now to *minister*, "and was among them as he that serveth," so *they* were now not to look to be greater than their Lord, but were to be made partakers of his sufferings. He then however encourages them with a promise in regard to the future; that as they were now to be with him in his temptations, so they were hereafter to have authority and glory; for "I appoint unto you, (saith he) a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of

\* Our translation is—"to condemn;" but the verb is *κρίνω* which is to exercise the function of judgment, either to acquit or condemn; and also (in various instances given in Lexicons from the New Testament,) to rule, and exercise authority. The word *κατακρίνω* is that generally used in the New Testament when condemnation alone is intended.

Israel." This place is, by those who spiritualize (or rather *allegorize*) the scriptures, interpreted of the authority which the apostles exercised in the church, which (they say) being the spiritual Israel, is therefore the twelve tribes; and the eating and drinking at the Lord's table, is explained of the administration of the *Sacrament* of the Lord's supper. But how clearly the context disproves this, both in Mark and Luke,—“Their great ones exercise authority upon them; but so shall it *not* be among you.” But, surely, to sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes would be exercising lordship among each other, contrary to our Lord's direction. So, the kingdom appointed, in which they are to be elevated to thrones, is evidently to follow the time of temptation; for only “if we *suffer* with him, we shall also *reign* with him.” 2 Tim. ii. 12. Therefore to place them upon thrones, during the time of their tribulation and temptation, is quite irreconcilable with all that the scripture says on the kingdom. The apostle Paul did not account thus; for he writes to the Thessalonians,—“We ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your *patience* and faith in all your *persecutions and tribulations* that ye endure; which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God, that ye may be counted worthy of the *kingdom* of God, for which ye also *SUFFER*.” 2 Thess. i. 4, 5. Well would it be, for the ministers of the Lord in particular, if they would bear more continually in mind, that they are now to be servants and not rulers. There is a great proneness, even in many excellent and good men, to carry themselves as lords, rather than ministers, in the heritage of Christ, and to assume authority even in the world. But we must prophesy in sackcloth, and patiently wait for the blessed time, when—“Behold, a king shall reign in righteousness, and *PRINCES shall rule in judgment*;” (Isa. xxxii. 1.) when God will also make the commonest officers in his kingdom peace, and his exactors righteousness;—when violence shall no more be heard in their land, wasting nor destruction within their borders. Isa. lx. 17, 18.

2. There is another important feature of the judgment yet remains to be considered, and that is the *vengeance* of the Lord upon his own and his people's enemies: for all this, and the gathering out of his kingdom every thing that offends and does iniquity, is, in my apprehension of it, included in **THE JUDGMENT**. The period of judgment must consequently comprehend those tremendous visitations or vials of wrath, which precede the millennium, the whole time of the saints rule on earth, and that final visitation of the wicked which occurs at the expiration of the millennium. *This is the time of Gentile ascendancy: that the period* (as I hope hereafter to show) of

*Israel's* domination. *This* is the day of depression and of tribulation among the saints: *that* is to be the period of their supremacy and triumph.

It is indeed objected against such a view of the subject, that the judgment is called in scripture "the *day* of the Lord," "that great *day*," and even "the *hour* of his judgment," which expressions are considered incompatible with its duration through upwards of a thousand years. This would not be a sufficient objection, even were we to understand the terms *day* and *hour* in their restricted sense of a period of twenty-four hours, and of a twenty-fourth part of the same; for it is evident from the context, in most instances where these expressions occur relative to the judgment, that a particular feature only of the judgment is spoken of—viz. the crisis when the divine wrath will be poured out: just as has been shown in the former chapter, the reference to the *kingdom* is sometimes to the circumstances connected with the progress of Christianity, and not to the future glory of the kingdom. And truly that period, when plague, pestilence, famine, the sword, and fire, shall fall upon the ungodly, may be with propriety distinguished as "that great day"—"the dark and cloudy day,"—seeing it is to put an effectual check to the ungodly tyranny of man, and to usher in a glorious period of righteousness and peace.

The expressions, *day* and *hour*, however, have not that limited meaning, either in the scriptures or among ourselves, as is here attempted to be imposed upon them. They are doubtless used in the restricted sense at times; but this is readily determined by the context. But on the other hand, any period of time, during which events of a uniform character take place, are called the *day* thereof. Thus in Gen. ii. 4, the *whole period* of creation is called *a day*. In Psalm xcv. the forty years wandering in the wilderness is called "the *day* of temptation." And in 2 Cor. vi. 2. the period of the divine mercy under the gospel is called "the day of salvation." So the word *hour* has the same extensive signification, on which account our translators often render (*αἰς*) it by the word *season*, as in John v. 35. 2 Cor. vii. 8. Philemon v. 15. In the first instance it signifies the whole period of John the Baptist's ministry; in the second, the time which elapsed between the reception by the Corinthians of the two epistles of St. Paul to them; and in the third instance, the whole term of the desertion of Onesimus from his master Philemon. In 1 John ii. 18. it is translated *time*, and relates to the whole period from the time of John to the second advent.

For a more elaborate discussion, however, of these terms, I must refer the reader to *Abdiel's Essays*, page 83; and here

content myself with remarking further, in regard to the judgment, that if the seven vials, in which is filled up the wrath of God, are a portion of that judgment, the description of one of them plainly indicates, that it cannot take place in a period of twenty-four hours; for under the sixth vial, the Euphrates is dried up, that the way of the kings of the east may be prepared; and three spirits are seen to go forth from out of the mouths of the dragon, and beast, and false prophet, to the kings of *the earth and of the whole world*, to gather them together to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." Rev. xvi. 12—14. Now without insisting on any particular interpretation of the Euphrates, the armies of the kings of the whole world cannot be gathered together in one day of twenty-four hours;—to say nothing of the previous work of preparation, here said to be effected by the spirits of devils working miracles.

(2.) It only remains therefore for me now to instance some of the more striking passages of scripture which relate to the *vengeance* or *wrath*, so frequently made mention of as forming part of the judgment.

Isaiah xxxiv. commences by solemnly inviting the attention of all flesh: "Come near, ye *nations*, to hear, and hearken ye *people*; let the *earth* hear, and all that is therein; the *world*, and all things that come forth of it. For the indignation of the Lord is upon ALL NATIONS, and his fury upon all their armies: he hath utterly destroyed them: he hath delivered them to the slaughter. Their slain also shall be cast out, and their stink shall come up out of their carcasses, and the mountains shall be melted with their blood." At verse 5, it continues—"Behold it shall come down upon IDUMEA, and upon the people of my curse to JUDGMENT. The word of the Lord is *filled with blood*," "for the Lord hath a great sacrifice in BOZRAH, and a *great slaughter* in the land of IDUMEA, &c.—their land shall be *soaked with blood*, and their dust made fat with fatness; for it is the day of the Lord's *vengeance*, and the year of recompenses for the controversy of Zion." Then, after dwelling upon the manner in which the land shall be desolated, the prophecy bursts forth, in the next chapter, into a rapturous description of the way in which the earth shall afterwards be renewed for the righteous.

In the preceding passage it will be perceived, that the judgment, therein spoken of, falls on *Idumea* (or *Edom*,\*) of which *Bozrah* was the capital. These names, with other characteristics of the prophecy, serve to identify and connect it with

\* Both the ancient and modern Jews, and after them, various Christian expositors, interpret *Edom* to be *Rome*. Mr. Scott considers it a mystical name for all the enemies of the church.

another prophecy in chapter lxiii. 1—5, which informs us also, who is to be the great actor in the tribulation: “Who is this that cometh from EDOM, with dyed garments from BOZRAH? this, that is *glorious* in his apparel, travailing in the greatness of his strength?” (*Answer:*) “I, that speak in righteousness, mighty to save.” “Wherefore art thou *red* in *thine* apparel, and thy *garments* like him that treadeth the *wine-fat*?” (*Answer:*) “I have trodden the *wine-press* alone; and of the people there was none with me. For I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury; and *their blood shall be sprinkled upon my garments*; and I will *stain all my raiment*. For the day of *vengeance* is in mine heart, and *the year of my REDEEMED is come.*”

Those expositors who have constantly endeavoured to turn every thing in prophecy to the circumstances of our Lord’s first advent, take advantage here, from the mention of its being “the year of the *redeemed*,” to apply the whole to Christ’s shedding his own blood as an *atonement* for his people. The expressions however are such as to shew that a very different event must be intended. He comes in his “*glorious* apparel,” and he travails in the “*greatness* of his strength;” whereas, at his first advent, there was no beauty in him, and in his travail his soul was poured out like water. He here “treads the *people* in fury;” then he was trodden under foot of men. He here sprinkles his garments with *their* blood; then his *own* blood was poured out unto death.\* Another prophecy, however, will clearly point out, by an identity of certain leading expressions, to what event reference is here made by the Spirit in Isaiah.

In Rev. xiv. we have a description of “the vine of the earth, which is cast into the great *wine-press* of the *wrath of God*; and the *wine-press is trodden* without the city, and *blood* comes out of the wine-press even unto the horse bridles, by the space of a thousand and six hundred furlongs:” and in chap. xix. one is introduced, “clothed with a *vesture dipped in blood*, and his name is called THE WORD OF GOD, &c., and he *treadeth the wine-press* of the fierceness of the wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF

\* Mr. Scott in this instance forms a bright exception to these commentators, He says, “These verses contain a prophetic representation of the victories of Christ over the *enemies* of his church; for of him the passage must be interpreted, nor can so much as an accommodation of it to any other be admitted. But it is remarkable, that many have understood it of the *sufferings* of Christ, and of his being covered with his own blood: though nothing can be more evident, than that he is represented by the prophet, as covered with the blood of his enemies, and as a mighty Conqueror and Avenger, and not as a Lamb slain for a sacrifice. (*See in Loco.*)



KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to *all the fowls* that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and *gather yourselves together* unto the *supper* of the great God, that ye may eat the flesh of *kings, captains, mighty men, horses, &c.*"

The mention of the *fowls of heaven*, called to a great *supper*, further connects this subject with a prophecy in Ezekiel xxxix. concerning the destruction of Gog and Magog, the slaughter of whose armies will be so great as to require seven months to bury the dead. At verse 17 are these words: "And thou, Son of man, thus saith the Lord God; speak unto *every feathered fowl*, and to every beast of the field. Assemble yourselves and come, gather yourselves on every side to my *sacrifice* that I do sacrifice for you, even a great sacrifice upon the mountains of Israel, that ye may *eat flesh and drink blood*. Ye shall eat the flesh of the *mighty*, and drink the blood of the *princes* of the earth;—ye shall be filled at my table with *horses and chariots*, with *mighty men*, and with all *men of war*, saith the Lord God. And—I will set my *glory* among the heathen, and *all the heathen* shall see my JUDGMENT that I have executed, and my hand that I have laid upon them."

The *wine-press*, and mention of the gathering of the *mighty ones*, &c. connect both these last prophecies with Joel 9, iii. 14. "Proclaim ye this among the Gentiles: Prepare war, wake up the *mighty men*, let all the *men of war* draw near; let them come up: beat your ploughshares into swords, and your pruning hooks into spears: let the weak say, I am strong. Assemble yourselves and come, *all ye heathen*, and gather yourselves together round about: thither cause the *mighty ones* to come down,\* O Lord. Let the heathen be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat; for there will I set to JUDGE *all the heathen* round about: Put ye in the *sickle*, for the *harvest* is ripe: Come, get you down, for the *press* is full,† the fats *overflow*, for their wickedness is great. Multitudes, multitudes, in the valley of decision; for the day of the Lord is near in the valley of decision." Such is the description of the preparation for vengeance; it terminates in verse 17, by declaring; "then shall Jerusalem be holy, and there shall no strangers pass through her any more;" and it goes on to describe the regeneration of the earth.

I shall close this series of prophecies by a reference to one more, which is connected with them by similar expressions relative to the *vintage*, &c. in Jeremiah xxv. Mr. Begg has

\* The Septuagint renders this last clause, "Let the meek man be a warrior."

† The harvest and vintage both appear combined here, as in Rev. xiv. 14—20.



an interesting exposition of it in his 'Connected View of the Redeemer's Advent,' &c. According to him, the prophet declares the relative *order* of a *series* of desolating judgments, from before the time of the publication of the prophecy, till the final destruction of antichrist, under the figure of a *wine-cup*, which the prophet is directed to present to the nations in succession. He maintains that the order of succession is designed, not only from the rotation in which the nations are mentioned, but from the circumstance of the same nations being in some instances made to drink *twice*, as in the case of *Edom*, under its own name in v. 21, and under the name of *Dedan* in v. 23. The names *Buz* (or *despised*) and *Zimri* (or *my wine*, or *my field*;) he conceives to be mystic appellations of Israel. The king of *Sheshach*, who is to drink last, he infers from Jer. li. 45. to be mystic Babylon, showing that though Jeremiah in chap. li. speaks of the *literal* Babylon in some places, yet that the general terms of the prophecy, both there and in chap. xxv. can only accord with the mystic Babylon.\* I conceive, however, that *Sheshach* cannot mean here that Babylon which is represented in the apocalypse as the harlot, and which is destroyed by the Beast that wages war with her; but rather that *Beast*, who is the destroyer, and who is the last antichristian power

\* The passage in Jeremiah li. 41, quoted by Mr. Begg as explanatory of the *king of Sheshach*, is as follows: "How is *Sheshach* taken! and how is the praise of the whole earth surprised!—how is Babylon become an astonishment among the nations." Mr. Begg seems to consider the last sentence as exegetical of the former, in which opinion I entirely agree with him, and should be satisfied there to leave the matter. It may be useful, however, to the reader, as this name has given occasion to much discussion, to notice the opinions of learned men on the subject, which opinions may be classified under three heads.—

Jerome gives a cabalistic account of it, after the Jewish manner, by substituting other letters, of equal numerical value, till out of them he makes *Babel*: and is quoted as authority for this signification of the word *Sheshach*, by many subsequent writers, who enter not into his mode of deriving it. The second class includes those who say, (as Mr. Scott does,) "that it evidently means Babylon, though it is not certain on what account it is so called." This view is not more satisfactory, as to the origin of the term, than that of Jerome. The learned Selden appears to me to have given the true solution, and is followed by Calmet and some others. He says that *Sesach* was the name of one of the Babylonian deities, in honour of whom there was a feast which lasted five days, called *Sacca*, like the *Saturnalia* among the Romans after Saturn. The authority he gives for it is a fragment preserved by Athenæus, from Berosus the Chaldean. (See his work, *De diis Syris*, ch. xiii.) Thus the prophet calls it in the first instance by the name of one of its tutelary deities; just as in chap. i. 2. he calls it by the names of *other* of its gods. 'Babylon is taken, *Bel* is confounded, *Merodach* is broken in pieces; her *idols* are confounded, her images are broken in pieces.' A writer in the 'Morning Watch,' (vol. iii. p. 78.) to whom I am indebted for the above reference to Selden, thinks that the name *Meshach*, given to Michael, was after this same deity; which is probable, if we compare Daniel i. 7. with Daniel iv. 8. by which it plainly appears that Daniel received *his* new surname after the name of their God, *Bel*.

destroyed by the immediate interposition of Christ himself.\* This appears the more probable from the fact, that after the enumeration of the various parties who are to drink of it in succession, the next parties, and the last before Sheshach, are all the nations of the world; which agrees with the intimation given in the prophecies I have just cited from Ezekiel and Joel, of the vengeance that is to be poured out upon ‘all the heathen, or Gentile nations.’—“And all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another; and all the kingdoms of the world, which are upon the face of the earth; and the king of Sheshach shall drink *after* them.” v. 26. This matter, however, will come before us more particularly, when we treat of *Israel* and of *antichrist*. In the mean while, it may be well to confirm the general view of the judgment of wrath, set forth in the previously-cited prophecies, by a few other passages from the twenty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah now before us. After alluding, in verse 28, to the *refusal* of some to take the cup, (which can be no other than their determination to shut their eyes to the coming judgments, and to cry *peace* when a sword is coming,) the prophecy continues—“For lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and should ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth, saith the Lord. The Lord shall roar from on high, and utter his voice from his holy habitation; he shall mightily roar upon his habitation; (see Joel iii. 16.) he shall give a shout as they that tread the grapes (or wine-press) against all the inhabitants of the earth. A noise shall come even to the ends of the earth; for the Lord hath a controversy with the nations; he will plead with all flesh; he will give them that are wicked to the sword. Thus saith the Lord of hosts: Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great WHIRLWIND shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth; and the slain of the Lord shall be at that day from one end of the earth, even unto the other end of the earth,” &c.

The similitude used in verse 32, of “a great *whirlwind*,” leads me finally to observe that the reader will frequently find the suddenness, fierceness and rapidity of these judgments couched under this figure of a *whirlwind* in the prophets.—“He shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living and in his wrath. The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth THE VENGEANCE: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked: so that a man shall say, Verily, there is a reward for the righteous; verily, he is a God that judgeth in the earth.”

\* Compare Rev. xvii. 11—18, and xix. 11—21.

See Psalm lxxviii. 9—11. Proverbs i. 23—33. Isaiah xvii. 12—14; xl. 18—24; xli. 14—16; lxvi. 15, 16. Jeremiah xxiii. 19, 20, and xxx. 23, 24; and especially read the grand description of the destruction of antichrist, and the threshing of the heathen in anger, who come out as a whirlwind to destroy the people of God, contained in Habakkuk, chap. iii.

It belongs to this portion of our subject again to notice, that the saints are apparently to participate in this infliction of the judgment upon their enemies, as well as in the reign and dominion of Christ which follow. Thus David says, in the before-quoted passage: "Let the saints be joyful in glory; let them sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the heathen and punishment upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written. THIS HONOUR HAVE ALL HIS SAINTS. Praise ye the Lord." Psalm cxlix. Malachi says of the saints in that day: "Ye shall tread down the wicked; for they shall be ashes under the soles of your feet;" (Mal. iv. 3.) and David again, "that the righteous shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked." Psalm lviii. 10. The overthrow of the Canaanitish kings by the Israelites under Joshua, and their putting their feet upon their necks, &c., is a striking type of this event. It has been already shown that they are to exercise *dominion*: the promise made in Rev. ii. 26, 27, to him that overcometh combines the two things;—"to him will I give power over the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they be broken, even as I received of my Father." See also chap. iii. 21.

(3.) I cannot conclude this section of the chapter on the Judgment, without calling the attention of the serious reader, and more especially if he be a minister of God's word, to the great importance of maintaining and diffusing correct views on this awfully interesting subject. Multitudes of professors of religion are at this time under a delusion in regard to the nature of those events which are impending over the church of Christ. The generality are agreed that a great crisis is at hand, and likewise that we are on the eve of the Millennium; but the party just alluded to are disposed to think, that this period of prosperity to the church is to arrive without any previous season of tribulation;—that we are to glide into it, as it were, by the instrumentality of our various institutions for evangelizing the heathen; by means of which there will be a gradually increasing diffusion of scriptural light, until the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, as

the waters cover the sea. Isaiah xi. 9. Among this class of persons are many who consider and who denominate those as unfounded complainers and gloomy alarmists, who now lift up their voice like a trumpet in Zion, and shew the people their transgressions, and the vengeance of God which they provoke. They love those flattering representations of the times, which set forth only what is good and encouraging in the church of God; and would fain persuade themselves that the spirit of apostacy, infidelity, and ungodliness, is limited to a comparatively small section of mankind, who are daily diminishing, or likely to diminish, through the influence of the increasing number of the righteous. I fear that many of these would have considered the prophets who testified of the coming wrath in their days, as similar complainers and alarmists. They would have instanced, as a set-off against the gloomy views of those who foretold the Babylonish captivity, the remarkable revival of religion in the days of king Hezekiah, and again in the days of Josiah,\* (that is, had they lived in those days,) and they would have turned a deaf ear to the assurance, that for all this the Lord's anger was not turned away. 2 Kings xxiii. 26, 27. So, had they lived in Palestine in the period previous to the second dispersion, and the days of vengeance foretold by our Lord, it would have been sufficient, in order to have assured themselves it could not be at hand, to have pointed to the wonderful spread of the gospel in those days among the heathen, and in their own land to "the greatly multiplied number of the disciples, and the great company of the priests who were obedient to the faith." Acts vi. 7.

As regards, however, the kingdom of Christ, which is the millennial kingdom, the testimony of scripture is most abundant to the fact, that it is to be ushered in by desolating judgments; and that the *universal* prevalence of religion, hereafter to be enjoyed, is not to be effected by any increased impetus given to the present means of evangelizing the nations; but by a stupendous display of the divine wrath upon all the apostate and ungodly.† For it is "when the *judgments* of the Lord are in the earth, that the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness;" (Isaiah xxvi. 9.) and though "when the

\* See the account of both revivals in 2 Chron. xxx; xxxi. and xxxiv. xxxv.

† The reader will find the scriptural view to be taken of the present Missionary exertions, discussed at large in "The Investigator of Prophecy," Vol. i. p. 117; where it is shewn, first, that the effects now resulting are very different from those which shall be produced by the means employed at the *general* conversion of the heathen; and, secondly, that the object of the Lord in raising up the present agency, is to call out and complete the elect remnant, who are to be gathered from the four winds.

Lord's hand is lifted up they will not see" at the first, "yet they SHALL see;" (v. 11.) and though they "refuse to take the cup" that is in the hand of the Lord, yet shall they be compelled "to wring out the dregs thereof, and drink them." The passages which have been brought forward in this chapter concerning the Judgment, all give evidence to the fact I am here asserting, of a tribulation previous to the millennium; for the context in almost every instance demonstrates, that the vengeance is immediately followed by a great manifestation of the glory of the Lord.

The Song of Moses and the Lamb, sung by those who have obtained the victory over the Beast, &c. (see Rev. xv.) at the time when the last vials of wrath are about to be poured out, and evidently in anticipation of their effects, strikingly confirms the fact, that those judgments will be the great means of leading men to the acknowledgment and worship of God, and that they are introductory to the manifestation of his glory,—“Who shall not *fear* thee, O Lord, and *glorify thy name?* for thou only art holy, for *all nations shall come and worship before thee;* for thy JUDGMENTS are made manifest.” (v. 4.)

It may be seriously asked therefore,—Is the state of mind which looks with complacency at the supposed increasing prosperity of religion,\* and overlooks the corresponding increase of blasphemy, apostacy and ungodliness, the state best calculated to profit others or be benefited itself, in times like those we live in?

In the first place, it is failing in our duty towards the unbelieving and ungodly portion of mankind, who have had the gospel proclaimed among them, but who have despised it. On these the vengeance will principally, though perhaps not primarily fall. For the Lord may probably make use of these in the first instance to inflict judgments upon others; (for they are his *sword*, Psalm xvii. 13.) but when he is “revealed from heaven with his mighty angels,” it will be “in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not the gospel* of our Lord Jesus Christ:” (2 Thess. i. 7, 8.) “For Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold the Lord cometh with ten thousand [or *myriads*, Grk.] of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodlily committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.” Jude 14, 15. It is the duty of *all* to call upon these “to fear

\* See this point likewise discussed in *The Investigator*, in the article referred to in the last note.



God and give glory to Him, for the hour of his Judgment is come;" (Rev. xiv. 7.) but more especially is it the duty of *God's ministers*. They are placed as watchmen in Israel to discern the signs of the times, and to look out whether it be a sword coming or peace; and if it be a *sword* coming, and the watchman "blow not the trumpet, and the people be not warned; if the sword come and take away any person from among them, he is taken away in his iniquity; but—his blood will I require at the watchman's hand." Ezek. xxxiii. 6.

This posture of mind is likewise greatly suited to confirm those in their lethargy and supineness, who are wont to trust in the righteousness of others;—who, though they know that they are not closely walking with God themselves, rely, as regards *national* judgments, on the persuasion, that there must be many more than ten righteous persons in the land to redeem it from the threatened wrath;—and who have need to be reminded, as respects the last tribulation, "that though Noah, Daniel, and Job were in the land, *as I live*, saith the Lord God, they shall deliver neither son nor daughter; they shall deliver but their own souls by their righteousness." (Ezek. xiv. 20.) As regards *England* as a nation, the following observation of Mr. Cuninghame appears very just.—"I know not that we are warranted in expecting, that *any* of the nations, which have enjoyed and abused the full light of the gospel, will be spared from the destruction which is to overwhelm the papal Roman empire. The wicked in protestant countries, and particularly in our own highly favoured nation, are *much more inexcusable* than those who live amid popish darkness and superstition." (On the Apoc. 3d edit. p. 469.)

Again, persons of this turn of mind are likewise helping on the delusion of those, who fancy that the Christian community is, in spiritual things and in good works, "rich and increased with goods, and in need of nothing," (Rev. iii. 17.) but whose works are not perfect before God,—who strengthen not the things that remain that are ready to die, (Ibid. v. 2.) and on whom the Lord "will come as a thief, and they shall not know what hour he will come upon them." (v. 3.) And as regards themselves, even though they be in the main partakers of divine grace, they are not likely to be arming themselves with the mind of Christ for suffering and self-denial. 1 Peter iv. 1. The Lord took great pains to warn his disciples of the suffering and humiliation which both he and they had first to undergo; and this he commonly did when they were disposed to be lifted up by the present success of his gospel. And the corresponding duty of *ministers now* is—to lead the people of God rather "to gird up the loins of their mind" to meet a time of great



sifting and trial, and to take unto them the whole armour of God, that they may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all to stand. Ephes. vi. 13. And one of the most important sources of consolation, when we are fallen on evil times, is "the hope of the grace which is to be brought to us at the revelation of Jesus Christ;" (1 Peter i. 13.) for which reason Paul bids us 'to take for a "helmet the hope of salvation;" and David exclaims, "I had fainted, unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living."\*

3. We are now brought to an interesting point in the inquiry concerning the Judgment, viz. what is to become of the *truly righteous* during those fearful desolations which will come upon the earth? The sentiments of Archbishop Usher on this subject, delivered by him in the immediate prospect of death, are so much to the point, and so interesting in themselves, that I will here give them.† This veteran observed: "'The greatest stroke upon the Reformed Churches is yet to come; and the time of the utter ruin of the See of Rome, shall be when she thinks herself most secure.' One presuming to ask him, what his present apprehensions were concerning a very great persecution, he answered; 'that a *very great persecution would fall upon all the Protestant Churches of Europe;*' adding, 'I tell you, all you have yet seen hath been but the beginning of sorrows to what is yet to come upon the Protestant Churches of Christ, which will ere long fall under a sharper persecution than ever. Therefore (said he) *look ye be not found in the outer court,* but a worshipper in the temple, before the altar. For Christ will measure all that profess his name, and call themselves his people; and the outward worshippers he will leave out to be trodden down of the Gentiles. The *outer court* is the *formal Christians*, whose religion consists in performing the outward duties of Christianity, without having an inward power of life and faith uniting them to Christ; and these God will leave to be trodden down and swept away of the Gentiles. But the worshippers within the temple, and before the altar, God will hide in the hollow of his hand, and under the shadow of his wings. And this shall be one great difference between the last and all the other preceding persecutions. For in the former, the most eminent and spiritual ministers and Christians did generally suffer most, and were most violently fallen upon.

\* See the application made of this text by the Council of Nice, in the early part of this vol.

† They are taken from the end of an excellent charge, bearing on these topics, recently delivered at the annual Visitation of the Clergy at Cambridge by the Archdeacon of Ely, and published by Hatchards under the title of *The Time of the End*.

But in this last persecution, these shall be preserved by God, as a seed to partake of that glory which shall immediately follow and come upon the Church, as soon as this storm shall be over. For as it shall be the sharpest, so shall it be the shortest persecution of them all, and shall only take away the gross hypocrites and formal professors; but the true spiritual believer shall be preserved till the calamity be over.' ”

I do not feel called upon here to insist on the correctness of the Archbishop's interpretation of the Temple and Outer Court, &c. of Rev. xi.: the point which is chiefly of importance in it is, that he had concluded, that in the last great tribulation true believers would be safe, whilst those who had only a name to live, together with the more manifestly ungodly, would be overwhelmed by the storm. This conclusion is evidently derived by the venerable prelate from the testimony of scripture, which affords abundant proof of the safety of the righteous. But there is another point likewise intimated in the scripture to which the archbishop does not refer, and that is—the very critical situation of some at that time, who are in the main believers, but who, owing to want of watchfulness and to worldly conformity and to negligent walking, will likewise be overtaken by the whirlwind, and severely punished. St. Paul clearly alludes to something of this kind in 1 Cor. iii. 12—15: “Now if any man build upon this foundation (i. e. Jesus Christ) gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble,—every man's work shall be made manifest: for THE DAY shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by FIRE, and *the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is.* If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work be burned he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved: yet—*so as by FIRE.*”

It may here be necessary to observe, that the term *fire* is often used in the scriptures to signify judgments effected by the *sword*, and tribulation and persecution of various kinds. There seems to be no room for questioning the literal nature of that conflagration or judgment by fire described in 2 Peter iii.; and it appears difficult to explain the flaming fire of vengeance mentioned in 2 Thess. i. 8, of any other than of literal fire. But there are other passages of scripture in which the expression *fire* appears, with equal conclusiveness, to be used in the figurative sense. For instance, in Luke xii. 49, Jesus says, “I am come to send *fire* on the earth, and what will I if it be already kindled? But I have a *baptism* to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished.” The parallel place to this, as will be seen by the context of each, is Matt. x. 34,—“I came not to send peace, but a *sword*,” &c.,

and the mention of the *baptism* in connexion with it leads us to what John the Baptist said of Jesus—"He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost *and with FIRE*; whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable *fire*." This fire of purgation serves to prove and purify the people of God, and to destroy the hypocrite and unbeliever; and is (as I apprehend it) that baptism which our Lord warned the sons of Zebedee they must be made partakers of; at the same time that it has a reference to that day or crisis of tribulation mentioned by St. Paul, which is to prove every man's work.\*

Another striking instance of the figurative use of this expression is in Deut. ix. 3, where Moses thus assures the people of Israel previous to their entering Canaan under Joshua,—“Understand therefore this day, that the Lord thy God is he which goeth over before thee: as a consuming *fire* he shall destroy them (thine enemies,) and he shall bring them down before thy face.” In the same way we are most probably to understand Isaiah iv. 4, and Zeph. iii. 8.

This fiery trial, then, or season of tribulation, will be apparently *witnessed* by the righteous, and it will be cut short for their sakes; but they will be saved out of it. In *what* manner I am not prepared to say; but that there will be deliverance in *some* manner or other, is evident. Thus David says of the righteous, “that in the *floods of great waters*† they shall not come nigh unto *him*.” Psalm xxxii. 6. So again—“*In the time of trouble* he shall *hide* me in his pavilion—in the secret of his tabernacle he shall *hide* me.” Psalm xxvii. 5. Psalm xxxvii. contains many similar assurances, especially verses 34, 38—40. “Wait on the Lord, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land: when the wicked are cut off *thou shalt see it*. The transgressors shall be destroyed together; the end of the wicked shall be cut off: but the salvation of the righteous is of the Lord, he is their strength in the time of trouble; and the Lord shall *help* them and *deliver* them,” &c. So again in Psalm xlv. “God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble; therefore will we not fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea; though the waters thereof roar and be troubled, though the mountains (or *kingdoms*) shake with the swelling thereof.” Isaiah foretels the same concerning the Lord's people: “They shall dwell in

\* The parties whose work is proved are apparently the ministers of the gospel; and their *work* seems to be those who have been led by *them* to the right *foundation*; but not built up truly and consistently in *all* the holy will and doctrine of the Lord.

† See this expression explained in reference to tribulation, “on the interpretation of prophecy,” page 102.

a *peaceable habitation*, and in *sure dwellings*, and in *quiet resting places*, when it shall hail coming down on the forest, and the city shall be low in a low place. Chap. xxxii. 18, 19. And in chap. xxvi. he exhorts them: "Come, my people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: *hide* thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast. For behold the Lord cometh out of his place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity," &c. Joel (iii. 16.) after describing the time of trouble, adds: "The Lord shall roar out of Zion, and utter his voice from Jerusalem, and the earth shall shake; but the Lord will be the hope of his *people*, and the strength of the children of Israel." And Zephaniah ii. 3. exhorts: "Seek ye the Lord, all ye *meek* of the earth, which have wrought his judgment: seek righteousness, seek meekness:—it may be *ye shall be hid* in the day of the Lord's anger."

These are some of the texts containing direct testimony: if we regard the *types* of this crisis of judgment we arrive at a similar conclusion. The deliverance of the faithful at the time of the floods of great waters, and at the fiery trial, is set forth by the deliverance of Noah at the flood, and of Lot at Sodom. The Exodus from Egypt typifies that still greater Exodus which is to come. The escape of the Christians to Pella, at the destruction of Jerusalem; the gathering the wheat into the barn, previous to the burning of the tares; the reaping the earth previous to the vintage (Rev. xiv.); and various other places, set forth the same event: and finally it is intimated in that exhortation of our Lord, "*Watch* ye therefore, and *pray* always, that ye may be accounted worthy to *escape* all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." Luke xxi. 36.

(2.) Connected with the salvation of the righteous at the time of these judgments is another fact; viz. that there will apparently be an election saved likewise from out of the nations who are engaged in the war of Armageddon. Most of these will be Israelites (who will be treated of in the next chapter;) but there will be also Gentiles saved; and who though previously unaffected by the fear of God, will be among those "inhabitants of the earth who will learn righteousness." Isaiah xxvi. 9. And besides these, it appears that there will remain unconverted heathen nations, called by the prophet "Tarshish, Pul and Lud that draw the bow, Tubal and Javan, and the isles afar off, that have not heard the fame of the Lord, neither have seen his glory." Isaiah lxvi. 19. These will not, apparently, be immediately involved in the great tribulation and warfare hitherto considered.

Against this view of the subject two objections present themselves: first, that the destruction of the inhabitants of the world is represented in some places of scripture as *entire*; and, secondly, that the world is to be *burnt* up at the coming of the Lord, which must therefore necessarily consume its inhabitants likewise.

In regard to the former objection, there have already been brought before the reader, when considering the principles of interpreting prophecy, (page 105,) certain passages which prove that the term *all* is sometimes used in scripture in a restricted sense, as may be ascertained by some other expressions in the context which qualify the word. One of these instances is exactly apposite to the point in hand, viz. Isaiah lxvi. and I must here beg leave to refer to it again. At verses 15, 16, it is written, "For behold the Lord will come with *fire*, and with his chariots like a *whirlwind*, to render his anger with fury, and his rebukes with *flames of fire*; for by *fire*, and by his *sword*, will the Lord plead with *all* flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be *many*." Whether the expression *fire* is here to be understood literally or figuratively, one thing is plain, that *all* flesh are said to be pleaded with by it, showing indeed "that the fire will try every man's work." And yet, at verse 19, it is *those that escape* of them that the Lord sends to Pul and Lud, &c.: thus showing likewise, that the destruction is not utter. To the above instance may be added one or two others. In Isaiah xxiv. 6. we read, "Therefore *the inhabitants of the earth are burned*, and—*few men left*." This at first, speaking as the context does of the ungodliness of *all* the dwellers upon earth, looks as if the whole were to be consumed; but the term *FEW* is a saving clause. So in Zechariah xiv. "*all nations*" are first described as gathered against Jerusalem to battle, (ver. 2.) then as smitten with a plague which consumes them, (ver. 12—15); but afterwards there is mention of every one that is *left* of all the nations that came against Jerusalem. These examples, with those already adduced, are, it is hoped, sufficient to show that there will nevertheless be an election of men in the flesh.

(3.) The conflagration still remains to be considered. Some of the passages above cited serve to throw a measure of light upon it; but I candidly confess that it is to me one of those things which St. Peter says are "hard to be understood." I want clear light upon the subject, and am sensible that, in my own case, there is yet much scripture relating to it that needs to be carefully considered. Consequently what I advance on this head is more for the purpose of exhibiting to the reader what may be said upon the subject, than as being in all respects satis-



factory to my own mind. It is then I think clear, that there is to be a literal conflagration: and it is equally clear that it will be *premillennial*; for, according to 2 Pet. iii. it is to be the means of renovating the earth, and producing the new heavens and the new earth, to be enjoyed during that period; which was the opinion generally entertained by the millenarian fathers and by the reformers.\* It is nevertheless questioned what will be the *process* of this burning, (viz. whether all at once, or by gradual eruptions of volcanic matter,) and to what *extent* it will take place. Some have considered that only the city and immediate territory of Rome was to be burned; among whom are many Jewish writers, who ground their opinion on Isaiah xxxiv. 6—10, interpreting Idumea as mystically signifying Rome. The object of this fiery visitation however is evidently very remote from that of renewing or regenerating that territory: it is to set it forth, after the examples of Sodom and Gomorrah, as an awful memorial to the people who shall dwell in the flesh during the millennium; for which purpose it is to lie waste, and its smoke continually to ascend. Others conceive that the whole of what they call *the prophetic earth*, meaning the Roman empire in its utmost limits, will be visited with fire. And others again think it is to be confined to the region of Palestine in its utmost limits. All these different hypotheses seem to arise from the difficulty of conceiving how there shall be men and animals left surviving, notwithstanding the burning;—a difficulty which we may safely leave with our God to unravel in due time. It would have been quite as difficult to have conceived in the days of Noah,—when navigation was as yet unknown, and none had ever constructed a ship or boat,—how men and animals could be saved from a universal deluge. And yet the Lord marvellously accomplished it, and doubtless he will again show, that nothing is too hard for him.

4. There remains one other point for consideration, and that is, *the judgment according to works* which will take place upon the *righteous*.

(1.) It is questionable again as regards *this* matter, where and at what period, this judgment will take place: and this is

\* Some have argued that the conflagration cannot be until the annihilation of the world, on the ground that the action of fire would render the soil unfit for the use of man. This is arguing in ignorance of the real facts of the case even at present; for unfruitful land is now often pared and burned to produce a soil; and the soil formed by triturated *lava* is excellent. But the proper reply to this objection is, first, that there is no sufficient proof that the earth will ever be *destroyed*, but only *renewed*; and secondly, that Peter declares that renewal will be by the dissolving of its elements through fervent heat. There is a very able essay on this subject in Dr. Holmes's "*Resurrection Revealed*." See the Appendix to the revised edition, p. 301.



*another* of the points which I feel myself unable at present to treat of with full confidence. Some conceive that the righteous will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air previous to the vials of wrath being poured out; and that whilst *there* they will be judged according to their works, and then descend with the Lord. This period, however, of their translation appears to be too early to be consistent with their coming out of the tribulation itself; for there are numerous passages, especially in the Psalms, which plainly evince that the church passes into deep waters in those days, and cries to the Lord from out of them. The opinion, however, does not seem *altogether* erroneous; for if we allow that there are to be different *stages and gradations* in these judgments (as, for example, those which involve the fall of Babylon and the cities of the nations, and those which effect the destruction of the infidel Beast, which is first made the chief instrument of destroying Babylon;\*) we may then readily understand how the saints may be implicated in the first portion of them, and yet be caught up previous to the battle of Armageddon. It is whilst they are in the air with Christ, that according to Mr. Cuninghame, and others, they are to be marshalled "in their various orders and degrees of glory and dominion."† And it is after this judgment of works, (as I apprehend,) wheresoever it take place, that the saints come forth "with the praises of God in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand, to execute the judgment written;" (see page 163.) and they form most probably those "armies in heaven," which, when Christ comes forth "in righteousness to judge and make war,"—"with a sharp sword going out of his mouth, that with it he should smite the nations,"—"follow him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean." Rev. xix. 11—15.

(2.) It is however of vast importance for the mind of the believer to be persuaded, that he is himself to undergo a judgment. However we may hesitate as to the where and when, we have no ground for questioning the actual fact itself; though it has nevertheless come to pass, that the fact is questioned, and considered by some to be at variance with the doctrines

\* Compare Rev. xvii. 12, 13, with verses 16, 17, and note also verses 20, 21, of chap. xix.

† If I correctly understand the observations which Mr. Cuninghame has made on this subject in two or three places of his recent edition of the Apocalypse, he considers that the church will be involved in the tribulation, and yet be caught up out of the midst of it. (See pages 51, 359, 491, and their context.) I concur with him in the main, but do not clearly see how he can consider the *next event* which the church has now to look for is the translation of the saints. For this supposes the fiery trial to the saints to be already past; which I cannot think to be the case, but rather look for *that* event as the next in order which is to befall the church.

of grace. But it is as plainly declared in the scriptures, that God will *render to every man ACCORDING to his deeds*, as it is insisted, that by the deeds of the law shall no flesh be *justified*. Both truths are declared by the same Apostle, and in the same Epistle (Rom. ii. 5, 6, and iii. 20.) Our Lord tells us, “that when the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels, then he shall reward every man *according to his works*.” Matt. xvi. 27. He sets forth a distinction of reward in the parable of the *pounds*, where one of the faithful has authority assigned him over *ten* cities, and another over *five* cities; (Luke xix. 17, 19) in which place there seems to be an allusion also to the precise *nature* of the respective glory of the saints, which will consist in dominion and authority over the nations. And the Lord further distinguishes between a prophet’s (or minister’s) reward, and a righteous man’s reward; shewing also that it is possible for any disciple to receive both the one and the other; (Matt. x. 41) and that every thing done for him,—even to the giving a cup of cold water to a disciple, because he belongs to Christ,—shall have its proportionate reward. In like manner St. Paul teaches us, “that he which soweth sparingly, shall reap also *sparingly*; and he which soweth bountifully, shall reap also *bountifully*;” (2 Cor. ix. 6) and that “whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap;” (Gal. vi. 7) nothing of which can be literally true, unless there shall be a distinction hereafter in the judgment according to works: and then we can understand how a man may be continually “laying up for himself treasure in heaven;” (Matt. vi. 20;)—why he should be exhorted to be always *abounding* in the work of the Lord; viz. forasmuch as we know that *our labour is not in vain* in the Lord; (1 Cor. xv. 38)—and why again we should be admonished “to *look to ourselves*, that we lose not those things which we *have wrought*, but that we receive a *full* reward. 2 John 8.

It is objected by some, that the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard is opposed to this doctrine; who all receive *equal* wages, whether employed from the first hour or the eleventh. Matt. xx. I apprehend that this parable chiefly respects the self-righteous spirit of the pharisees, who were jealous, both because those who had been previously as publicans and sinners, and likewise the Gentiles who had been ignorant of God, were, by the Gospel of Christ and the grace of the Lord, put upon the same level with themselves, who had “borne the burden and heat” of the Mosaical dispensation. But be that as it may, there is nothing in this doctrine which really conflicts with that of justification by faith. It will readily be admitted, that none are accounted righteous before God on account of

any merits or works of their own; and that whether they have yielded thirty fold or a hundred fold, all are equally justified freely, who are effectually called by the Spirit, at whatsoever period of life that call may have taken place. It will also be freely admitted, that the good works which they have wrought, and all the fruits of holiness they have exhibited, are not strictly their own, but are produced by the operation of the Spirit of God; and therefore that as the *power* is his, so also the *glory*;—yea, it will be at once conceded, that so far as we are concerned, we find the flesh continually hindering and defiling what is good, and our best righteousness but as filthy rags, needing the blood of sprinkling. To reward those works therefore which are the fruits of God's power in us, is only another act of *mercy* in the Lord; which agrees with the words of the Psalmist—"God hath spoken once; twice have I heard this; that *power* belongeth unto God: also that unto thee, O Lord, belongeth *MERCY*;—for thou renderest unto every man ACCORDING to his work." Psalm. lxi. 11, 12. The word *according*—"according to his work" or works, which occurs in several other places not yet quoted, clearly intimates that the reward, though of *mercy*, is nevertheless *apportioned* to the work wrought.

It matters not, then, in this view of the subject, at what period men are called by the grace of God;—whether it be in infancy, or at the eleventh hour, both are accepted, both are justified, and that freely, fully, and equally, through the precious blood of Christ, and they will condemn every tongue that riseth up in judgment against them. But do the self-denial, and devotedness, and temper of the man, when he is called, signify nothing? Is there to be no difference between him who has fought a good fight, (2 Tim. iv. 7.) and him who is "*scarcely* saved, so as by fire?"—between the man who builds upon the only foundation, "gold, silver, precious stones, and him who builds wood, hay, stubble?" Yes: we are assured, as before noticed, that though the latter be saved "he shall suffer *loss*," (1 Cor. iii. 15.) whereas the former will "receive a reward;" (ver. 14.) which statement appears to me incapable of rational explanation, except on the principle that some shall be *great*, and some *least* in the kingdom of God. Matt. v. 19.

(3.) The *manner* in which this part of the judgment will be conducted comes next under consideration. I conceive from what St. Paul says of "the *day* that is to try every thing by fire," which we have seen has reference to the period of tribulation, that many a "prophet" will suffer loss at *that* time, by many of his flock, in whom he has gloried, not being armed with the mind of Christ to endure suffering, and therefore not

really possessing the *Spirit* of Christ; (see Rom. viii. 9.) so that when affliction or persecution ariseth for the word's sake, they are proved to have no root in themselves, and immediately they are offended. Mark iv. 17. And this renders it a matter of such great importance to the *ministers* of God, that they should, as before observed, endeavour to prepare their hearers to be partakers of the *sufferings* of Christ, knowing "that if we *suffer* with him we shall also reign with him; if we deny him he also will deny us, (2 Tim. ii. 12.) They cannot be wrong in taking to them the whole armour of God, and preparing to withstand in the evil day, even though no evil day overtake them;—they cannot err in *watching* for Christ; for whether he come in the second watch, or come in the third watch, and find them so, blessed are those servants." Luke xii. 38. But, if they should be found *not* watching, and *unprepared*, for the evil day, then they may perhaps fall away altogether;—their minister will certainly suffer loss;—and well for him after all will it be, if their blood be not laid at his door!

But it may be that they also may be *saved*, yet so as by fire; for "many shall also be purified, and made white and tried," &c. (Dan. xii. 10.)—being overtaken by the affliction in different degrees; so that by their *portion* of suffering, their works will be in some degree made manifest. The warnings and threatenings delivered to the seven churches of Asia, if viewed as referring to the crisis of trouble (see page 90.) are remarkable in this point of view.\* Some are to be tried by tribulation only ten days, (Rev. ii. 10.) Some are to be cast into *great* tribulation except they repent, (ver. 22.) by which means, saith the Lord, "all the churches shall know that I am he which *searcheth the reins and hearts*; and I will give unto *every one of you* ACCORDING TO YOUR WORKS." And some he threatens, that because they do not watch, he will come upon them "as a thief, and they shall not know what hour he will come upon them." Rev. iii. 3. On the other hand the Lord promises to some, that he will "put on them no other burden" than that they have experienced, (Rev. ii. 24.) and to others, that he will keep them from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon *all the world* to TRY them that dwell on the

\* Whatever prophetic reference or accommodation to intermediate periods may be made of Rev. ii. and iii. (which I am not going to dispute,) I conceive that the messages to the seven churches of Asia are specially intended to set forth the circumstances of the whole professing Church of Christ in the last days, which, in its different sections, denominations, and classes of professors, will assume all the different aspects therein described; and that the *admonitions and promises* contained in the messages to them, are especially intended for the benefit and direction of believers, in those days.

earth, (Rev. iii. 10.) These judge themselves, and therefore escape being judged of God. 1 Cor. xi. 31.

It is manifest, however, that the preceding rule of judgment cannot apply to thousands whose lot has fallen in times of quiet to the church, and who nevertheless have not brought forth fruit abundantly, and have been supine and lukewarm, not to say *carnal* in spirit. And though it might determine, in regard to those living in times of tribulation, the measure in which they might receive chastening, or be exempted from it, it would be quite inadequate as a rule for determining the measure of reward. This can only be done (so far as I can perceive) "in the day when God shall judge the *secrets* of men by Jesus Christ:" (Rom. ii. 16.) for *then* "he will both bring to light the *hidden things* of darkness,"—those actions which though perpetrated in secret, have not escaped his all-seeing eye; and then will He "make manifest the *counsels* of the hearts,"—those inward motives and principles which have led men to perform various actions; yea, those inward workings of sin, probably, which have been *habitually* entertained, though the actual commission of the sin has been prevented. 1 Cor. iv. 5. The apostle plainly declares this in other scriptures, and includes himself as one, who expected to have the secrets of his own heart made manifest. To the Romans he declares—"We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ;" and in the two following verses he takes occasion, from the scripture which saith, "Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God," to conclude—"So then, *every one of us* shall give account of himself unto God!" Rom. xiv. 10—12. To the Corinthians also he declares, that he labours continually to be accepted of God, from a conviction, that "*we must all* appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, *according to that he hath done, whether good or bad.*" 2 Cor. v. 9, 10. And thus in Jeremiah it is declared; I the Lord search the heart, I try the reins, even to give to EVERY MAN *according to his ways, and according to the fruit of his doings.*" Jer. xvii. 10. And Solomon saith, "that God shall bring *every work* into judgment, with *every secret thing*, whether it be *good*, or whether it be *evil.*" Eccles. xii. 14.

It is also urged against this view of the subject, that it is incompatible with the future happiness of God's people to have the secrets of their hearts exposed; and that it is written: "Who shall lay *any thing* to the charge of God's elect?—it is God that justifieth." Rom. viii. 33. Yes—it is God that *justifieth*: or they must altogether perish from his presence. He will suffer none to condemn them if he has previously jus-

tified them in the Spirit; (1 Cor. vi. 11.) but it must nevertheless be remembered, that only those who are walking after the Spirit have the assurance that they are delivered from condemnation. Rom. viii. 1. "Without holiness no man shall see the Lord;" (Heb. xii. 14.) and well would it be for multitudes of heartless worldly professors, who are evangelized in head and not sanctified in spirit, did they only keep in view that they must give account to a holy and jealous God, who searcheth the heart and trieth the reins, and that "for every idle word which men shall speak, of the same shall they give account in the day of judgment." Matt. xii. 36.

In regard however to the ultimate *happiness* of the saints, I conceive that they themselves, when delivered from their present infirmities and prejudices, will have so clear a view of the manifestation of the holiness and glory of God in all he does, that they will with humility and cheerfulness acquiesce in the reward, though they themselves may suffer loss, and begin with shame to take the lowest place. And it may be asked, *who* and *what* is the very best Christian of the present day, that he should hope to enjoy an immunity, which neither prophets nor apostles have enjoyed before him? The failings of Abraham, Moses, David and others have been published through the world, and made notorious as the noon-day sun; and Peter's denial of his master is as universally known as the gospel which contains the account of it. Who then are we, that we should expect exemption? But the secrets of the heart *cannot* be hid; for at that time "we shall know even as we are known." 1 Cor. xiii. 12. And indeed were there no direct exposure of the secret deeds and thoughts of men in that day;—were the Lord only silently to distinguish among us and divide us; yet that very distinction itself would, in effect, amount to the same thing. We could not help concluding of him, who would be made to take a lower place than man's judgment would assign him, that there was some *reason* for it, though secret to us; only we should be left, in that case, to the darkness of surmise. But the Lord will choose "to be justified when he speaks, and clear when he judges." Psalm li. 4. Thus, then, some men's sins are open beforehand, going beforehand to judgment: and some they *follow after*. Likewise the good works of some are manifest beforehand; and they that are otherwise cannot be hid. 1 Tim. v. 24, 25.

We may well therefore exclaim, "What manner of persons ought we to be, in all holy conversation and godliness!" Greatly to be considered is that exhortation of St. John: "And now little children abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be *ashamed* before him, at his



coming." 1 John ii. 28. If however we do abide in him, and his word abides in us, we need not fear as to the result: it is our Father's good pleasure to give us the kingdom; and through grace he will "present us *holy*, and *unblameable*, and *unreprovable*\* in his sight." Col. i. 22.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE RESTORATION OF ISRAEL, AND THE NEW JERUSALEM DISPENSATION.

IT has in these latter days been made a question, whether the posterity of Abraham, according to the flesh, shall be restored in their national character, as Jews or Israelites, to the land of their forefathers; or whether the numerous promises of Scripture, which have given rise to such an expectation, are not rather to be understood in a mystical sense, as having reference only to their ultimate conversion to the Christian faith, and their absorption into the Gentile Church. I view it as a modern question,† because with scarcely any exception the eminent fathers and expositors of the church have interpreted these promises as having respect to a literal or national restoration; and it was not till men, who were prejudiced against the millenarian principle of interpreting prophecy, came to see how the doctrine of a literal restoration could be successfully pressed against their views, that they applied their learning and ingenuity to the task of *spiritualizing*, or rather *allegorizing*, those passages of the word of God which in this respect conflict with their opinions.

Something has been already said upon this subject at pages 63 and 64 of this work; and a variety of ancient authors are there cited who have maintained in all ages the hope of a national restoration, though in other matters they had departed from the literal principle of exposition. It were easy to add to their number; but I shall content myself with bringing forward the testimony of Dr. Whitby, whose evidence on this head, as he was opposed to the millenarian system, is the less

\* In Dr. Sayer Rudd's Essay on the Millennium, published in 1734, he endeavours to shew that many of the saints will be *rebuked*, at the Lord's coming.

† Paul Burgensis denied their actual restoration. See Addit. to Nic de Lyra on Deut. 27 and Levitic. 26.

open to suspicion. On Romans xi., speaking of the hope of the conversion and restoration of the Jews, he says, "It hath been the constant doctrine of the Church of Christ, owned by the Greek and Latin fathers, and by ALL commentators I have met with on this place."\*

The bearing of this subject upon the whole word of God, involving as it does the *principle* of interpretation by which the meaning of other important topics is to be ascertained, gives it a claim to the very serious regard of all who humbly desire to understand the whole counsel of God. For it is obvious, that unless some very decided and undeniable canon can be adduced for a *contrary* principle of expounding certain passages, common sense and common consistency will lead us to conclude, that the same analogy prevails throughout.

Besides this however, the question becomes of great interest and importance from the manner in which many other prophetic events are interwoven or connected with the restoration of Israel. The careful investigator of prophecy will discover that it has a bearing upon the Kingdom of Christ, the Judgment, the Resurrection, the Advent, and the future glory of the Church; and that it is absolutely necessary to be decided as to the nature of that restoration promised to Israel, before we can with any degree of confidence determine the real character of these events, or come to any satisfactory conclusion as to the times and seasons. Into the principle points therefore connected with this question we must now inquire.

1. Two things have been already brought forward in this work, which to my own mind would be decisive of the question. The one is, that the land of Palestine has been covenanted by the Lord to the patriarchs and to their posterity, to an extent and under circumstances far beyond anything which has been hitherto experienced; and we know "that the gifts and calling of God are without repentance," or change of purpose,—a declaration made by the apostle with express reference to the question of Jewish restoration. Rom. xi. 29. The other is, that those things which have been predicted concerning the chastisement and sufferings of Israel, and also concerning some of the *good* things which the Lord hath spoken concerning them, have been most literally accomplished; and we are consequently bound to conclude, (without, as just observed, there be decided evidence to the contrary in the text,) that the

\* The reader who is fond of authorities may nevertheless add to those mentioned at page 64, the names of Cyril, Gennadius, Haymo, Origen, Photius, Primasius, Theodoret and Theophylact. Even such men as *Erasmus* held this opinion. So also Poole, Guise, Locke, and Samuel Clarke. And among writers of the present age, opposed to the premillennial advent, there may be instanced Doddridge, Faber, Scott, Simeon, &c.

*blessings*  still in reserve for them, when their warfare shall be accomplished, will have a similar literal fulfilment.\*

The first sight of the matter would indeed seem to indicate, that some of the blessings promised to Israel must have respect to them especially in their national character; “and which, (as Mr. Begg has justly observed,†) from their very nature can by no means be applied to any Gentile race. For example, how can all those allusions in the promises to a *gathering* and *return* from a previous ejection and *scattering* among the nations refer to Gentiles? What again have the allusions to the *two* kingdoms of Judah and Ephraim,—to their re-establishment and final incorporation,—to do with the concerns of the Gentile church?‡ And how can promises, which respect the future *extension* of their territory, and the exact specification of its *limits* and *boundaries* and *divisions* and *allotments*, be applied to any inheritance of the saints in the supernal heaven, without losing sight of those very details on which the correctness of an interpretation principally depend?

Some writers however have concluded, that the promises of national restoration to the Jews were fulfilled at the time of their return from the Babylonish captivity, when the city was rebuilt and the second temple erected. It is not denied that a portion of Israel did then return to the land of their fathers; but an examination of some of the texts bearing on this subject will demonstrate, that certain circumstances in those prophecies received no accomplishment at all at that period;—that those particulars, which are pointed to as fulfilled, were only very inadequately fulfilled, when compared with the terms of the prophecy;—and that the events which followed that restoration do not at all correspond with those which it is predicted shall accompany or immediately ensue on the restoration here contended for, as yet to come to pass.

(1.) The first to which attention is requested is Deut. xxx. Mr. Begg, in the work before noticed, says on this chapter;—“The prediction is most extensive. It embraces the whole period of Israel’s history till the present and future times,” &c. The Babylonish captivity is not however overlooked. It is foretold in a preceding part of this remarkable prophetic narrative in terms sufficiently distinctive: “The Lord shall bring thee and *thy king*, which thou shalt set over thee, unto a

\* The reader is requested to refer back to page 99.

† See his “Connected View, &c. of the Redeemer’s Advent,” p. 27.

‡ Some modern expositors have indeed discovered that the *two* tribes are a type of established churches; and the *ten* tribes of the dissenting congregations. We apprehend the Dissenters themselves will never assent to a general application of this interpretation; for the *Voluntary Principle* discussion might in that case very soon be settled.

nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known." (xxviii. 36.) This then clearly refers to that captivity when, "in the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim king of Judah, came Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem and besieged it; and the Lord gave Jehoiakim, king of Judah, into his hand." Dan. i. 1, 2. 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 6. 2 Kings xxiv. 14, &c. This part of the prediction had at that time its complete fulfilment; while it cannot at all apply to the captivity which afterwards followed their overthrow by the Romans; for they had then *no* king to be carried captive.

But we have also another distinctive mark by which the prediction in the above verse is fixed to the Babylonish captivity, and by which it is also rendered inapplicable to that which they afterwards suffered. They, together with their king, were at this time to be carried only into "*a* nation;" while the restoration promised in the conclusion of the prediction must refer to their subsequent *dispersion*, which is afterwards predicted. (xxviii. 64.) For it is a restoration "from *all* the nations,"—"from the *utmost* parts of heaven. (p. 29.) See also Jeremiah xvi. 14, 15. to the same purpose.

I would further observe, that the expression "if *any* of thine be driven out unto the *outmost parts of heaven*, from *thence* will the Lord thy God gather thee, and from *thence* will he fetch thee," &c. implies that the return will not be of a *part* of Israel, but of *all*;—not one will be left behind. It is not, by any commentator that I know of, asserted, that *the whole* of Israel returned after the Babylonish captivity: they only contend for a *part*; but insist that that part may be considered as sufficient to justify its being viewed as the whole nation, forasmuch as the rest might have returned if they would. See also Isaiah xliii. 5—7, where *every one* of his, the Lord's sons and daughters, are to be brought from far, and from the ends of the earth.

But, farther than this, it is said, that after the return, spoken of in this prophecy, to the land of their fathers, the Lord "will do them good, and *multiply* them ABOVE thy fathers." On this subject Mr. Hirschfield, missionary to the Jews, says\*—"The Jews never afterwards became *so numerous* as they had been under David and Solomon: though in the restoration they were to be "multiplied above their fathers." In connection with this passage, and in reference to the great increase of the Jewish people, consider the language of Hosea i. 10, 11.—"The number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea,

\* See his "Strictures on the past History and future prospects of the Jews." page 31.

which cannot be measured nor numbered," &c. To which place may be added Isaiah xlix. 20.—"The children which thou shalt have, after thou hast *lost* the other, shall say again in thine ears, The place is too *strait* for me: *give place to me that I may dwell.*"—And see likewise Jeremiah xxxiii. 22.

Mr. Hirschfeld further notices the sixth verse of this prophecy, where it is said—"And the Lord thy God shall *circumcise thine heart*, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live;" and remarks on it, that this circumcision of heart was certainly no characteristic of the nation in Stephen's time, since he addresses them: "Ye stiff-necked and *uncircumcised* in heart and ears, ye do ALWAYS resist the Holy Ghost." Acts vii. 51.

The next prophecy which I shall note is Isaiah xi. 11—16. The former verses are allowed to be descriptive of the *millennium*, or at least of the period of the glorious rest of the church, when "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb," &c. (v. 6.) "and the earth shall be *full* of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea;" (verse 9.) a period which certainly has never yet been witnessed. "And it shall come to pass *in that day*, that the Lord shall set his hand *again* THE SECOND TIME, to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, Egypt, Pathros, Cush, Elam, Shinar, Hamath, &c. and from the *islands of the sea*;\* and he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel and the dispersed of Judah from the *four corners of the earth*, &c."—"And the Lord shall *utterly destroy the tongue of the Egyptian sea*; and with his mighty wind shall he shake his hand over *the river*, and shall smite it in the *seven streams*, and make men go over *dryshod*. And there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people, which shall be left from Assyria; *like as it was* to Israel in the day that he came up out of the land of Egypt." In this remarkable passage I need only briefly point to two circumstances, which the words marked in italics and capitals will have already prepared the reader for. First, we can entertain no reasonable question whether the return from Babylon be meant: that was only the *first* time the Lord set his hand to recover his people; whereas this is expressly stated to be "the *second* time." Secondly, it is attended by a miraculous drying up of the streams of the Egyptian river and sea by a mighty wind;† and that we may not hesitate as to its literality, we are assured that it is to be in like manner that the same sea and the river Jordan were dried up when the people

\* Mr. Scott says—"All the regions *separated from Asia* are generally meant; and here the British isles are included."

† A similar prophecy is contained in Isaiah xxvii. 12.

came out of Egypt. Mr. Scott says on this place—"I presume not to prophesy from the prophecies; but the *literal* restoration both of Israel and Judah is clearly predicted."

In Jeremiah xxiii. 1—8, there is a prophecy in which mention is made of a gathering of the flock of the Lord, &c., from the *north* country, and from *all countries* whither they were driven. (v. 5, 8.) They are assured that they shall "*fear no more*" but Israel and Judah shall dwell *safely*." (v. 4, 6,) and this particular restoration and salvation is to be accompanied by a manifestation to them of the Redeemer—the "RIGHTEOUS BRANCH," who shall *reign* and *prosper*. (v. 5.) A writer in the Investigator of Prophecy (vol. iv. p. 225.) pertinently observes, that to get rid of the force of this prophecy with reference to to a *future* literal restoration of Israel it must be shewn that the BRANCH was manifested to Israel and Judah, at the time of the return from Babylon; and that that return was from the *north* country and from all other countries, whither they have been driven. If this cannot be done it must be shewn, that in the time of Christ, when the Branch *did* appear, there was a return from captivity of the character above mentioned; that the Branch then "*reigned*" over the house of Israel; and that Israel continued from that time to dwell *safely* and in their *own* land.

Another prophecy of Jeremiah (chap. xxxi.) may next be appealed to. He prophesied just when they were filling up that measure of their iniquity which brought upon them wrath to the uttermost, and lived into the period of the Babylonish captivity itself. At verses 5, 6, however he says: "Thou shalt yet plant vines upon the mountains of *Samaria*: the planters shall plant and shall eat them as common things. For there shall be a day that the watchmen upon the mount *Ephraim* shall cry, Arise ye, and let us go up to *Zion*, unto the Lord our God." Now *Israel* did not, at the first return, plant vines at *Samaria*: the people who inhabited there were Cutheans, under Sanballat, and were hostile to the Jews. (See Nehemiah ii. iv. vi.) And as the people who inhabited the territory of *Ephraim* were thus inimical to the Jews, so neither did they ever encourage any to go up to *Zion*; but on the contrary, they built a temple on Mount Gerizim, in opposition to the temple at Jerusalem. To this rivalry of the two places the woman of *Samaria* apparently alludes, John iv. 20. And as the circumstances just adverted to prove that the prophecy refers to some future period; so the *planting vines at Samaria* plainly bespeak that it is of a literal character. Moreover, at verse 12 it is said:—"They shall come and sing in the height



of Zion," &c.—“and, *they shall not sorrow* any more at all:” whereas their sorrows and troubles have been more abundant since their return from Babylon than ever they were before; and they have even yet a tribulation to go through, which will be without a parallel in the history of the world. See Daniel xii. 1.

I pass over, for the present, various prophecies contained in *Ezekiel* from chapters xxviii. to xxxix.—the four last of these especially, as the repetition of similar testimony will, I conceive, be unnecessary after what has been adduced. I will only here farther observe, that the division of the land, and the description of the cities and temple given in chapters xl. to xlviiii. are quite different, as is universally admitted, from any thing which was accomplished after the return from Babylon; and therefore in the judgment of most it remains to be yet fulfilled. And there is another circumstance likewise worthy of notice, in regard to the temple, &c. described in *Ezekiel*, viz. that no individual has as yet been enabled to produce any thing like a consistent interpretation of it upon the mystical or symbolical principle. There are some things in that long description which appear to invite a mystical interpretation; but there are others which can in no wise be thus explained, and which commentators are consequently obliged to pass slightly over, or to leave them as they find them. The reader who wishes to see how completely all commentators have been at fault on this matter, need only turn to Mr. Scott’s introductory observations on the fortieth chapter, and his subsequent treatment of particulars. We shall have occasion however to return to this subject presently.

Passing on to Hosea iii. 4, 5, we have the following prophecy—“For the children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a *sacrifice*, and without an *image*, and without an *ephod*, and without *teraphim*: afterward shall the children of Israel return, and seek the Lord their God and David their king; and shall fear the Lord and his goodness in the *latter days*.” There are two points of considerable importance in this passage: viz. 1. The condition of Israel during the time of their affliction related therein. 2. The period of their deliverance from it. In regard to the first point it will be easy to shew that it was *not* their condition during the Babylonish captivity; and in regard to the second, that the period named is not that of their return from Babylon.

First then as regards their affliction: they are to abide many days without a *sacrifice*, *image*, *ephod*, or *teraphim*. Mr. Scott,

after rightly explaining their abiding without a sacrifice, thus proceeds: "They have also remained without an image, ephod, or teraphim,—without any of those *idolatrous* observances and apparatus, to which they were so generally attached when this prophecy was uttered." Notwithstanding the opinion of that able commentator, the sense here attached to the words is manifestly inconsistent with scripture. For the prophecy regards, not Judah in particular, but *Israel* in the general; and it is declared of them, when they should be scattered among the nations—"There ye shall serve gods, *the work of men's hands, wood and stone*, which neither see, nor hear, nor smell. But if from thence thou shalt seek the Lord thy God thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul." Deut. iv. 28, 29; see also Deut. xxviii. 36, 64, and Jer. xvi. 13. The termination of this affliction is evidently the same;—viz. their seeking the Lord: but the affliction itself is so manifestly contradictory to Mr. Scott's interpretation, that we are compelled to seek a meaning of the terms *image, ephod, and teraphim* more according with the description of their condition in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah. Jerome and Grotius render the word תרפים by *altar*, instead of *image*, and they contend that the word *teraphim*, (as does Calvin) is one of a middle nature, and may signify the *cherubim* from whence came the answer of God. The Septuagint version renders the passage—*ουδε οντος θυσιαστηριου, ουδε ιερατειας, ουδε δηλων* or, in some copies, *δηλων*—which is literally, without an *altar*, without a *priesthood*, and without *manifestations*. This consists with their being without a *sacrifice*; all which is spoken of in scripture as a judicial infliction; whereas to be without idolatrous worship is no affliction, but on the contrary, to be *given up to it*, is the mark of God's great anger. See Rom. i. But the house of Israel was not, strictly speaking, in this plight during the Babylonish captivity. They were indeed removed from their temple and altar; but they had prophets among them, as Daniel, Ezekiel, Obadiah, and Jeremiah into a considerable part of it; and very extraordinary manifestations of God in visions to the two former of these prophets; as also of his power and mercy toward them shewed by his dealings with Esther, Mordecai, Daniel, &c. by whose means he protected them and caused them to enjoy much favour, and their religion greatly to increase. It was not till *after* the return from Babylon that those who remained in captivity lost entirely those advantages here named; so that the best of them, who practise not idolatry, are without any manifestation of God's being among them; and the generality of the ten

tribes have fallen into the idolatrous practices of the heathen round about them.\*

But, secondly, the time when they shall return and seek the Lord and fear him is the *latter days*. Now there is no commentator of note who considers that the *latter days* can apply to any period earlier than the commencement of the Christian Dispensation: whereas the return from the captivity was upwards of five hundred years prior to that period: and when the period did arrive, instead of its being marked by the national *conversion* of the Jews, they cast off their fear in their national capacity, and were again cast out of their land by the Lord.† Many learned commentators, however, conceive that by *latter days* is to be understood the period of the end of the Gentile dispensation; and the context of scripture and connection of events bears them out in most instances.

(2.) I shall only at present add to the specimen now given from the Old Testament, of prophecies which concern a *future literal restoration of Israel*; that the New Testament is not silent on this important and interesting matter.

In Matthew xxiii., where the Lord foretels the wrath which should come upon the Jews for the righteous blood they had shed, (v. 35) he is evidently speaking of them in their *national* character; and he adds—"Behold your *house* is left unto you desolate. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me henceforth, till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord." Their *house* is here used to designate them in their national character, even as they are often called "the *house* of Judah," and "the house of Israel," &c. Some say the Lord merely alludes in the threat here instanced to his providential coming to destroy Jerusalem: but how did this fulfil his word? If this were the *coming* he meant, the house of Judah did indeed *feel* him at this time; but what discernment had they of him? When did they nationally recognise him, and declare him blessed? These things have therefore to be fulfilled at his second advent.

In Acts i. 6, 7, the disciples of the Lord inquire of him: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to *Israel*?" The Rev. A. M'Cauley, Missionary to the Jews, has, in a work

\* It can hardly be said that they were without a prince during that time; for Jehoiakim was raised to a throne whilst in that captivity. 2 Kings xxv. 27. And of Jechonias came Salathiel, a prince; and of him came Zorobabel, another prince. See Matthew i. 12.

† Mr. Scott says on this place—"Let it be recollected that this prediction follows that of the calling of the Gentiles. (Note ii. 18—20)." I cannot find however anything in chapter ii., or his note on it, referred to above, to justify the remark.

recently published,\* fully established the fact, that the term *Israel* and *Gentiles* are in the New Testament commonly used in the same distinctive sense as they are employed in the Old Testament; though I do not agree with the excellent author in the *extent* to which he endeavours to apply his principle of arguing. It is sufficient however here to assert, that our Lord could have understood his disciples at this time in no other than in a literal sense, and that his reply is calculated to confirm their expectation of the national supremacy of the literal Israel at some future period; though he does not gratify their curiosity as to the time.

Romans xi. is very clear and decisive on both points. It begins by declaring, that "God hath not cast away his people;" and the fact to which Paul appeals, as proof that all are not cast off, viz.—that he himself is an Israelite of the seed of Abraham of the tribe of Benjamin, shews, that he is speaking of Israel, not in any mystical sense, but in the literal national sense. And after proceeding to shew, that even at that time there was still an "*election of grace*" from among them, (v. 5) and that the rest were "blinded," and had "fallen" and were "cast away;" (v. 7, 12, 15) he goes on to insist that they should be grafted into the vine again; speaking of them still in their distinct national character, as the "*natural branches*," (v. 21—24) and admonishing the Gentiles, *as Gentiles* (v. 13,) not to boast against them; intimating that there was also to come a time of rejection to the Gentiles, if they should cease to walk by faith; (v. 20, 22) and that when the election or "*fulness*" from among the Gentiles should be complete, then "there should come out of Zion the Deliverer, and turn away ungodliness from *Jacob*." (v. 26, 27.) On this passage we will hear Mr. M'Caul.—"In Rom. xi. 26, 27, the apostle proves the future national conversion of Israel by a citation from the 59th chapter of Isaiah—"And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins." Now the manner and object of this citation proves two things—First, that this passage of the *prophet* refers to the literal Israel. Second, that it refers to a time yet to come. But what is the immediate context?—"Arise, shine; for thy light is come, &c. Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy

\* "New Testament evidence to prove that the Jews are to be restored to the Land of Israel." Lond. Wertheim, 12mo. pp. 26.

One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee, &c. Violence shall no more be heard within thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders." To separate this whole 60th chapter from the preceding verses [quoted from it] is impossible; but if it be connected with them, then it refers, according to the apostles, to some future period of the literal Israel's history, and predicts their restoration to their own land." p. 17.

Some have thought, especially Mr. Joseph Mede, that 1 Tim. i. 16. also proves this point: "Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me *first* Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering for a *pattern* (or *type*, ὑποτυπασιν) to them which should *hereafter* believe on him to life everlasting;" and they endeavour to show, that the sudden conversion of the apostle on his way to Damascus, and his subsequently becoming a most successful minister of the gospel to the Gentiles, is the type of the manner in which all Israel shall hereafter be converted,—viz. by the shining forth of the Lord from heaven,—and of their afterwards becoming a great blessing to the Gentile world. I am desirous, however, not to mix up doubtful matter in an argument of such great importance; and therefore I leave this, and some other passages of the New Testament: otherwise, much more might be said upon this subject.

2. Much of the weight of the argument, or rather evidence, for the future literal restoration of Israel, depends upon the two-fold fact, that the *ten tribes* of Israel were not restored at the time of the return of Judah from captivity; and that they continue in existence in some portion of the globe, under such circumstances as that they can again, in the providence of God, be recognized and approved in their national character. This portion of the subject will therefore require separate consideration.

(1.) The fact that the restoration of the *whole house of Israel*,—including both Ephraim and Judah, or the ten tribes and the two tribes,—is foretold in the prophets, has already come before the reader in some of the prophecies already adduced, and therefore needs no farther evidence in this place.\* I proceed, therefore, to the objections, the strength of all which may be found in two or three articles by a very able writer in vol. iv. of the Investigator of Prophecy, under the signature T. K.

The first that I shall notice is derived from the prophecy contained in the 50th and 51st chapters of Jeremiah. He observes, that the return of the ten tribes is foretold in chapter l. 4, 17, and 33; and that it is in connection with the capture of

\* The reader however may, if he please, refer in addition to Jer. iii. 18—23; xxx. 3; Ezekiel xxxix. 25, 40. and Hosea i. 11; and there are a few other texts which will require to be noticed in the argument which follows.

the literal Babylon by Cyrus. He maintains, therefore, that the prediction was then fully accomplished, and that the reconciliation between the two houses, which it is then declared should take place, was also then fulfilled, so that we hear not afterwards of any schism.

In answer to this, two or three things may be briefly but decisively urged. First, the prophecy concerning Babylon is not to be limited to the Babylon existing in the time of Cyrus; various circumstances connected with the prophecy manifest the contrary, among which one connected with Israel will be sufficient for our present purpose: viz. that at verses 19—24, there is a reference to Israel, as the Lord's "*battle-axe and weapons of war,*" which is made instrumental in the vengeance on Babylon; and it may be asked, Was Israel made a *weapon of war* in the Lord's hand in the time of Cyrus, or in any way instrumental in inflicting that vengeance? It may further be asked, Were the Lord's people *called out* of Babylon, and afforded an opportunity of escape, previous to the attack by the Medes,—as it is distinctly intimated in both chapters they should be at the overthrow of Babylon, which is there principally intended? (l. 8; li. 45.) Besides, this Babylon was not destroyed by Cyrus, in the manner stated in verses 13 and 26; for the conquest and change of dynasty cannot be considered as "*an end*" of that city. And as to the Israelites who were of the ten tribes, the main body of them would not be affected by the conquest of Babylon by the kings of the Medes, (li. 11.) seeing that they were actually in previous captivity to the Medes themselves; for they were placed in "Halab and Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." (2 Kings xvii. 6; xviii. 11.)

(2.) But there is *historical* evidence brought forward by this writer from Josephus and Philo to show that there actually were, between the period of the return from Babylon and the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, vast numbers of the ten tribes in Judea, and large colonies of them in other places; and that Jerusalem was continually visited by deputies from them with offerings. Other writers contend that a sufficiency of individuals of the ten tribes returned with the Jews under Zorobabel, to constitute it virtually a return of the captivity of the nation. Whilst T. K. observes, in regard to the previous jealousy between the tribes: "So entirely do these feelings appear to have ceased, that the writer of the Maccabees gives to the united population the name of *Israel*—a name which I suppose would be the very last he would have employed, if any portion of the former jealousy remained," p. 32.

This latter circumstance would be anything but satisfactory,



in the way of proof, even supposing there were no contrary evidence; for the Jews have an equal right to be denominated *Israel*, with the members of the ten tribes. But the simple reply, and a completely sufficient one, is to be found in *Ezra* i. 5, vi. 17—21, and viii. 35. In the two latter places he calls them all *Israel*, and speaks of an offering of *twelve* he-goats, according to the number of the *tribes* of *Israel*; which has caused some to conclude that all the tribes were there present. But in the former of these three places the same *Ezra* calls the whole company that returned "*Judah and Benjamin.*" Further, although *Josephus* speaks of the number of the ten tribes who came up to *Jerusalem*, and that "many of them came, on the decree of *Artaxerxes*, with their effects to *Babylon*, desiring to return;" he nevertheless adds, that the main body abode still in *Media*; and therefore (he says) "there are *two* tribes living in *Asia* and *Europe* in subjection to the *Romans*; but the *ten* tribes are beyond the *Euphrates* to this time." (*Antiq. lib. ii. c. 5. sect. 2.*) As to the *Israelites* (or *Jews*, for they were probably in most instances of the latter,) who came up to *Jerusalem* for devout purposes, (*Acts* ii. 5.) there were many in *Hezekiah's* time, who came up gladly to the *Passover* from out of the tribes of *Asher*, *Manasseh*, and *Zebulun*, whilst yet the main body of the nation laughed to scorn the deputies sent to them by the king of *Judah*. *2 Chron. xxx. 10, 11.*

There are yet, however, two or three important testimonies to be derived from scripture, which will tend to put this matter beyond a question. The first is, that the prophet *Zechariah*, who prophesied *after* the return from *Babylon*, does nevertheless foretell a future restoration of "the house of *Judah* and the house of *Joseph*," concerning whom the Lord thus speaks by him.—"I will bring them again to place them:"—"and they of *Ephraim* (or *Joseph*,) shall be like a mighty man, &c."—"I will hiss for them and gather them, &c."—"I will bring them again also out of the land of *Egypt*, and gather them out of *Assyria*, and I will bring them into the land of *Gilead* and *Lebanon*, and place shall not be found for them. And he shall pass through the sea with affliction,\* and shall smite the waves of the sea, and all the deeps of the river shall dry up, &c." How exactly this corresponds with the prophecies already considered, and how irreconcilable is it all with the return from *Babylon*!

Secondly, as regards those *Israelites* of the ten tribes who accompanied the *Jews* on their return from *Babylon*,† the case

\* *Jerome Arias*, and the *Septuagint* have it not, "through the sea with affliction," but—"by a *strait* of the sea."

† The number could not have been very great, seeing that the *whole* multitude only amounted to about fifty thousand.

is exactly provided for in Ezekiel xxxvii. At verses 16, 17, the prophet is directed to take one stick and write upon it, "For JUDAH, and for the *children of Israel his companions.*" Here we have Judah and his companions of the house of Israel, as they attached themselves to him during the captivity, and, as it is admitted, they came up with him from Babylon. But the prophet is next directed to take another stick, and write upon it, "For JOSEPH, the stick of EPHRAIM, and for *all the house of Israel his companions,*" and join them one to another in one stick. The Lord then goes on to declare the meaning of this: "Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen, whither they be gone, and will gather them on *every side*, and bring them into their *own land*: and I will make them *one nation* in the land upon the mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall no more be *two* nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. Neither shall they defile themselves any more with their idols, nor with their detestable things, nor with *any* of their transgressions, &c." (verses 21—23.) This is very contrary to the charges of abomination and wickedness which Christ brought against them in his days. But the prophet goes on to declare, "that they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they and their prince, and their children, and their children's children for ever, and my servant David shall be their prince for ever." Ver. 25. And then the prophecy goes on to say, "that the Lord's *sanctuary* shall be with them for evermore," and also his "tabernacle;" whereas we know that they have all of them been now, for nearly 1800 years without sanctuary or tabernacle at all. On the foregoing verses just quoted, the author of an animated and pertinent tract, on this subject says: "What do you think they (the people of Israel) understood when they read these words? what *could* they understand? Do you think that when they read of "their own land, the mountains of Israel," or, (as it is called in v. 25,) "the land that I have given to Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt," they understood either *heaven* or the *Gentile church*, in *neither* of which their fathers had ever dwelt? They knew that this prophecy had been given long after the division between Judah and Ephraim; and when had it ever been fulfilled? In what possible sense could it be said, that the house of Israel and the house of Judah had been re-united, and formed "*one nation in*

\* See Acts ii. 34.

the land" under "one king?" Read the whole chapter, and say how they could possibly understand less than that the kingdom of Israel should be restored in the plain and obvious sense of the words?\*"

This portion of the subject may be closed by finally observing, that as the *king* they are to be made one nation under, is here (as also in other places,†) declared to be of the house of *David*, all application of these prophecies to the circumstances of the kingdom of Israel under the princes who ruled from the time of the return from the captivity to Titus, is again forbidden: for the Maccabees were Asmoneans, who ruled to the *exclusion* of David; and they were tributary princes; whereas Jerusalem is under David "to serve herself of those whom she has served."

(3.) But if the ten tribes are to be restored in such wise as that they may be identified, the interesting question arises—*Where are they?* They are declared by Jerome (see on Dan. xi.) to have been existing in or near the places where they were originally located in his time, which enables us to keep them in sight down into the *fifth* century.‡ Mr. Hirschfeld, who has been before quoted, says, that they were still on the banks of the Euphrates, in Persia, and its neighbouring provinces down into the *eleventh* century, "since they had their heads of the captivity, and most flourishing academies; and though considerably weakened by persecution, yet travellers of that nation discovered many synagogues of their brethren in the 12th and 14th centuries." He therefore concludes them to be still there.§ Be this as it may, they have latterly disappeared from the observation of the more civilized portion of mankind; and it has become a subject of very interesting inquiry, with the Christian traveller, the missionary, and the student of prophecy, to ascertain their present place or places of existence.

The hypotheses and conjectures on this head may be resolved into two classes. The first is that which supposes certain nations and tribes of men, who are at present, as regards the mass of them, entirely unconscious of the matter, to have

\* "The Future Destiny of Israel," by a Clergyman of the Church of England. 1830,—p. 7.

† Jer. xxx. 1—9; Ezek. xxxiv.; Hosea iii. 4—5; Zech. xii. 10, &c.

‡ Jerome died about A. D. 420.

§ Mr. Hirschfeld gives no authorities for his statements, and I am unacquainted with his source of information in this particular; otherwise than that synagogues of *Jews* have been found there without any dispute. But the question is, whether they were of the ten tribes, or of Judah and Benjamin: the term *Israelite* has been almost merged for a long period in that of *Jew*, which is applied by some to all, indiscriminately, without question as to tribe.

originally descended from the Israelites. In the year 1650 Thomas Thorowgood, a member of the assembly of divines, published a work called "*Jews in America, or probabilities that the Americans are Jews.*" Sir William Penn at a later period has expressed the same opinion; and it has more recently been revived in a series of papers that appeared in the *Jewish Expositor*, under the title of "The Star in the West," and also in a late publication by Mrs. Barbara Ann Simon, called "The Hope of Israel." Some plausible grounds are given for the opinion, derived chiefly from their customs and superstitions.

I have myself likewise, in a paper published in the *Jewish Expositor*, vol. xiii. p. 125, under the signature Abdiel, endeavoured to demonstrate, by a series of facts, that the Welch or ancient Britons have a Jewish origin; which is therein proved by the similarity of language, names, ancient customs, superstition, and other circumstances.\*

The same affinity might perhaps be claimed for the Irish, and perhaps for many others. But, however plausible, and even convincing, such hypotheses may be, as establishing the origin of a nation, it appears to me that the evidence of the identity of any people with the ten tribes must be of a character more immediately obvious, being sustained by tradition among themselves, and supported perhaps by genealogical tables. This brings us to the second class of evidence.

The Jews of Cochin, on the coast of Malabar, have been supposed to be of the ten tribes. Bryant, speaking of them, says, "they came there, according to Hamilton, as early as the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar." But Dr. Buchanan, who visited them in 1806, considers them to be Jews of the tribe of Benjamin, who came there after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. They are in number about one thousand, about one-half of whom are white and the other half black. Mr. Joseph Wolff, the eminent Jewish missionary, who has since visited them, makes a distinction between the white Jews and the black Jews, which may tend to reconcile both these accounts: and he is decidedly of opinion that the Beni-Israel around and at Bombay are of the ten tribes. Page 194.†

\* It may be interesting also to some to notice here, in reference to the American Indians, that the Welch may claim the honour of having discovered America at an earlier period than Columbus; as appears from a passage concerning an adventurer of the name of Madoc, (which is the same as *Mordecai* and *Merodoch*) in Lloyd's History of Cambria. He traces various British names given to places and objects in America; and if this be so, it is just possible that some of the customs alluded to among the Indians were derived intermediately from the Welch.

† It is from the journal of this enterprising traveller, for 1831—4, recently published, to which this and subsequent references are made.

Another race of people worthy of note are the *Afghans* or *Affghans* in Persia; though the accounts respecting them are in some measure conflicting. We learn from 2 Kings xvii. 6, and xviii. 11, (as before has been noticed) that some of the ten tribes were anciently placed down at Halah and Habor. Mr. Wolff in his recent journey to Persia and ancient Media, was informed by the Jews of Bokhara and Balk in Toorkestaun, both of them cities which he visited, that they are the ancient Habor and Halah; but that the Jews lost their written accounts of this matter in the time of Jenghis Khan. This account was corroborated by the Mussulman mallahs; who told him further, that the first name of Balk was *Hanah*, and afterwards *Halah*, and that it had been built by a son of Adam. This seems to decide, so far as tradition can do it, that this is the region in which the ten tribes were formerly located.

In regard to the inhabitants of this region, Mr. Wolff obtained further accounts. He states that the same Jews of Bokhara informed him, that they emigrated from Babylon to Persia, and settled at Sabzawar, two days' journey from *Meshed*; and that before the time of Jenghis Khan they were carried to Balk and Samarcand. When Samarcand fell into ruins a great number of them went to Bokhara; and *there*, they say, they found *many who had originally come from Babylon*, and of whom *many had emigrated to China*, which they call *Tsheen Patsheen*; and that these took their genealogies with them. Pages 187 and 194.

*Meshed* having been named above, as connected with that district, it will next be useful to inquire what account Mr. Wolff gives of the Jews of this place; and what were their opinions also of the *Affghans*. Mr. Wolff says that the Jews of *Meshed* have not the Talmud; that they keep themselves entirely secluded from their neighbours, and never intermarry with them, nor even with the Jews of Yazd, on account of the bad character of the latter; that they have no hatred towards Jesus Christ, neither have those of Toorkestaun and Khoros-saun; which caused Mr. Wolff to infer, that they were of the ten tribes who had no share in the crucifixion. Page 159. He further states that these Jews believe the *Affghans* to be descendants of the Jews; an admission which we may be quite sure a Jew would be slow to make in regard to those who are living as Gentiles, unless he had strong and irresistible reasons for so concluding. And he adds, that Aga Levi, one of these Jews, informed him that the tribes of *Benjamin*, *Simeon*, and *Joseph* were carried to *Candahar*, where they lost their books, and then turned Mahommedans. Page 134.

On the other hand, Mr. Wolff has some *doubts* respecting the Affghans; First, because they have not the Jewish physiognomy; secondly, because there existed a contrary tradition, that they were descended from the *Copts*; thirdly, because he could only trace one word in their language which was strictly Hebrew, viz. אור *or*, light, (p. 231.) He confesses, however, that there were two tribes of this people—the *Youssuf Szeye* and the *Khaibaree*, “which cannot be looked upon without astonishment. They are the only two tribes having a Jewish countenance: their customs are quite patriarchal; and they are the most hospitable of the Affghans,”\* (p. 242.) Mr. Wolff also believes, and gives the positive proof of documents on the subject, that the proper names of the Affghans in general are in numerous instances Jewish. They have many Hebrew names in their genealogy in tracing themselves up to *Affghana* their ancestor. This Affghana, according to an ancient Persian manuscript, is the son of one *Irmiah* or Jeremiah, and before him all is regularly Hebrew up to Abraham. (p. 241–2.)

The opposing testimony to Mr. Wolff, as regards their language, is of high authority. Sir William Jones says, that the best Persian historians declare them to be descended from the Jews;† and that their families are distinguished by the names of the Jewish tribes: although, since their conversion to Islamism, they studiously conceal their origin.—“The Pushtoo language (he adds) *of which I have seen a dictionary, has a manifest resemblance to the Chaldaic.*” And he notices the fact, that the Apocryphal Ezra speaks of a portion of the ten tribes who separated from the rest, and settled in a district which he calls *Arsareth*, and that there was then a considerable district under the dominion of the Affghans, which they called Hazareth or Hazaret.‡ Captain S. Riley of Nusseerabad, a letter from whom is likewise inserted in the Journal (p. 227,) believes the Affghans to be of Jewish descent; on account of the great number of Hebrew proper names in their appellatives, and their dialect still retaining the genitive sign of the Chaldee, and other marks of cognate affinity. The missionaries Carey and Marshman state “that in the Pushtoo or Affghan language there are more

\* Mr. Wolff also instances some remarkable *customs* observed in another tribe of them, which he calls the Kaffre Seeah Poosh: viz. in their sacrifices they sprinkle the blood of the victim (a sheep or a cow) on an idol which is sitting on a horse, and the meat they give to men. They have a throne of stone, in which are some words taken from the Pentateuch of Moses. They distinguish between clean and unclean animals,—mice, dogs, and fish being of the latter: and women after childbirth are separated from them for three days, and considered unclean. (See Lev. xii. 2–6.) Page 246.

† In Burnes' Travels to Bokhara he states, that they *look like Jews*, and that the younger brother marries the widow of the elder. Vol. i. p. 164.

‡ Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 336.



Hebrew words than in that of any other nation:"\* and they quote a learned Affghan as saying, "that his nation are *Beni Israel*, but not *Yahood*"—that is to say, sons of Israel, but not Jews.

The most reasonable conclusion therefore is, that Mr. Wolf is mistaken in regard to their language. He did not understand it, but merely picked up a few words as he travelled, which were given to him in answer to his inquiries, as the names of objects to which he probably pointed. This afforded him no opportunity of judging of the inflexions of the words as they come under regimen; which is the point to which Captain Riley speaks: nor is a column or two of words accidentally assorted, to be put in competition with the *dictionary* which Sir William Jones declares he inspected. Neither does it account for the admitted fact of the number of Hebrew appellatives.

Other places have been named, in which it is supposed the descendants of the ten tribes have existed; as the kingdom of Cashmere in Hindostan, and the interior of Africa; both mentioned by Basnage in his History of the Jews.† I do not however wish to enter into conjectural matter, excepting with regard to one instance; which is based upon a hint contained in scripture, and therefore entitled to consideration. I must preface it, however, with the observation, that the fact of the existence of the ten tribes having in later years become involved in considerable obscurity, is no argument against the literal fulfilment of the prophetic word respecting them, but a very striking confirmation of its literal certainty and truth: since the scriptures themselves speak of them as if removed from observation previous to their restoration. They are called in the first instance "*outcasts of Israel*," as distinguished from the "*dispersed of Judah*," (Isa. xi. 12.) and on their restoration Zion is described as exclaiming, "Who hath begotten

\* See a note in Mr. Bickersteth's "Guide to Prophecy," p. 51.

† Bernier, in his description of Hindoostan, gives ground to conclude that Cashmere was anciently possessed by either Jews, or the posterity of the ten tribes, and that they apostatized. Mr. Wolf could find none there on his recent visit, but picked up traditionary accounts that many of them had emigrated into Tartary. And Basnage quotes the opinions of travellers, as to there being large colonies of the ten tribes in Tartary; and also that there existed in the neighbourhood of Persia, secured by mountains which surrounded them, and independent of the Persian power, a race of Jews, who were in their habits very like Tartars, having flocks and dwelling in tents. (Bk. vi. ch. 2, 3, &c.) Mr. Habershon, in his recently published "Dissertation on the Prophecies," speaking of the *Ten Tribes*, says, "Various communications have lately been made to the world, through Jews who have visited the Leipsic fair, as well as by means of an Oriental Geographical Society established at Calcutta, that a people exist in the interior of Asia, whose usages, physiognomy, and other characteristics, prove them to belong to the Hebrew nation." Page 181.

me these, seeing I have lost my children, and am desolate, a captive, and removing to and fro? And who hath brought up these? Behold I was left alone: *these, where had they been?* Thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people, and *they shall bring THY SONS in their arms, and thy daughters shall be carried on their shoulders?*" (Isaiah xlix. 21, 22.)

In Isaiah, however, chap. xvi. 3, 4, the prophet thus addresses *Moab*:\* "Take counsel, execute judgment; make thy shadow as the night in the midst of the noon-day; *hide the outcasts; bewray not him that wandereth. Let MINE OUTCASTS dwell with THEE, MOAB;—be THOU a covert to them from the face of the spoiler,*"—immediately connected with which words are expressions which seem to imply, that thus it shall be, until that determined be poured out upon the desolator, and the spoiler shall cease from out of the land.—"For the extortioner is at an end, the spoiler ceaseth, the oppressors are consumed out of the land; and in mercy shall the throne be established, and HE shall sit upon it in truth in the tabernacle of David, judging, seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness." It would follow from this that the territory of *Moab* affords a covert for the ten tribes; and Mr. Keith in treating on Dan. xi. 41,—"*these [countries] shall escape out of his hand, even Edom and Moab and the chief of the children of Ammon,*"—shews that there is to this day, in the possession of the Arabs, a district called *Kurak*, and also *Moab*, which never has been conquered by the Turkish arms; but that the Porte is indeed itself compelled to pay tribute to the Arabs of those parts, in order to obtain permission for the caravans to pass by their territory unmolested. And within this district is that part of Arabia *Petrea*, the inhabitants of which are so exceedingly jealous of strangers penetrating into their defiles and rocks and hills, that none have both successfully penetrated and fully discovered that singular region.†

3. There are other points worthy of notice in regard to the restoration, some of which are likewise somewhat involved in obscurity, from the circumstance that the different texts which

\* In regard to *Moab*, I consider the prophecy here cited has respect to the territory and geographical circumstances of the country, whatever the inhabitants in possession of it may be called. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the captivity of *Moab* is to return. (Deut. ii. 9. Jer. xlviii. 47; xlix. 6.)

† Mr. Keith does not make these remarks with any reference to the ten tribes. Particulars will be found in his work on the Evidence of Prophecy; and the circumstance of *Moab* being a covert for the Ten Tribes is more largely handled in the Investigator, vol. iv. p. 342. *Egypt* is also there mentioned, as being a country from whence they will in numbers proceed. See Lowth on Isaiah xix. 18—25.

treat of them have never yet been sufficiently considered, compared one with the other, and adjusted into their exact situations in the prophetic narrative. For example, there are passages which seem to declare that their *repentance* does not ensue until after their return, (or at least the return of a *portion* of them—which I hold to be the more probable opinion, and that these will be of *Judah*,) and that the nations have come up to besiege them. The Fathers of antiquity, who at least were acquainted with the earlier traditions of the church on the subject, thought that they would be restored in an unconverted state, by means of human policy, and that they would be the first to declare for *Antichrist*, who would march against Jerusalem and easily conquer it, and then cajole them by flatteries and impose upon them by spurious miracles. They farther supposed, that Antichrist will, in the first instance, rebuild the city and temple of Jerusalem, and that the Jews will deceive themselves with the hope, that the kingdom of Israel will be restored by his means to its former splendour.\*

Certain it is, from the word of God, “that Zion shall be redeemed with judgment, and her converts with righteousness; and the destruction of the transgressors and of the sinners shall be together, and they that forsake the Lord shall be consumed.” (Isa. i. 27, 28.) And this is to be at the very period when “the Lord shall restore her judges as at the first, and her counsellors as at the beginning; and *afterwards* she shall be called, “The City of Righteousness, the Faithful City.” (v. 26.) And it shall come to pass, that he that is *left* in Zion, and he that *remaineth* in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, every one that is written among *the living in Jerusalem*; when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, *by the spirit of judgment and by the spirit of burning.*” Isaiah iv. 3, 4. This cannot refer to either of the two sieges of Jerusalem which have already occurred; for there were none *left remaining and written among the living in Jerusalem* on those occasions; nor was the judgment followed (as in this case it is declared it shall be) by the Lord creating upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her

\* See Aretas in Apoc. ix. 14; Lactant. lib. vii. cap. 17; Cyril Hieros. Catech. 15. § 7; Theodoret in Daniel xi. Jerome Epist. ad Aglas. Quæst. Œcimen. in 2 Thess. ii. Ephraim Syrus de Antichristo. Hippolytus de Consum. p. 12. Sulp. Sev. 2 Dial.

John v. 43, has been supposed by some to be a prophetic denunciation of our Lord to the Jews, that in the last days, because they now rejected Christ, there should arise one who should glorify himself and whom they should receive. “I am come in my Father’s name, and ye receive me not: *if another shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.*”—See Dr. Hildrop on Antichrist, p. 120.

assemblies, "a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night." (verse 5.) But these scriptures seem to point to a time when there shall be a siege: and Zechariah xiv. 1, 2, decides it: "Behold the day of the Lord cometh, and thy spoil shall be divided in the midst of thee; for I will gather *all nations* against Jerusalem to battle, and the city shall be taken and the houses rifled; and the women ravished; and half of the city shall go forth into captivity, and the *residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.*" In Isaiah x. is a prophecy concerning some signal enemy of the Lord's people, under the title of *The Assyrian*. Most expositors consider it the same as the wilful king of Daniel xi. and the Antichrist of the last days; be this as it may, the whole scope of the prophecy indicates, as well as particular sentences of it, that it chiefly refers to a period yet to come. It seems that the hypocritical portion of the nation shall lean upon this personage; and that the Lord by his means shall afflict them, but ultimately turn his hand against him. The expression in verse 20,—"*And it shall come to pass in that day, that the remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth,*"—seems to justify the opinion of the Fathers before mentioned, that they shall be seduced by the Antichrist. And the probability is, that some political movement will take place, in accordance with the liberal spirit of the age, which shall reinstate the Jews (i. e. the two tribes) in their own land; and that though there will be among them a people afflicted for their sin and poor in spirit, whom the Lord will deliver as an election out of the midst of them; yet the "strange children shall dissemble with him," and they shall trust in princes, and lean upon the arm of flesh, and possibly again on *Egypt*, and these are "the rebels" whom the Lord shall consume from out of the midst of them, and purely purge away the dross and tin of the nation.

I consider the following texts perfectly reconcileable with the view here taken; viz.—Ezekiel xi. 14—21; xx. 33—44; xxxvi. 16—38; Zephaniah iii. 8—13; Zechariah xii. 1—4; and a careful consideration of them will well repay the student of prophecy. The only part of them difficult to reconcile is, verse 34, 35, of Ezek. xx., where the Lord says, he will "bring them out from the countries in which they are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched-out arm, and with fury poured out: and I will bring you into the *wilderness* of the people, and there will I plead with you face to face; &c." but

this I conceive may belong to a later period of their deliverance, which I will next proceed to notice.

There is, as was observed in the last chapter, an intimate connexion between the restoration of Israel, and that tremendous series of *Judgments* by which the Lord will contend with and overthrow all nations. It comprehends two principal future epochs, with probably only a very short period between them. In the former the Jews themselves will be overtaken by affliction and will dreadfully suffer. To the first of these acts in the great drama I apprehend Jeremiah xxx. refers, when, after declaring that the Lord will bring again the captivity of Israel and Judah, (v. 3. 4.) he adds—"For thus saith the Lord: We have heard a voice of trembling of fear, and not of peace. Ask ye now, and see, whether a *man* doth travail with child? Wherefore do I see every man with his hands on his loins, as a woman in travail, and all faces turned into paleness? Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even *the time of Jacob's TROUBLE*: but he shall be saved out of it." V. 5—7. This is probably the *commencement*,—the first stage, (as just observed) in the tribulation mentioned by Daniel xii. 1; who says, "At that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book."\*

But having thus purified them, and as it would appear from other scriptures *appeared* to them, (Zech. xiv. 4) the Lord will go forth against those nations which have congregated against Jerusalem,† and a most signal and awful destruction will ensue; which, though accompanied by miraculous circumstances, will also be in part accomplished by the instrumentality of Israel and Judah themselves. And now it is I apprehend that a portion of the ten tribes will be brought out of Moab and Ammon, and other places, and start into existence, so that a nation will be born in a day; the Lord as it were going up before them.‡ "In that day the Lord will make Jerusalem *a cup of trembling* unto all the people round about, when they shall be in the siege both against Judah and Jerusalem; and in that day will I make Jerusalem a *burdensome stone* for all people: all

\* Mr. Cuninghame says, (p. 499) "There are passages of the prophetic word which unequivocally indicate to us, that the political resuscitation of Israel in the flesh is to be the event, which shall in a peculiar manner stir up the enmity of the powers of the world and give occasion to the mighty confederacy which shall be broken at Armageddon."

† Ezek. xxxix. Joel iii. 2—14.

‡ Isaiah lii. 6—12. Hosea i. 7. Micah ii. 12, 13.



that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces, though all the people of the earth be gathered together against it." Zech. xii. 2, 3. "In that day (saith the Lord) will I make the governors of Judah like an *hearth of fire* among the wood, and like a *torch of fire* in a sheaf; and they shall devour all the people round about, &c. The Lord also will save the *tents\** of Judah first." V. 6, 7. "And it shall come to pass in that day, that a great tumult from the Lord shall be among them, (the *nations* gathered round Jerusalem,) and they shall lay hold every one on the hand of his neighbour, and his hand shall rise up against the hand of his neighbour: and Judah also shall fight at Jerusalem." Zech. xiv. 13, 14. "And the remnant of *Jacob* shall be among the Gentiles in the midst of many people, as a lion among the beasts of the forests, as a young lion among the flocks of sheep, &c. Mic. v. 8. "Turn you to the strong hold, ye prisoners of hope: even to-day do I declare that I will render double unto thee, when I have bent *Judah* for me; filled the bow with *Ephraim*, (as arrows) and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece:" (Zech. ix. 12) "for the Lord hath made Judah his *goodly horse* in the battle," and his "*battle bow*;" (x. 3, 4) and of Israel he says, "Thou art my *battle-axe and weapons of war*; for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms." Jer. li. 20. "Arise, and thresh, O daughter of Zion; for I will make thine horn iron, and I will make thy hoofs brass; and thou shalt beat in pieces many people, and I will consecrate their gain unto the Lord, and their substance unto the Lord of the whole earth." Micah iv. 13.

It were easy to oppress the reader with passages of this description: let him, if he wishes for more, read Isaiah xxxiv. xli. 14—16; lix. 16—21. Ezekiel xxviii. 24—26. Haggai ii. 21—23. Obadiah 17, 18.

After this consumption decreed upon the Gentiles, and the Lord hath recompensed them upon their own pate for the controversies of the nations, there will apparently take place the gathering out of all nations of the rest of Israel or Judah, who have not previously been induced to come up.—"For I know

\* I quote this next line merely to take the opportunity of observing, that I do not understand it. I at first took up the interpretation I have somewhere met with, that this deliverance was to be in behalf of *Judah*, in preference to *Israel*; but the reason given for it in the Scripture is,—that the house of *David* (who was of *Judah*) and the glory of the inhabitants of *Jerusalem*, do not magnify themselves against *JUDAH*. The key to it is possibly verse 5.—"And the governors of Judah shall say in their heart, *The INHABITANTS OF JERUSALEM shall be my strength*, in the Lord of hosts their God;" that is, independently of these, who are a portion of Judah *encamped* in the vicinity, or in the open towns and unwall'd villages. See Ezekiel xxxviii. 11.



their works and their thoughts; (saith the Lord:) it shall come that I will gather all nations and tongues (the context is, when he shall "plead by fire and by his sword with all flesh;") and they shall come and see my glory. And I will set a sign amongst them; and I will send those that *escape* of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, to the isles afar off that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles; and they shall bring *ALL your brethren* for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses and in chariots, and in litters, (or *coaches*, margin) and upon mules and upon swift beasts, &c. Isaiah lxvi. 18—20. At this juncture it is, I apprehend, that the tongue of the Egyptian sea will be destroyed, and a passage made both in the Euphrates and in the Nile;" "and there shall be an highway for the remnant of his people *which shall be left*:"—the context shews that this is *after* the battle. Isaiah xi. 15. Zech. x. 11. And then "the nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lay their hand upon their mouth, their ears shall be deaf: they shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth, they shall be afraid of the Lord our God, and shall fear because of thee." Micah vii. 17. "The sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee; and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet; and they shall call thee, The City of the Lord, The Zion of the Holy One of Israel." See also Isaiah xlix. 23, and Rev. iii. 9.

Of one thing, in conclusion, I must advertise the Reader; viz. that what I have advanced under this section of the subject, is offered more in the way of suggestion and inquiry, than in the confidence of demonstration. The grand features, which stand out in the whole chapter, of a future literal restoration and purification both of Judah and Ephraim, together with tremendous judgments and destruction to be poured out upon the gentile nations, none can well mistake. The adjustment of details and circumstantialia are necessarily a matter of perplexity and difficulty previous to the event. I trust, however, that more able and more diligent students of God's word will yet be raised up to pursue this deeply interesting subject, and through the blessing of God more clearly to unravel and adjust its various particulars.\* We may be quite certain that every tittle of what God hath spoken will be found strictly

\* Among the texts which I find it difficult properly to place are Jer. xxxi. 31—33, and xxxii. 36—41. But I presume they refer to the second stage in the gathering of Israel.

reconcilable and most exactly according with all the other minutiae of his revelation. "All the words of his mouth are in righteousness; there is nothing froward or perverse in them; they are all *PLAIN* to him that understandeth, and *RIGHT* to them that find knowledge." Proverbs viii. 8, 9.

In the mean while there are practical considerations which must force themselves upon the attention of all who believe the word of God in this matter. It is evident that *all nations*, not excepting our own highly favoured and privileged country, will be brought within the vortex of this tremendous "whirlwind;" and when the Lord shall no longer keep silence, but arise to shake terribly the earth, we may truly ask:—"Who shall live when God doeth this?" "Who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap." Numb. xxiv. 23. Mal. iii. 2. There are *some* however, "who shall be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of Man." Luke xxi. 36. Those who—as the context of the latter place informs us—suffer not that day to come upon them *unawares* through surfeiting and cares of this life, but are watchful and pray always; (verses 34—36.) those "who sigh and cry for all the abominations that are done in the midst of their church and nation;" (Ezek. ix. 4.) those "who fear the Lord and speak often one to another;" (Mal. ii. 16.)—on those the Lord will set a mark, and they need not fear in the days of evil, when the iniquity of their heels compasseth them about;" (Psalm xlix. 5.) for "they shall be *mine*, saith the Lord of Hosts in that day when I make up my jewels; and I will *spare* them, as a man spareth his own son that serveth him." Mal. ii. 17.

We are also admonished by this subject of what we owe toward *Israel*. It is well worthy of note, how *jealous* the Lord is in behalf of this people; insomuch, that though he makes use of a nation as his rod to chastise Israel, yet has he it in readiness to avenge himself on that same nation, if they take occasion therefrom to shew contempt or malignity against them. In Isa. xlvi. 6, he rebukes and threatens the Chaldeans—because "I was wroth with my people, I have polluted mine inheritance, and given them into thine hand: *thou didst shew them no mercy*; upon the ancient hast thou very heavily laid the yoke."—"Therefore shall evil come upon thee," &c. ver. 11. So in Zech. i. 15, the Lord says, "I am very sore displeased with the heathen that are at ease, [the context indicates that they are easy in regard to the oppression and destitute condition of Israel;] for I was but a little displeased, and they helped forward the affliction." The prophet then has an

assurance, on the one hand, that the Lord will yet comfort Zion, and will yet choose Jerusalem, (ver. 17;) and then he sees four horns, which are explained to be symbols of the four powers that have scattered Judah, Israel, and Jerusalem; and he sees four carpenters, who come to fray them, and to cast out the horns of the gentiles, which lifted up their horn over the land of Judah, to scatter it. Ver. 16—24. This should lead us to *fear*, lest we should be involved in those judgments which will fall upon the nations, when the Lord holds his controversy with them for these things. We may not be able to avert vengeance from the nation; but we can at least act, individually, as Rahab did; who, foreseeing the wrath that was coming on her own people, and moved by fear, conciliated the Lord in good time, by shewing kindness to his *people*. And they appear to be now thrown in our way, and brought as it were to every man's door, (for where is the nation that has not Jews scattered among them?) on purpose to put to the test our bowels of compassion towards them. And if, on the one hand, there is need to fear the jealousy of the Lord if we despise or neglect them, we may, on the other hand, be assured of his favour, if, out of love to Him, we do them good. In regard to Israel, it is still, "*Blessed* is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is he that curseth thee." Numb. xxiv. 9. And with the exhortation to "pray for the peace of Jerusalem, we have the gracious assurance—THEY SHALL PROSPER THAT LOVE THEE." Psalm cxxii. 6.

4. There still remains a point for consideration which must be the subject of another section, viz.—what will be the glory of the new Jerusalem dispensation; and what participation will the saints who are already gathered to their fathers have in it.

(1.) It is evident from a multitude of scriptures, that the glory of Israel will now be pre-eminent; and that all that has been excellent and holy in every preceding dispensation to mankind will be concentrated in this, with a very great increase of it.

To them shall come the first dominion among the nations, (Mic. iv. 8) and the whole forces of the Gentiles will then flow to Zion, (Isa. lx. 5, 7) and she shall clothe herself with them as a bride putteth on her attire, (Isa. xlix. 18) and kings shall be nursing fathers, and queens nursing mothers to her, (ibid. v. 23.) Then shall be realized, in the fullest sense of the term, *an universal empire*; and that which has been the desire of all nations (viz. righteous and secure government, see p. 155) shall then be enjoyed; for her counsellors and judges and princes will be righteous, and all her minor officers and

exactors peace and righteousness; (Isa. xxxii. 1, lx. 17; Jer. xxx. 21,) and all things will be consecrated to Jehovah; so that from the very pots used in their domestic affairs, to the bells which tinkle on their horses, it shall be "*holiness to the Lord.*" Zech. xii. 20. Their kingdom is one that cannot be moved; (Heb. xii. 28.) and in it there shall be stability and strength of salvation. Isa. xxxiii. 6.

And as they shall have universal empire, so also will they obtain another great desideratum among the humble followers of God, viz. *conformity in church government*—Jerusalem will be as a city that is at unity in itself; and all the nations shall come up to the mountain of the Lord's house to worship; (Isa. ii. 2; Micah iv. 2; Zech. viii. 23;)—and of Israel will the Lord take for priests and Levites, and make them the ministers among all nations, (Isa. lxi. 6; lxvi. 21.) "And in that day there shall be ONE LORD, and his NAME ONE." Zech. xiv. 9.

And as they have been put to rebuke, and have been a proverb and a hiss among all: so the Lord will "get them fame in every land where they have been put to shame." Zeph. iii. 19. "All that see them shall acknowledge that they are the seed whom the Lord hath blessed;" (Isa. lxi. 9) and he will make them a blessing,—yea "*showers of blessing*" to the nations; (Ezek. xxxv. 26; Zech. viii. 13) so that the receiving of them shall indeed prove as life from the dead. Rom. xi. 15.

It has been stated in the previous section, from Zech. xiv. 4, 5, that the Lord will *personally appear* again at this time: this is further evident from Rom. xi. 26, where St. Paul, speaking of the restoration and conversion of the Jews says, "And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written—There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant with them when I take away their sins." The quotation is from Isaiah lix. 20, and the connexion is, the great previous deliverance experienced "when the enemy comes in like a flood;" and the "fury to his adversaries and recompense to his enemies, which the Lord now repays." Verse 17, 19. "When the Lord shall build up Zion, *he shall appear* in his glory." Psalm cii. 16. And then shall he himself be governor among the nations, and KING over *all the earth*. Psalm xxii. 28. Jer. xxx. 9. Ezek. xxxiv. 24; xxxvii. 24, 25.

It is not, as I apprehend, until this complete restoration or conversion of Israel, confirmed by the decree and secured by the mighty deliverance of the GREAT KING, that the land will be finally divided, and that city and temple built which is to remain. The previous proceedings have apparently been un-

authorized and self-willed, not to say rebellious, and in dependence on the counsel and assistance of apostate men. It is not till after the tribulation that they receive the divine fiat to build houses and inhabit them, and to plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof. Isaiah xlv. 26; lxxv. 21. Ezek. xxviii. 26. Then will they inherit the land (as the Rev. T. Scott admits, in his "Restoration of Israel") to the utmost limits of the grants made to the patriarchs."

Its great boundaries will be the Mediterranean, the Nile, and the Euphrates, including Philistia, Moab, Ammon, Arabia, Idumea, Goshen, and other places not before possessed, (Gen. xv. 13—21. Exod. xxiii. 31. Deut. xi. 22. \*) The division is altogether different from that made by Joshua, or that enjoyed after the return from the captivity. And as the land is thus *extended*, so also will it be *renewed*—probably by the operation of *fire*, so that it will bring forth abundantly.† And in it will be rebuilt the city and temple of Jerusalem, promises of which are contained in Jer. xxx. 18, 21; xxxi. 38—40; xxxiii. 10, 11. Zech. xii. 6, &c.; and also in Ezekiel, of which place there will be occasion to speak presently. The temple described by Ezekiel is evidently not like that built by Solomon; for Solomon's was contained in a square of 60 cubits, whereas Ezekiel's will cover a square of 500 cubits.

Some have supposed that there will be literally a restoration of sacrifices, (as Mr. Tyso, Mr. Begg, and the editor of the Morning Watch;) and there is very much in Ezekiel's account of the matter which can scarcely be explained but upon this hypothesis: nor does there, when it is duly considered, appear anything inconsistent with the truths of the gospel, that those sacrifices, which before the Lord's coming set forth his precious bloodshedding *prospectively*, should after the Jews are restored set it forth *retrospectively*, in the same manner as it is even now actually set forth in the Lord's Supper: "for as oft as we eat of that bread and drink of that cup, we do show forth the Lord's death till he come." Nevertheless, there are great difficulties in the way of this hypothesis; for not only is there much in the Epistle to the Galatians and Hebrews, which appears incompatible with it,—so that the resumption of sacrifices would look like a return to the "beggarly elements" from

\* See for further particulars, Horne's Introduction, vol. iii. p. 4—6. The Egyptian name for the Nile is simply *Phiaro*, or *the river*. (Modern Traveller, vol. i. p. 6.)

† Isaiah xxix. 17; xxxv. 1—9; li. 3, 16; liv. 11—13; lv. 12, 13; lx. 17; lxxv. 17, 25. Ezek. xxxiv. 26, 27; xxxvi. 37. Joel iii. 18. Amos. ix. 13. Other great physical means will then apparently be brought into operation to produce the miraculous drying up of the rivers, the bursting forth of a new river at Jerusalem, the rending of the rocks, &c. (Zech. xiv.)



which the church has been delivered; but many things in Ezekiel's own description of the matter appear inexplicable on this ground. For example, it is admitted that the temple described by him, in which these sacrifices were to be offered, was not erected in his days, nor indeed ever yet has been. Yet the prophet was required to show the whole pattern of the house, with its forms and ordinances, to the people of his own day, in order that *they* might keep the whole *form and ordinances* thereof and do them. Chap. xliii. 10, 11. And Ezekiel was himself commanded to take the seed of Zadoc, and with them officiate in the offerings and sacrifices. Ver. 18—27. But we are nowhere informed that either he or they did so: and if it be supposed to refer to Ezekiel and the sons of Zadoc in their resurrection state, there are directions which seem incompatible with *that* condition;—as for example, verse 18.

(2.) We have further to inquire, as regards this point, how far the literal restoration of Judah and Israel, if accompanied by the second advent of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by his bringing the saints with him,—in other words, by the resurrection of the saints which sleep, and the transformation of the living saints,—is reconcilable with that event. This is a question which likewise involves some difficulty, arising from the incredulousness and prejudice of our minds in regard to details. I do not however see any *real* difficulty in the matter. For as to the mere objection against an intercourse between men in the flesh, and men risen from the dead, on account of its being derogatory to the glory and happiness of the latter, it scarcely needs any remark, seeing that *angels* have frequently communed with men, and are made ministering spirits to them, (Heb. i. 14.) whilst yet we cannot conceive that it subtracts in any degree from their happiness, but rather adds to it. And as therefore we have seen, in the second chapter of this work, that there are distinct promises that Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the cloud of witnesses who have obtained a good report through faith, are to inherit the land, and the city which God hath prepared for them, and which hath the foundations which cannot be moved, (Heb. xi. 9, 10, 16.) there is no reasonable ground to question that these promises will be made good to them in the resurrection: which we have also seen was the opinion of the Jewish and of the ancient Christian church.

At the same time, however, I do not conceive, that the lot will be the same of what I call the saints of the *resurrection* portion of the church, and that portion of Israel which is redeemed in the *flesh*; and which redemption I hold will most probably be *subsequent in time* to the resurrection of the saints, and the rapture of the living saints to meet the Lord in the



air; seeing that the Lord descends upon the Mount of Olives prior to the final gathering of Israel from all corners of the earth; and that a resurrection of many of them that sleep in the dust is mentioned as in immediate connexion with the unparalleled tribulation.\* Zech. xiv. Dan. xii. 2. The very circumstance that the former are possessed of *spiritual* bodies,—yea of *glorified bodies* (Phil. iii. 21)—at once points out a manifest distinction. But when we farther take into consideration the promise made to the apostles, that they should, in the regeneration, sit at the table of Christ, and also sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, (Luke xxii. 30, 31, and compare Matt. xix. 28,) it appears that there is to be a distinguishing glory put upon some by a nearness to the person of Christ, and by a *dominion* also over others. And seeing that in one place the reward given to the faithful servants of Christ is likened to the having authority over ten cities and five cities, (Luke xix. 17, 19,) it would appear that a pre-eminent judgment or dominion over the whole world will probably be given to all the saints who are then raised; which agrees with what is written in various scriptures on this head. Compare Rev. ii. 26. 27; iii. 21; vi. 2; xx. 4. Dan. vii. 22, 27. I do not consider, however, that either Jesus or the saints will *always* be manifested to the world in their glorified bodies; but only at certain times, and perhaps only at Jerusalem, whither the nations will go up to worship; and none will have a right to enter *there*, but what are made holy, (Isaiah lii. 1; xxi. 27; xxii. 14.) It was only *at times* that the kings of Israel sat in the gate in their royal apparel to give judgment: and

\* I am happy to concur in this matter with Mr. Cuninghame, who has given so much attention to the study of prophecy, and who discusses it in general with so much ability. He says, in the last edition of his work on the Apocalypse: "When I published the former editions of this work, not having seen the distinction in time between the advent of our Lord in the air, and his descent to the earth in the day of Armageddon, I conceived that the restoration of Judah was to *precede* the Advent. I now believe that this *restoration* is to begin *just at the rapture of the saints*; and that they are to be led through the wilderness as formerly by the pillar of a cloud by day, and of fire by night, without knowing their conductor as the crucified Nazarene." Page 492.

Though the adjustment of the facts which I have been led to make is in some slight degree different from that of this eminent writer, I will nevertheless add a further extract for the information of the reader:—"That the Lord himself is to lead Israel through the *wilderness*, and plead with them face to face, appears evident from Micah ii. 12, 13; and vii. 15—17, compared with Ezekiel xx. 33—37: yet from Zech. xii. 10. it is apparent that the discovery of the crucified Jesus of Nazareth, as their conductor and guide, belongs to a later period. That the appearance also described in the last passage is a different one from the former is manifest for two reasons; first, it is in another place, viz. Jerusalem; whereas the former was in the wilderness. Ezek. xx. 35. Secondly, it is at a later period; viz. after their restoration to their own land, and when the confederacy of the nations shall have come against Jerusalem; whereas the former was before the restoration."

only *at times* that the glory of the Lord was visibly seen over the tabernacle or filling the temple.

I beg however to advertise the reader in this matter, in the same way that I did in respect to a portion of the last section; viz.—that I offer these things by no means with a decided conviction that I clearly see the proper adjustment and explication of all the particulars; but as suggestions offered by the scriptures themselves, and which seem to bear the aspect which is here given to them. There is however one other consideration which may serve to throw light upon the subject, and which is a point that has been greatly overlooked by many of those who have endeavoured to explain the last chapters of Ezekiel:—it is—that there are actually *two* cities there described, though often confounded as one;—and the more excellent one of them remarkably accords with the description in Rev. xxi. and xxii., and is presumed to be that in which the Lord and the saints will be more immediately manifested. I take not on me to decide this matter, but will present to the reader the words of Mr. Begg, who has written on the subject very ably in his work on the Advent.

“But in this division [of the lands] is to be noticed another and most remarkable circumstance. *Besides* the ancient city of Jerusalem which is to be rebuilt, and in which the sanctuary of the Lord is to be re-erected, particular mention is here made of *another city* of nearly ten miles square, separated by the portion of the Levites, twenty miles in breadth, from that in which the sanctuary is placed: “And the five thousand that are left in the breadth, over against the five and twenty thousand, shall be a *profane* place for THE CITY, for dwelling and for suburbs, and the city shall be in the midst thereof.” Ezek. xlvi. 15. The measurement of this city with its suburbs follow, and it is added,—“And the residue in length, over against the oblation of the holy portion, shall be ten thousand eastward and ten thousand westward, and it shall be over against the oblation of the holy portion; and the increase thereof shall be for food unto them that serve THE CITY. And they that serve the city shall serve it *out of all the tribes of Israel.*” Ezek. xlvi. 15—19. These three compartments, into which the holy oblation is divided, consisting of two of ten thousand reeds each in breadth, and one of five thousand, all being of equal length, render it in the whole *a square of fifty miles*: “All the oblation shall be five and twenty thousand by five and twenty thousand; ye shall offer the Holy Oblation four square with the possession of the city.” Ver. 20.

“This remarkable allotment offered to the Lord, it is to be observed, is situated nearly in the centre of the different por-

tions of all the tribes of Israel, "between the border of Judah and the border of Benjamin," and it is said "shall be for THE PRINCE." After describing the boundaries of the remaining five tribes of Israel (the relative situation of which is also different from what they were formerly,) and again adverting to the measurements of this remarkable city, with the number and names of its gates, the prophecy closes by declaring of it, that "The *name* of THE CITY from that day shall be called, THE LORD IS THERE." "

In another chapter the same author continues: "And I, John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, *coming down from God out of heaven* prepared as a bride adorned for her husband." This celestial city is designed as the residence of Christ and the redeemed, and comes down out of heaven where it is previously "*prepared*," and where it is now "*reserved*" for this purpose.\* "And I heard;" continues the apostle, "a great voice out of heaven, saying, *Behold the tabernacle of God is WITH MEN, and HE will DWELL WITH THEM, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God.*" Ver. 3. This we apprehend is that *second* city seen in vision by Ezekiel, in the holy oblation offered to the Lord in the new division of the holy land. He calls it "*the Most Holy place*" and more frequently "*The City.*"

"There are many coincidences in the account given of it by John with that of Ezekiel. Of the *names* of its gates the prophet says, "And the gates of the city shall be *after the names of the tribes of Israel;*" and he particularizes the respective situations of the different gates by name. Ver. 31—34. The new Jerusalem, as seen by the apostle has also *twelve* gates, "and names written thereon, which are the *names of the twelve tribes of the children of Israel.*" Rev. xxi. 12. The arrangement of these gates is also precisely the same with that given by Ezekiel, viz. "on the east three gates, &c." Ver. 13. This city has an *attendance* enjoyed by no other; for "they that *serve* the city shall serve it out of all the tribes of Israel;" and a portion of the holy oblation is allotted for their maintenance.† Verse 18, 19. Of the *new river* (before referred to) Ezekiel says, upon the bank thereof, on this side and that side, shall grow all trees for meat, whose leaf shall not fade, neither shall the

\* The expressions "*prepared*" "*reserved*" plainly have reference, where the apostle uses them, and also in the four last chapters of Revelation, to the *saints*, who are also the *house* and *city* of God. So that it is the *inhabitants* of the city whom St. John, (as I take it) sees descend; though he afterwards proceeds to describe the fabric of their habitation.

† A parallel to this feature seems to have been intended by Mr. Begg, but accidentally omitted; unless he views the fruit of the trees being given for *meat*, in the next parallel, to apply to this also.

fruit thereof be consumed; it shall bring forth *new* fruit, according to his months, because their waters they issued from the sanctuary. And the fruit thereof shall be for meat, and the *leaf* thereof for *medicine*. Ezek. xlvii. 12. So John also narrates of the New Jerusalem, that in the midst of the street of it, and on *either* side of the river, was there the tree of life (not *one tree* merely, since it grew "on either side of the river," but many trees of *one species*;) which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit *every month*, and the *leaves* of the tree were for the *healing* of the nations." Rev. xxii. 2. How striking is the coincidence!

"That the apostle might have a full view of the wonderful city, there came unto him an angel who carried him away "in the spirit to a great and high mountain, and showed him that great city, the holy Jerusalem, *descending out of heaven from God*; and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal, and *had a wall great and high*, and had twelve gates," (v. 10—12.) A similar coincidence exists in their different accounts of the *measurements* of the city they severally describe. In all the works we have seen which treat of this point, a great discrepancy is indeed supposed to exist between the statement of the prophet and that of the apostle. But this mistake has arisen from an oversight of the fact, that while the one states the *circumference*, the other informs us of the *square* measurement. Ezekiel says, "It was *round about* eighteen thousand measures" of the angel's reed, was in length "six great cubits" of twenty-two inches each. Being a square, each "*side*" was "four thousand and five hundred measures" of the reed. Ezek. xxxviii. 32. But John, in his measurements, does not specify its *length or breadth*, but having mentioned that it is *square*, he gives the measurement accordingly. "And the city lieth *four-square*, and the length is as large as the breadth. And he (the angel) measured the city with the reed, *twelve thousand furlongs*. The length and the breadth and the height of it are equal." Rev. xxi. 16, 17. It was not the length, or breadth, or height, which the angel measured. These indeed he declares to be "*equal*," but the 12,000 furlongs, instead of being the dimensions of *each or any of its sides*, as is commonly supposed, are "the measurement of the city"—"*four-square*." We consider this, therefore, as neither the length nor the breadth, but as the measurement of the *area* of the city; and reckoning by the Jewish furlong of two hundred and sixty-six two-fifth cubits, as stated by Maimonides, on extracting the *square* of the measurement of the circumference of the city given by Ezekiel, we obtain a view by which the statements of the prophet and apostle

are found to correspond very nearly,—and which would probably correspond exactly, if the standard of Maimonides were perfectly accurate,—thus confirming the view of their identity.” Page 160.

To this temple Mr. Begg finally refers Rev. xxi. 7. Ezek. xxxvii. 25—27, 1 Peter i. 4, Rev. iii. 12; and he thus concludes the chapter—“Much confusion has resulted from applying to the inhabitants of the new earth the character of the citizens of the new Jerusalem which descends out of heaven unto it. The distinction is obvious. While in the new earth Isaiah predicts there shall be both sin and death, the apostle John declares the exclusion of both from the holy city. Again, from the account of the descent of the new Jerusalem being placed in John’s vision after that of the final resurrection and judgment, it has been supposed by some to be the place of blessedness *after* the millennium. But the order of *insertion* is of itself no criterion of the order of *time*. The apostle gives in succession different views; and when he has carried forward his narrative of one class or series of events, he returns to take up another, or to explain particular parts which would have occupied too much space in the narrative itself. The whole book is constructed on this principle; and thus (as respects the order of the chapters,) long after the announcement of the kingdoms of this world having become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, we have again brought before us the existence and success of antichrist. But, in all such cases, keys are given for the elucidation of the prophecy, and for determining the relative period of the several parts. In the case before us, the new Jerusalem descends to the *new earth*, and this is connected with the millennium by the prediction of the prophet Isaiah. Its relation to time and the things of time is farther evident from the fact, that the kings of *the earth* do bring their glory and honour into it: “it must therefore be *upon the earth*, that they may have access unto it; and it must have a reference to this world while the relation subsists between kings and their subjects.” Page 162.

There is much in the last passage extracted which appears just; especially as it refers to the order of the insertion of an *event* in the Apocalypse not being any criterion of the order of *time* in which it will be fulfilled. But this is not the whole of the difficulty which attends the interpretation of the two last chapters of the Apocalypse. There are *internal* indices which seem to point to a later period of time for the fulfilment of what they describe; (i. e. down to verse 5 of chap. xxii.) though some of these Mr. Begg gets over by means of his system of interpretation, which confines the promise, that



there shall be no more *death*, and the statement, that the apostle saw no *temple* therein, to the condition of the inhabitants of "the city" as distinguished from those of ancient Jerusalem, which is to be rebuilt "on its own heap," or ancient site. Jer. xxx. 18. Still, it does not account for another circumstance; viz. that in the new heavens and new earth which are at that time created, there is "no more *sea*;" (Rev. xxi. 1.) whereas the sea is existing up to the latest period of the previous chapter; since it gives up the dead which were in it, at the judgment therein described.\* Verse 13. "Moreover, those who sit on the thrones in chapter xx. 4, live and reign with Christ *a thousand years*; whereas it is said of those in the New Jerusalem of chapters xxi. and xxii. "and they shall reign for ever and ever." It is very evident also, from 1 Cor. xv. 24—28, that the state which immediately follows "the first resurrection" is one which is only introductory to a more complete and still more glorious one, wherein God shall be all in all. This I have before adverted to at page 139; and if I enter not here into a more particular description of that ultimate state of glory, it is because I think there is scarcely any thing revealed concerning it, from which an accurate judgment can be formed of details by us who live under the present dispensation. It has been the manner of God, under every distinct dispensation, to give additional revelation calculated to throw light upon the existing and succeeding one. Thus an immense and accumulative light kept growing up by means of the prophets from the time of Moses, until the return from Babylon; and a great further illumination of the church took place from the time of Christ until John received the Apocalypse; and I doubt not, but when the next dispensation is introduced, there will still be an increase of revelation, which will throw further light upon the millennial and ultimate states. Indeed Joel ii. 28, has yet to be farther accomplished: "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions;" and the whole nature of a dispensation, in

\* It makes no difference as regards this point, whether the expression *sea* is to be understood as a symbol or literally. There seems to be no reason for interpreting it symbolically in the one place, and literally in the other: both must be alike; and in that case there is apparently a marked distinction between the state described in the one chapter and the other. Dr. Whitby, whose sentiments on some points of prophecy are singular, views the whole as figurative. He considers Rev. xxi. 1—5, as parallel with Isaiah lxv. 17, and xliii. 18, 19; and as the new heavens and new earth mentioned in the latter places are contemporary, as he assumes, with the conversion of the Jews, so he concludes Rev. xxi. to refer to the same thing, and that it must be before the *conflagration* of the world, since that event would reduce the Jewish nation to ashes. Chap. ii. sect. 3.



which the saints will continually have personal access to Christ, must necessarily be one of increasing knowledge and illumination.

It must nevertheless be observed, on the other hand, that there are passages in Rev. chaps. xxi. and xxii. which seem to forbid the viewing those chapters as setting forth events posterior in time to the state which commences at the millennium. For example, chapter xix. opens with the shout of triumph sent up on account of the judgment on the great whore; (verses 1—4.) and this is responded to by a voice from the throne, calling on the saints to praise God and to rejoice, because the *marriage* of the LAMB had come and *his wife had made herself ready*. Verses 5—9. Then comes the description in verses 11—20 of the treading of the wine-press, the overthrow of the nations, and capture of the last anti-christian beast. This accords with what has been previously said, that the rapture of the saints (or marriage of the Lamb) will probably take place prior to the Armageddon warfare, but after the final judgment brought upon the anti-christian ecclesiastical power described in the Revelation. Yet the new Jerusalem, which the apostle sees descending from God out of heaven, is described in chapter xxi. as no other than *the Lamb's wife made ready* and prepared for the nuptials, (see verses 2, 9.) which must be the same subject as that declared in verses 17—19 of chapter xix. There are expositors who conclude, that the saints will be caught up to meet the Lord, and *remain in the air* with the Lord during the whole of the millennial dispensation; only occasionally manifesting themselves; and that they will fulfil a similar office to the saints of the millennial dispensation, which the angels are now actively fulfilling to the saints under this. There does not however appear any sufficient warrant for this conclusion, though I do not dispute that it may be so; but as it is the duty of a writer on prophecy not to speak with confidence on subjects which he cannot clearly demonstrate, I therefore leave this, and the other matters just touched upon, in uncertainty, not having myself light to enable me to do more than name them.

There is one point however that remains to be more fully noticed, on which there is abundant and clear light vouchsafed; viz. the participation of those saints in the Jerusalem glory who have been previously called out from among the Gentiles. Human nature is ever prone to carry us into extremes; and whilst some have gone to the one extreme of denying any restoration of the *Jews*, and any Jerusalem glory on earth; others have proceeded to the opposite extreme of excluding the *Gentiles* from that glory. There will doubtless be a distinction

between Israel and the other nations, so far as regards that portion of mankind who are partakers of flesh and blood during the millennium; but none whatsoever, excepting as to the degree, in those who are the children of the resurrection. Whatsoever Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are substantially to be made partakers of, the same will all that have walked in faith be made joint heirs of, whether Jew or Gentile. The Rev. A. McCaul, has endeavoured to shew, and with some success, in his "New Testament Evidence," before alluded to, that the term *Israel* is always to be limited to the *literal* Israel, where its meaning can be ascertained by the context; and he therefore contends that the only questionable place (viz. Gal. vi. 16, where "the Israel of God" is mentioned) ought, by the rules of sound criticism, to be interpreted after the same analogy, and not of what is called the *spiritual* Israel. But it does appear to me that the question is, in this case, whether the *national* distinction of Jew and Gentile is recognised in the New Testament; for this cannot reasonably be disputed; but whether the promises of the glory made to Abraham are exclusively to belong to those who are nationally descendants of Abraham, or whether all believers will not be partakers with them.

Now this does not depend upon the word *Israel*, but upon very explicit statements in favour of the Gentiles. They are declared to be made partakers "*with them of the root and fatness of the olive tree.*" Romans xi. 17. Nothing can be more plain than what St. Paul advances in Romans and Galatians. He declares in Romans iv. that the promise to Abraham that he should be *heir of the world*, was not to either him or his seed through the Law, but through the righteousness of *faith*; and that it is of *faith*, that it might be by *grace*; to the end the promise might be sure to ALL the seed: not to that *only* which is of the *law*, but to that *also* which is of the *faith* of Abraham, who is the *father of us ALL*;" (verses 13—16;) and thus he is the father, not of the circumcision only, but of those also "who walk in the steps of that *faith* of our father Abraham, which he had being uncircumcised." Verse 12. In chapter ix. he distinctly declares, that they are not all children which are by the *flesh* descended from Abraham; "but the children of the *promise* are COUNTED FOR THE SEED." Verse 7. So in Galatians he declares—"Know ye therefore, that they which are of *faith*, the same are the children of Abraham. iii. 7. "Ye are ALL the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," &c. "there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female; for ye are ALL ONE in Christ Jesus; and *if ye be Christ's*, then are ye *Abraham's seed* and HEIRS according to the promise."

Verses 26—29. Again, he states in Ephesians, “that it is now revealed, that the *Gentiles* should be FELLOW HEIRS, and of the *same body*, and partakers of his *promise* in Christ by the gospel.” Ephesians iii. 5, 6. So in Ephesians ii. he declares, that the Gentiles, though formerly “aliens from the *commonwealth of Israel* and strangers from the *covenants of promise*,” are now “NO LONGER *strangers and foreigners*, but FELLOW CITIZENS with the saints, and of the household of God.”

It is endeavoured to evade the force of these texts by asserting, that they refer only to the promises of salvation in the general, and of the heavenly glory. But this is asserted without the slightest testimony of scripture on which to build it; and those who should sit down to attempt to discriminate between the promises of scripture which belong to the risen *Gentile*, and those which belong to the risen *Jew*, and to bring *proof* of such distinction, would indeed find themselves involved in an inextricable labyrinth. The Gentiles will beyond question be made partakers of all those promises which the apostle to the Gentiles holds out to them; and also of those contained in the epistles of Christ to the seven Gentile churches of the Apocalypse; and these are the same as those which relate to the Jew. Thus many who were not then apparently children of the kingdom, were to come (our Lord declared) from the east and the west, and the north and the south, and sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God.\*

Moreover it is important also to observe, in regard to those who in the millennium shall be partakers of the resurrection, that to whatever vicissitudes men in the flesh may, during that period or after it, be subject, they cannot affect those who shall rise from the dead, or who being alive, shall have their vile body *changed* at the appearing of Christ. These cannot be hurt of the second death; (Rev. ii. 11.) on them it hath no power; (Rev. xx. 6.) “They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, *being the children of the resurrection*.” Luke xx. 35, 36.

Surely these promises are worth defending: the hope of them will make many an affliction appear light, and animate us amid surrounding judgments and distress of nations with perplexity to endure to the end.

\* The reader will find this subject more fully treated, as also the First Resurrection, and the condition of the saints therein, in “Abdiel’s Essays,” before referred to.

## CHAPTER IX.

## ON DANIEL AND THE APOCALYPSE.

IN passing to the consideration of THE ANTICHRIST, a subject which already has been slightly touched upon or alluded to at pages 49, 51, and 69 of this volume,—we have to quit in a great measure the paths of clear and explicit prophecy, and enter into the obscurer regions of symbol and enigma.

And here I would once more request the reader to bear in mind, that the whole of prophecy may be resolved into two principal portions, viz.—that which sets forth things which shall be hereafter in such literal terms or ordinary and familiar tropes, that we can be at no loss to discover the plain meaning, by attending only to the general analogy of Scripture; and that which sets forth future events in acknowledged figures, symbols, allegories, types, and other adumbrations. The former I would call *demonstrable* prophecy; not because the latter is incapable of demonstration, but because the *means* or *principles* of demonstration lie, in the former instance, more obviously before us, and are, as it were, naked and open to the eyes of every believer; whereas the latter are of a more involved and intricate character, and their meaning and application is in many instances only to be determined by a careful and laborious investigation and comparison of the various books of Scripture; such as Daniel seems to have prosecuted when he tells us, “that he understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, &c.” ix. 2. And as the latter class of prophecies are avowedly in some instances *sealed* or shut up, so as that they should not be understood by the church until the period when they should be needed, (Dan. xii. 4, 9;) and as in every instance they are couched in such terms as to shroud their general purport or particular application from all who are not aided by divine wisdom; (Dan. xii. 10,) it follows that, in the one case, they *could not* be understood, even by the church, until the time appointed of the Father; and that in the other case there must always remain a degree of obscurity about the matter, even after the fulfilment. This requires the interpreter to advance his exposition with a comparative degree of diffidence; and it must, in numerous instances, from the different measure of talent, of learning, of industry and of prejudice also, in really good men, give scope for a measure of discrepancy also in their

several interpretations.\* And this appears to be among the means, whereby, in the providence of God, this department of prophecy is more especially hidden from the ungodly and worldly, who are too incurious and careless humbly to examine for themselves, and who take occasion from the mistakes or differences of Christians to discard the whole, either with profane derision, or with equally profane contempt.

I consider, therefore, that what I have advanced in the former chapters of this volume is susceptible of that demonstration which enables me to offer it with a full persuasion and confidence, that it is in the main correct; saving those passages or topics regarding which I have apprised the reader, as I have proceeded, that I speak of them with hesitation. But for the reasons just assigned,—and from the further circumstance, that my own mind is not convinced in regard to *any* interpretation as yet offered of the whole apocalypse (however I may concur in certain parts and particulars)—I approach this part of the subject with much greater diffidence.

It might be concluded by some, and indeed *is* concluded, that as there is so much difference of opinion among the best expositors in regard to the truths contained in this portion of prophecy, that the better way would be to leave it alone altogether, and wait until it please God to cast more light upon it. This, however, is a conclusion which cannot be too strongly deprecated. *Letting the subject alone* is what, in the great majority of instances, has occasioned that lamentable ignorance in regard to prophecy, which has been one great source of the numerous unsound and superficial and merely imitative expositions that have at different times made their appearance in the world. Many of these publications would never have been endured, nor ever indeed have been written, had the Christian church been sufficiently acquainted with the subject to have detected the grossest errors; but the fact is, that the majority of Christians in the present day are not even acquainted with the *text* of the Apocalypse, nor with the relative position of the subjects contained therein; but when their regular reading of the scriptures leads them to that book, they turn back and begin again. And this is the more remarkable, considering that the Lord, as if foreseeing the contempt with which this portion of his revelation would be treated by carnal men, has in a very especial manner commended both this and the prophecies of Daniel to our attention. Thus (apparently referring to Dan. viii. 13, ix. 27, xi. 31, and xii. 11,) he says,

\* The reader is requested to refer again to what has been said on this head at page 113, and particularly to the extract from Bishop Sherlock, at page 117.

“Whoso readeth, *let him understand;*” (Matt. xxiv. 15;) and he commences the Apocalypse with the promise of a special blessing “to him that readeth and them that hear, and that keep the words of that prophecy,” as has been in a former place observed. Page 14.

But, besides this, to leave alone these portions of divine revelation, would be to abandon all idea of successful inquiry into that important topic comprehended in prophecy—ANTI-CHRIST. For, as before remarked, the light which we possess concerning it is chiefly derived from hence. I have not, indeed, any intention of entering into a regular exposition of these books; for neither would the space which this volume affords be sufficient, nor am I prepared by the needful previous light or conviction for the undertaking; but it will be very desirable to set before the reader some information respecting certain topics contained in them; and on some particular points, I may likewise take the opportunity of stating what appears to me to amount to a demonstration; and in others, what commends itself as wearing the appearance of a high probability. It will be useful, however, in the first instance, to make a few particular observations on the books themselves.

1. The authenticity, and, by consequence, the inspiration of the book of Daniel, was questioned by Porphyry, an enemy to the Christian faith, in the third century, on the ground that a portion of the prophecies contained therein was so exact a description of the actions of Antiochus Epiphanes, (whom we shall have to notice again presently,) that the writer must have lived subsequent to the event. The Jews, likewise, have endeavoured to disparage the book of Daniel, from the circumstance of their finding themselves so pressed by Christians with certain portions of it, when they would deny that Messiah has already appeared, or that he was to be cut off. They do not, however, question the authenticity of the book; they only, in some instances, remove it from its proper and ancient situation among the *prophets*, and assign it a place among that class of the sacred writings, which they call *Hagiographa*. These circumstances, however, unsupported as the objections in both instances are by any shadow of proof, are in themselves corroborative of the *inspiration* of Daniel, when once the authenticity of the book is established; in regard to which it is only needful to advance one single and very notorious fact:—viz. that the book of Daniel was translated into Greek, and preserved by the Egyptians in what is called the Septuagint version, long before the time of Antiochus—a fact which the Jews do not venture to deny.



And as the authenticity of Daniel has been questioned, so likewise has that of the Apocalypse by the abettors of certain systems, as has been shown in a former chapter. Page 43. It may be sufficient, however, in this instance to adduce the testimony of one of the Fathers,—viz. Irenæus, who declares that the revelation given to John was seen by him “not long ago, almost in the very age itself of Irenæus, about the end of Domitian’s reign.”\* Lib. v. cap. xxx. The doubt which was cast upon the work for a time tended, indeed, in the end to establish its canonical authority with a more full and complete testimony than it would in all probability have otherwise enjoyed; witness the “Observations” made on the work by the great Sir Isaac Newton. His well known caution, learning, judgment, and powerful abilities render whatsoever he advances, as the result of his historical research, of the very first authority; and he declares, “that he does not find any other book of the New Testament so strongly attested or commented upon so early as this.”

In regard to the general contents of these two books, the opinion of the learned Joseph Mede appears to be correct so far as it goes, viz.—that Daniel is *apocalypsis contracta*, and the apocalypse *Daniel explicata*; in that what is shown to Daniel in the sketch or summary form, he considers is presented to John in the details. But it appears to me that we may go farther than this, and say that the very details themselves lie for the most part scattered in the other prophets; and I consider therefore that it is a very important *clue* to the right interpretation of St. John, to view the Revelation given to him as adjusting those scattered and discursive prophecies, and assigning to them their true position in the great prophetic history or picture. Let the reader compare, for example—

## EZEKIEL i.

AND

## REVELATION IV. &amp;C.

EZEKIEL sees “four living creatures” —“and their wings were full of eyes round about them four.” ver. 5, 18.

JOHN sees “four beasts full of eyes, before and behind,” ver. 6.

“As for the likenesses of their faces, they four had the face of a *man* and the face of a *lion* on the right side, and they four had the face of an *ox* on the left side, they four also had the face of an *eagle*.” ver. 10.

“And the first beast was like a *lion*, and the second like a *calves*, the third had a face as a *man*, and the fourth was like a flying *eagle*.” ver. 7.

---

\* Dr. Lardner assigns the date of the versions of the Apocalypse to somewhere between A.D. 95 and 97. Vol. vi. p. 638. Some interesting matter connected with this point will be found in a Review of Dr. Tilloch’s Dissertation on the Apocalypse, contained in *The Investigator*, vol. i.

"Their appearance was like burning coals of fire, and like the appearance of lamps;"—"and out of the fire went forth *lightnings*;" (ver. 14)—"and when they went I heard the noise of their wings, like the noise of great waters, as the *voice* of the Almighty, the *voice of speech*," &c. ver. 24.

"Their *wings* were stretched upward, two wings of every one were joined one to another, and two covered their bodies." ver. 11. "Every one had two which covered on this side, and every one had two which covered on that side, their bodies."\* ver. 23.

"And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone; and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it." ver. 26.

"And I saw as the colour of *amber*, as the appearance of *fire*, &c. from his loins upward and downward." ver. 27.

"And it had *brightness round about*: as the appearance of the bow that was in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about." ver. 28.

"The likeness of the *firmament*" (above which was the throne, ver. 26) "was as the *terrible crystal*, &c. ver. 22.

"And when I looked, behold, a *hand* was sent unto me; and lo, a roll of a *book* was therein." ch. ii. 9.

"And it was written within and without; and there was written therein *lamentations*, and *mourning*, and *woe*." ch. ii. 10.

"Then did I eat it, and it was in my mouth as *honey for sweetness*." ch. iii. 3.

But afterward "I went in *bitterness*, in the heat of my spirit." ch. iii. 10.

The beasts were "in the midst of the throne, and round about the throne;" (ver. 6.) "and out of the throne proceeded *lightnings* and *thunderings*, and *voices*;" "and there were seven *lamps of fire* burning before the throne." ver. 5.

"And the four beasts had each of them *six wings* about them." ver. 8.

"And, behold, a *throne* was set in heaven, and *one* sat on the throne." ver. 2.

"And he that sat was to look upon like a *jasper* and a *sardine* stone." ver. 3. In chap. x. 1., of the same personage it is said, "his face was as it were the sun, and his feet (or legs) as *pillars of fire*."

"And there was a *rainbow round about* the throne, in sight like unto an emerald." (ver. 3.) "And I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a *cloud*, and a *rainbow* was upon his head." ch. x. i.

What is in Ezekiel called a *firmament which is above the throne*, is in the Revelation, described as "a *sea of glass* like unto *crystal*," which is "before the throne." ver. 5.

"And the voice, &c. said, Go and take the little *book* which is open in the *hand* of the angel, &c." ch. x. 8.

The account of this book, in the Rev. ch. x. is placed immediately between the recital of the first and third *woes*. See chaps. ix. and xi.

"And I—ate it up; and it was in my mouth *sweet as honey*." ch. x. 10.

"And as soon as I had eaten it my belly was *bitter*." (*Ibid.*)

\* In verse 6, Ezekiel speaks as if they had *four wings* only; but he there speaks probably of those which covered their bodies, and were joined to each other; for they had also two *stretched up*, with which they flew.

A remarkable correspondency has already been pointed out between the city of Ezekiel, chap. xlvi. and that of Rev. chap. xxi. (see page 209.) Joel iii. Isaiah xiv.; Jer. l. and li. may likewise be profitably compared with other portions of the Apocalypse, which establish this connection between the other prophecies and those of St. John in a manner that forces the conviction upon us, that there is a designed relationship between them. And if this be admitted, then various important results will flow from it. For example, Sir Isaac Newton has said of the Revelation; "He that would understand the old prophets must begin with this." But may we not rather say that the careful study and comparison of *both* are absolutely necessary to the explaining of each other? It will, I think, be found, that if important minutiae and particulars are given to John, together with an occasional disposition of facts calculated to throw light upon passages contained in the old prophecies; so likewise are there many particulars given at times in the old prophets which are of great use toward better determining the meaning of St. John, and which will afford aid also towards fixing the order and time of events.

To give an instance connected with the parallel just placed before the reader. First: the four beasts or living creatures described in Rev. iv. may be demonstrated to be an emblem of *the Church*; (whether the church militant or glorified need not here be inquired into:) for they sing,—“Thou hast redeemed us by thy *blood* out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation; &c.” Chap. v. 9. The vision of Ezekiel therefore must have some reference or connexion with the *Church*. Secondly: if there be a designed relation between the visions, what is set forth in Ezekiel could not have been accomplished prior to the time of St. John, seeing that the invitation to the latter in chap. iv. 1. is, “Come up hither—I will shew thee things which must be *hereafter*.” Thirdly: the description which introduces the vision of Ezekiel, chap. i. 4—“And I looked, and behold a *whirlwind* came out of the *north*, a great cloud, and a fire unfolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the colour of *amber*, out of the midst of the fire. Also *out of the midst thereof* came the likeness of *four living creatures*;—seems to point to some connexion between the proceedings of the church of God and that awful period of tribulation so frequently set forth in Scripture as a *whirlwind*. See page 163.

But if there be a connexion between the prophecies of the Apocalypse and those of Ezekiel, still more evident is the relationship between the former and the prophecies of *Daniel*.

The four beasts described in Dan. vii. coming out of the sea, like a lion, a bear, a leopard, and a non-descript with *ten horns*, obviously refers to Rev. xiii. 11, where apparently the last of these four beasts, the non-descript animal, is seen rising out of the sea, with seven heads\* and ten horns. And his diversity from all other animals apparently consists in a monstrous combination of the likeness of the previous three; for he is like unto a *leopard*, and he has the feet of a *bear* and the mouth of a *lion*, (verse 29.) These four beasts are explained by Daniel (verses 17, 23) to be four *kingdoms*; and it is very important in fixing the meaning of the visions of Daniel and St. John to ascertain, what four kingdoms or empires they symbolize.

In this there is a pretty universal agreement among commentators, both ancient and modern, protestant and papal, that they are the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman. The fourth monarchy is declared by the writer of the book of Esdras to be *Rome*; and Mede asserts it to have been the opinion of the Jews both before and after the time of Christ. Alcasar, Ribera, Gaspar, Sanctius, and Cornelius A Lapide (or Alapide,) together with Baronius and Bellarmine, all Roman Catholic writers, admit Babylon to signify *pagan Rome*; and the intimate connexion between the Beast and the Babylonian

\* Some suppose the seven *heads* described in Rev. xiii. 1, to be made up of the head of the lion, bear, and non-descript beast, together with the four heads of the leopard. Dan. vii. 6. Bengel, however, says, "that the ancient fathers understood by the seven heads, so many ages or *monarchies of the world* from its beginning to its end." I do not remember to have met with the enumeration of these seven: the Jews reckoned there would be *nine* from the beginning to the end. There existed in the time of Dr. Homes, the contemporary of Mede, a manuscript Targum, mentioned by him, which in Esther, chap. i. makes the computation thus: "The first monarchy was of God; second under Nimrod; third under Pharaoh; fourth under Solomon; fifth under Nebuchadnezzar; sixth under the Medes and Persians; seventh under Alexander the Great; eighth under Julius Cæsar; the ninth, the kingdom of Messiah, or Christ." This is apparently the same Targum as that mentioned by Jacob Colerus in the preface to the Hebrew Bible of Hutter. Omitting the first in this enumeration, and the very doubtful one under *Solomon*, which appears to have been inserted by Jewish vanity, and the list is useful as marking the agreement in the 5th, 6th, 7th, and 8th, with the designation and order of succession given by ancient Christian chronologists. In a very scarce tract by Sir Walter Raleigh, published in 1636, "discovering all the empires and kingdoms of the world, as they flourish respectively under the four imperial monarchies; faithfully composed out of the most improved authours, and exactly digested according to the supputation of the best chronologers," he thus places them, 1. Assyrian, 2. Persian, 3. Greek, 4. Roman.

I would take this opportunity of observing, that the seven heads explained to be *mountains* in Rev. xvii. 9, cannot be the same as the seven *kings* of verse 10, as many expositors conclude. For of the former it is said, "the seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman *sitteth*, indicating, that at the time intended in the vision, the woman or city is placed upon them all at once: whereas of the *kings*, five are fallen, one only is present, and one yet to come.

Harlot of the Apocalypse is sufficient to identify them as being of the same empire.\*

A modern Spanish Roman Catholic writer, whose name is supposed to be Lacunza, but whose work is published under the Jewish name of Ben Ezra, has attempted to shake this opinion; on the ground that the four empires were not "inferior" the one to the other, particularly the second to the first, as it is intimated in Dan. ii. they should be.† But whatever seeming difficulties may attend a portion of the exposition, it is impossible to withstand the general tradition on this head that has existed in the church, together with the historical testimony mentioned in the note on the last page; to which may be added an observation of Mr. Faber's.—Speaking in his Sacred Calendar of the mode of reckoning the four empires symbolized by the image which Nebuchadnezzar saw in his dream, he says—"Such a mode of reckoning, &c. is admirably illustrated by the famous astronomical canon of Ptolemy. As the good spirit of God employs the four successive empires of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome in the capacity of the great *Calendar* of Prophecy; so Ptolemy has employed the very four same empires in the construction of his invaluable *canon*; because the several lines of their sovereigns so begin and end, when the one line is engrafted on the other line, as to form a single unbroken series from Nabonassar to Augustus Cæsar." Vol. ii. p. 9.

But we may go further than the coincidence between interpreters and historians. The question appears to be susceptible of actual demonstration. There can be no doubt that the Babylonian empire is the *first*; for Daniel (ii. 38,) is precise upon the point to Nebuchadnezzar, in whose crown and government that empire was headed up: "Thou art this head of gold."‡ Again, of the woman, who is seen by John sitting upon the

\* Many testimonies as to Rome being the fourth empire may be found in Mede's works, in Dr. Cressener's *Demonstrations*, &c. and Dr. More's *Mystery of Iniquity*.

† The successive inferiority of the one kingdom to the other is considered by Dr. N. Homes to refer to their respective treatment of the Jews. See the *Resurrection Revealed*, revised edition, p. 141.

‡ I have unceremoniously referred to this vision as prophetic, though some expositors would make the first six chapters of the book of Daniel *historical*, and only the last six *prophetic*. But there appears to be no room to question this vision. Some expositors consider the vision of the Tree also, in chap. iv. to be prophetic. (See Holmes's "Time of the End.") The visions may indeed be introduced through the medium of historical narrative, but this by no means invalidates their prophetic sense, or renders them of private interpretation. The same may be said of the Epistles to the Seven Churches. (Rev. ii. and iii.) A very able treatise on the prophetic sense of these Epistles was published in 1833, by the Rev. H. Girdlestone, which abounds with valuable critical and historical information.

ten-horned beast, (which corresponds, as we have seen, with the fourth beast of Daniel,) it is declared to the apostle—"And the woman which thou sawest is *that great city, which REIGNETH over the kings of the earth.*" Rev. xvii. 18. The expression *reigneth* marks it to be the then present time that is alluded to; and it may safely be asked, what city reigned over the world in St. John's time, excepting *Rome*? Certainly not the literal *Babylon*, though the woman is here so called.\*

Having, then, the first and last, the only question that remains concerns the intermediate *two*, or the second and third empires; and these seem to be determined by the vision of the Ram and He Goat of Daniel viii. which is thus explained by the angel: "The ram which thou sawest, having two horns, are the *kings* of Media and Persia; and the rough goat is the *king* of Græcia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the *first king.*"† And there is a correspondency in certain features of these two emblems, sufficient to warrant their identification with the second and third empires of chaps. ii. and vii. For the third is in chap. ii. represented by the two arms and breast of the image; in chap. vii. by the two sides of the bear, who raises itself up on one side, (i. e. one side becomes more elevated than the other;) and the Medio-Persian Ram has "two horns, but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last." And as the third beast has *four* wings of a fowl, and *four* heads, and *dominion* was given to it;" so "the goat waxed very great, and when he was strong the great horn was broken;

\* The Roman Catholics, who insist that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, may be pressed with a further *demonstration* here; for Peter says, in his 1st Epistle, chap. v. 13, "The church that is at *Babylon*, elected together with you, saluteth you;" in which case, he must here designate Rome by its mystic name of *Babylon*. Lightfoot, however, says, (in *Hor.* ad 1 Cor. p. 270)—"James, Peter, and John went to the *circumcision*, and we can shew the *diocese* of each of them. James had Palestine and Syria; Peter Babylon and Assyria, (evidently understanding this verse literally;) and John the Helenists, particularly in Asia and farther on." Mr. Rabett, however, affirms that Babylon was *destroyed* many ages before the time the Apocalypse was given. (P. 194.) But this, though it is true to such extent as to rob it of all title to the appellation "Great Babylon," is questionable to that extent which would deprive it altogether of its claim to be considered the metropolitan city of Assyria.

† I have marked three of the terms in the above quotation in *italics*, for the purpose of pointing out how clearly they make manifest that these Beasts in Dan. vii. and viii. do not symbolize one individual king only, but kingdoms, comprehending a succession of kings. We have the *kings* of Media and Persia, in the plural, represented by the Ram. And though the Goat is described as being "the *king* of Græcia," as if only one individual king were intended; yet a further explanation declares the horn between the Goat's eyes to represent the *first king*—thus plainly implying a *succession* of them. Mr. Faber, therefore, has no warrant to limit the expression in Daniel, "Thou art this head of gold," to the life of the individual Nebuchadnezzar.



and for it came up *four* notable ones toward the four winds of heaven.”\*

2. It were vain to attempt to enumerate the different views which have been taken of the Apocalypse as a whole. Grotius, Wetstein, and some other learned men, refer all to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jewish wars, and the civil wars of the Romans.† Rosenmuller, Eichhorn, and some other German divines, consider it a prophecy of what should happen to the Christian church to the end of the world, in the way of false teaching, persecution, &c.; Christianity being finally victorious. The latter divides it into three parts: the first, from chap. i. to xii. 17, relating to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism, from xii. 18, to xx. 10, to its triumph over heathenism; and the remainder to its final triumph over the world, and to the happiness of the life to come. And whilst some have principally viewed the *Pagan* persecutions only, others have applied it all, or mainly, to the *Papal* persecutions or apostacy; a third class considers the whole as *future*, and looks forward to the rise of an *infidel* power, in which all will be accomplished; and a fourth class combines all three views, and alleges all three powers to be set forth therein. We shall have occasion presently to revert to some of these. Some again interpret it all of civil and ecclesiastical affairs, in an historical and emblematical manner; and others make the application of the whole to invisible or spiritual things only. Some consider

\* It would not be right, on this important point, to pass by another argument, which is by some considered as an equally clear demonstration that the beast of Rev. xvii. is *Rome*. The seven *heads* are explained to be seven *mountains*, on which the woman, or city, sitteth. (v. 9.) This is by many supposed to be only another figure, in explanation of the former figure; but by these it is considered absurd to suppose a symbol interpreted by a symbol, and therefore the mountains are understood *literally* as seven *hills*, on which the city is built. There are many well-known allusions in the Latin poets, quite irrespective of prophecy, to “the seven-hilled city,” which have been quoted by writers on this subject. Thus—

Hanc Remus et Frater; sic fortis Etruria crevit  
Scilicet et rerum facta est pulcherrima *Roma*  
Septemque una sibi muro circumdedit arces.—*VIRG.*

Sed, quæ de *septem* totum circumspicit orbem  
*Montibus*, Imperii *Roma* Dæum quæ locus.—*OVID.*

Dumque suis victrix *septem* de *montibus* orbem  
Prospiciet domitum *Martia Roma* legar.—*IBID.*

Diis, quibus *septem* placuere colles—*HORACE.*

*Septem urbs alta jugis, toti quæ presidet orbi,*  
Fœminias timuit territa *Marte* *minas*.—*PROPERTIUS.*

*VIRG.* See *Georg.* lib. ii. v. 6, 7, 8.—*OVID.* *Trist.* Lib. I, El. v. 69, 70.—*IBID.* Lib. iii. El. vii. v. 51, 52.—*PROP.* Lib. iii. El. xi. 57, 58.

† There is a good synopsis of the views of Wetstein in the preface to Adam Clarke's quarto edition of the Bible.

it a revelation entirely affecting the Gentiles, pointing to the fact of its being all addressed to the seven Gentile churches of Asia; and many of these consider Daniel as concerning chiefly the Jews, because he was shewn what would befall his own people in the latter days. On the other hand, some, who are led away by system to the opposite extreme, can see nothing but Israel after the flesh in the Apocalypse, and consider the Jew as the master key to the whole.

The above are some of the views and systems of interpretation, and there are several others, one of which may not be passed over: viz. that of the republican dissenters of the present age, who can see in Daniel and St. John only the destruction of all church establishments, and the subversion of all thrones, to be succeeded by a millennium consisting of the universal prevalence of those principles, which the Lord permits, and makes use of instrumentally, in pouring out the vials of his wrath.\* There can be little doubt,—and the consideration gives a most awful character to the signs of the present times,—that all which our heavenly father hath not planted will be rooted up, and every thing which offends will be gathered out of his kingdom; and it is to be apprehended, from the word of God, that every throne not established and maintained in righteousness will be overthrown: but to suppose that the agency, which the Lord shall employ in order to effect it, is permanently to occupy its place, is as absurd as to suppose, that when the Lord made use of the Philistines or Chaldeans wherewith to chastise Israel, he intended ultimately

\* A specimen of these views will be found in the *Illustrations of Prophecy*, vol. i. page 26—28. Dr. Towers, Clarke, (author of *Prophetic Records*) Vint and Jones are among the principal writers of this school. Whiston bore the same way in a former age. A short quotation or two from the "*Illustrations of Prophecy*," which is the manufacture of Towers and Vint, will serve to demonstrate its tendency. "There are few countries in Europe in which the subsistence and comforts of the mass of the people are not materially affected, and in which they are not rendered more scanty and precarious, by the crowds of *horses* which are unnecessarily kept; and which are maintained in consequence of the nature of the subsisting governments, the prevalence of false ideas, and the extreme inequality which exists between the different ranks of society." (vol. ii. p. 90.) "It surely is no very improbable supposition (now that the spirit of political inquiry has arisen in Europe, and the minds of men are turned with so much eagerness to the examination of the nature, and the comparative advantages of the different governments,) that the time is not far distant, when genuine Christians will in general view the existing governments of the European continent as decidedly antichristian; and when many of them will take an active part in substituting in their place political institutions which do not violate the laws of the gospel." "Of the abuses that exist in the world a large part arise from the tyranny of the rich over the poor, and from the extreme inequality of conditions, an evil which is aggravated and engendered, by the maxims and constitutions of the existing governments." (page 226.) At page 245 there is an apology for and panegyric in behalf of Bonaparte, which is too long to be quoted here. The unrestricted liberty of conscience granted by him constitutes him a saint in the eyes of Mr. Vint.

to establish them in their place. These writers lose sight of two important truths; viz. that the agency whereby these things are to be effected is of an *infidel* character, (as will be shewn hereafter;) and it is greatly to be feared that many of those who exultingly take this view have insensibly imbibed some of the more specious of infidel principles, derived from their communion with Socinians; for “a little leaven leavens the whole lump.” The other fact lost sight of is, that although existing thrones and ecclesiastical establishments will be overturned, it will not be for the purpose of introducing a millennium of republicanism and schism,—so that men may every where govern themselves and walk in religion and politics according to what is right in their own eyes; but they will be shaken and removed in order to set up in their place a universal church and monarchy,—a union of church and state in the most extensive and complete sense of the term. It will be a church and empire which, in every respect, as regards discipline and polity, will be the reverse of the *beau ideal* of modern liberals. For “thus saith the Lord God; remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same; exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, and it shall be no more, *until HE come whose RIGHT it is; and I will give it HIM.*” Ezek. xxi. 26, 27. Nothing can be more absolute than the manner of this kingdom, as shadowed forth by the type of Christ, *Joseph*; who had all things put under him, (he only excepted who did put all things under him: compare Gen. xli. 40. and 1 Cor. xv. 27.) and who used his authority in bringing the whole empire—the inhabitants, their money, their cattle, and their lands—into the possession and under the most entire subjection of Pharaoh. The reign of Solomon, another type, was likewise exceedingly absolute; (1 Kings xii. 4.) and it has been shewn at pages 153 and 205 that the people of God will, in subjection to Christ, be partakers of his power, and rule the nations with a rod of iron.\*

\* It is not all dissenters, who have written upon prophecy, that take up the views I have here deprecated. The names of Cuninghame, Thorpe, Anderson, Cox, and Tyso, stand out in striking contrast to the majority of this school. Some of these doubtless entertain strong sentiments on the subject of ecclesiastical establishments and church government and authority under the present dispensation. Mr. Anderson, indeed, carries his principles in this respect to an extent which I have not yet met with in any dissenter; but he manifests an admirable candour and desire of truth throughout; whilst his views, in regard to the authority and connexion of church and state during the Millennium, are so apposite in the way of illustration of the case in hand, that I cannot forbear giving a quotation from Part ii. of his “Apology for Millennial Doctrine.” At page 41, he lays down the following proposition. “In the days of the Stone [i. e. the *Kingdom* of the Stone, Dan. ii. 34, 35.] the Church, in addition to the power which she at present exercises over the conscience,

Seeing however what discordant views have been taken of the Apocalypse at different periods, and even by different writers in the same age, some are disposed to abandon the study of the book altogether, on the assumption that to arrive at a correct understanding of it is impossible; whilst others are led to infer from these discrepancies, that none of the interpretations as yet advocated contain any truth, but that the whole fulfilment must be yet future, and will be so striking when it

shall be invested with all that power over the bodies of men and their external circumstances, which is at present exercised by the kings of the earth." He then proceeds to explain:—"In that time there will be no division of power into civil and ecclesiastic, for the whole shall be ecclesiastic. Not only will the whole be conducted by churchmen, which magistrates may be, and in some happy cases are, at present; but the magistracy itself shall be of the church, acknowledging no other head than Christ, and no other interests than those of his royalty." Then after a long quotation from Tillinghast in support of his view, he thus continues:—

"Let it be primarily observed then, that the matter of dispute which lies between us and our opponents is not, whether in the days of the Stone and Mountain Christ shall have a *spiritual* dominion over the hearts of men. Whoever may represent this to be the state of the controversy does it either most ignorantly or slanderously. We are second in zeal to no party in advocating the internal holiness and deeply-toned spirituality of the millennial kingdom;—all the denial lies with the opposite party, who will not believe, that, in addition to this reign over the heart, the Redeemer shall be put in possession of the external government of the world, administered by his church. We maintain, that under the approaching dispensation he shall exercise *all* power; they maintain that he shall continue to put forth only a *part* of power. Beside the power he now has in the Church, we claim for him the administration of the State—that all law be consolidated, and made Church law; they refuse this claim, and plead on behalf of the kings of this world, that matters should be permitted to continue as at present—the Church having one government administered by the power and in the name of God; the State with another, separate and distinct, administered by the power and in the name of the Williams, the Philips, the Ferdinands, and the Miguels of this earth: only, say they, let there be such good agreement between the two parties, (kings and parliaments and magistrates being personally Christian men,) that the power of the State shall never be exercised to the detriment of the Church, but rather for the protection of her members in the civil rights of conscience. The supposition of a case, and a statement of the different ways in which it would be dealt with according to the two systems, will more distinctly illustrate wherein we and our opponents disagree. Suppose that in millennial times a man were to contest the doctrine of the *royalty of Christ*; according to the system of our opponents, he would be dealt with only as a heretic or infidel, in the way of excommunication from the Church, while his civil privileges remained entire; but according to our system, the Church being invested with all power, and being, in fact, *the State*, he would be dealt with as being guilty of treason, by being cut off from the midst of the people. This is evidently carrying the matter much further than even the most zealous advocates of ecclesiastical establishments are at the present day disposed to proceed. They stop short of this conclusion, in which their fundamental principle involves them, if consistently prosecuted to a termination. It is among my brethren, however, of the Dissenting communion, that the strongest objections will be made to our representations of the external power of the Church; for I know that with some of them the very *beau ideal* of millennial glory is, that all State establishments of religion shall be prostrated to the dust, so as to rid the spiritual institution of all secular contamination."

does take place as to leave no question on the minds of any that it is the true one. Both these conclusions are apparently erroneous. The first is decidedly so, seeing that it is opposed to the testimony of the Holy Ghost, who declares the blessedness of those who read and who hear the words of this prophecy. Rev. i. 3. And as regards the second,—“Show me the question (says Bishop Hurd) in religion, or even in common morals, about which learned men have not disagreed; nay—show me a single text of Scripture, though ever so plain and precise, which the perverseness or ingenuity of interpreters has not drawn into different and often contrary meanings? What then shall we conclude—That there is no truth in religion?—no certainty in morals?—no authority in sacred Scripture? If such conclusions as these be carried to their utmost length, in what else can they terminate, but absolute universal scepticism?” Vol. ii. page 60.

It has already been shewn (p. 116) that some of the prophecies are not likely to appear more plain and convincing to sceptical minds, after they are fulfilled, than they were before, seeing that the very design of the Spirit has been to veil them in symbol and enigma. Moreover, that discrepancy is not so great as is alleged: the more eminent commentators do in general agree in their interpretation of certain principal features of prophecy; and in regard to almost all of them, though we may not be able to follow the general thread of their interpretation, yet, as Sir Isaac Newton says, in his work on the Apocalypse—“there is scarce one of note, who hath not made some discovery worth knowing:” (p. 253) there is at least something in the works of those, who are not mere copyists, calculated to furnish a help or a hint in some point or other.

The principle however, like every other, may be carried too far. The Rev. H. Girdlestone, in his able and erudite work on the Epistles to the seven Churches, says of the discordance of commentators on the Apocalypse,—“They disagree like the clocks of a great city, in the minutes, not in the hour: their disagreement is less than their agreement. He that understands our common Christianity knows, that with an almost infinite variety of opinions upon secondary and minor points, there is almost an universal consent on first principles.” Pref. x. But surely it is something more than a difference on minute and secondary points when one expositor assumes almost the entire Apocalypse to be fulfilled, and another considers the whole to be future. On no fundamental principle scarcely can we concur with Wetstein (for example); who refers the whole, as has been stated, to the earliest period of Christianity. He makes the Millennium to consist of a period of *forty years* only;



on which hypothesis it neither agrees with literal time, nor with any admitted principle of interpreting symbolical time; and he must of necessity refer the seals, the trumpets, the vials, the Antichrist, and every other prominent feature, to events and persons which the great majority of commentators entirely reject.

It is not improbable, however, that the *generality* of interpretations may be in a greater or less degree reconciled. It would appear from the controversies which have taken place upon some features of the Apocalypse, that the very structure of it was such as designedly to present in some instances an ambiguous aspect, so as to render an application of parts of it to more events and periods than one justifiable in certain instances. Let any one read, for example, the discussions which have taken place, whether the number of the beast, (Rev. xiii. 18,) belong to the ten-horned beast or the two-horned beast; and he will be perplexed to know, amid the plausible arguments for both opinions, to which he is to ascribe it: though this is a point which is really independent of historical events, and is to be determined rather upon abstract and critical grounds. The same may in a measure be said in regard to other points;\* and it is the opinion of many able commentators, that the whole prophecy is so constructed as to be easily applicable to the struggles of Christianity with Paganism at an early period, with Popery at a later period, and with Infidelity in the last days; whilst others can see these three periods of trial distinctly and *separately* shadowed forth. Mr. Habershon, in his recently published "Dissertation on the Prophetic Scriptures," shews that many of the discrepancies of interpreters with regard to *dates* may be reconciled on Scriptural principles; and it may consequently be hoped, that in proportion as the principles of interpretation are more attended to, and become more understood, many apparent difficulties and discrepancies may be removed. The great point for the student of prophecy to attend to is to become well acquainted with the text and facts of prophecy, both as contained in the Apocalypse and other prophets likewise; and then he will be at least prepared to detect false and irreconcilable interpretations on the one hand; and to discover analogies and parallelisms, which offer a key to interpretation, on the other.

3. This leads to a few remarks respecting the proper mode of studying the Apocalypse. The first thing is, to be satisfied

\* Bengelius, for example, considers the woe in Rev. xiv. 9—11, applicable to two different subjects; and this he infers on abstract principles.



of the literal meaning of the words of the text; which should be carefully examined in the Greek, (if the student be acquainted with it,) and determined beforehand, and not in the course of his interpretation, when he is liable to be warped by his system, and induced to force a signification on a word which is not obvious, and which he would not otherwise have resorted to. The second thing is to search for synchronisms and parallelisms and such other indices in the work itself as are calculated to throw light on the order, connection, and period of the visions. This is a most important preliminary work, and may be pursued by the reader who is acquainted only with the English, with considerable success and profit. The eminent Joseph Mede would not venture on the interpretation of any of the visions, till by the demonstration of his synchronisms he had fixed the order and series of them; and he has left us a work on this subject alone; which, though the further investigation and research of succeeding students have shown that it cannot be followed in all particulars, is nevertheless deservedly held in estimation by students of prophecy. An inquiry of this sort into the internal marks and notices of the work is altogether distinct from interpretation, though a most valuable and necessary preparatory aid to it, and what no sound and judicious expositor would wilfully neglect. Bishop Hurd, who has been before quoted, observes, in regard to the order and period of the visions, which is there to be ascertained: "The knowledge of this order is a great restraint on the fancy of the expositor; who is not now at liberty to apply the prophecies to events of any time to which they appear to suit, but to events only falling within that time to which they belong in the course of this predetermined method. And if to this restriction, which of itself is considerable, we add another, which arises from the necessity of applying, not one, but many prophecies (which are thus shown to synchronize with each other) to the same time, we can hardly conceive how an interpretation should keep clear of these impediments, and make its way through so many interfering checks, unless it be the true one." On Proph. vol. ii. 130.

A third step (or it may be made the *second* step with equal advantage) is to examine by a careful comparison of scripture the meaning of the various symbols, metaphors, and figurative expressions, by which the precise signification is veiled more or less in enigma; and where a symbol or hieroglyphic is fairly susceptible of more than one interpretation, it is to be carefully marked down. Sometimes a clear and explicit interpretation of a figure or symbol is to be met with in one part of scripture; from which it would seem unwarrantable to deviate, when the

same symbol is met with in other parts without the interpretation; and sometimes, though no explicit interpretation is to be met with, yet will something be found likened to the same thing, in the way of similitude, which is elsewhere used absolutely as a hieroglyphic or symbol, or which, indeed, from the frequency of its use, may in some instances be viewed as a tropical expression.\* In this manner the figurative language of scripture may be reduced to rule, and a dictionary might be constructed on such principles as would enable the student at once to proceed to the preliminary task of translating, as it were, the symbols, and by this means so paraphrasing the text as to throw considerable light and clearness upon the meaning of the prophecy, and so afford a greater additional safeguard to erroneous interpretation.

Such a dictionary is still a desideratum, constructed upon the rigid principle of scriptural analogy. There are many valuable observations upon symbolical language to be found in the writings of Mede, More, Daubuz, Hurd, Faber, Cuninghame, and Frere.† Some of these have given sufficient of a dictionary to enable them to interpret that portion of the prophecies which they have taken in hand; but their explanations are in many instances fanciful and arbitrary, and adopted with an evident view to the interpretation which is previously resolved upon in their own minds: so that the meaning of the symbol is determined by the interpretation, and not the interpretation by the meaning of the symbol. To give an instance: Mr. Frere, in his "Combined View," gives us the following, in the chapter headed "Symbolical Dictionary." "*The third part of the Earth*—the Eastern Roman Empire, of which Constantinople was the capitol, being that portion which fell to Constantine on the division of the empire by Constantine the Great among his three sons." (p. 81.) "*The great River Euphrates*—The Turkish Empire, which first arose in the neighbourhood of that river." (p. 84.) Now the references in support of these explanations are, in the first instance, to Rev. viii. 7—12, ix. 15—18, xii. 4; and, in the latter, to Rev. ix. 14, xvi. 12; which are nothing more than places in which the same expressions occur, without the slightest evidence that the meaning which Mr. Frere affixes to them is the true one.‡ These are passages to which the key is rather to be applied, than that

\* See the observations and instances illustrative of this point, at pages 101 and 103 of this volume.

† Schoettgen may also be consulted with advantage, and likewise Glass's *Philologia Sacra*.

‡ Mr. Faber, and some other commentators, understand by *the third part of the earth*, the *whole* of the Roman empire, both *eastern and western*; but on no better ground.

they are the key itself. When he tells us (p. 82.) "that *stars* are the apostles, bishops, ministers, &c. of the church of Christ," and refers us to Rev. i. 20. it is satisfactory, because it appears a plain scriptural authority for the interpretation: nor is it meant to be asserted in this place, that Mr. Frere has assigned erroneous significations to the two former expressions; but that no reader, unacquainted with the profane history of the matter, and with the application of it made by Mr. Frere, could possibly have discovered that the third part of the earth was *the eastern Roman empire*, and the river Euphrates *the Turkish empire*. If they can be afterwards made to appear so, it can only be by a proof derived from the *system* of interpretation of the author, and not from any abstract principles of scripture, which can be judged of and produce conviction independently of the interpretation. Numerous instances of the same sort might be given from Mr. Faber, who far exceeds Mr. Frere in the arbitrary character of his explanation of the symbols.

The most copious and learned dictionary of symbols is that compiled chiefly from the writings of Daubuz by the editor of the abridged edition, the Rev. P. Lancaster. It is defective, however, as frequently basing the authority for the explanation on the writings of heathens: for it seems contrary to every just notion of divine consistency to suppose that a prophetic revelation of the Holy Spirit cannot be properly understood without the study of authors whose writings must familiarize us with things, which the same Holy Spirit admonishes us against. The utmost that can be said for the writings of such authors is, that they afford collateral proof, in confirmation of an argument, and may be adduced for critical uses; but to *base* upon them any portion of the interpretation of divine revelation appears altogether at variance with Christian principle.\* For this reason Mr. Faber's whole system of interpretation seems to offend, and has been justly censured by Mr. Cuninghame. For he goes still farther, inasmuch as it is actually ne-

\* The heathen writers who have been resorted to by the learned for the illustration of symbols are the Egyptian Horapollo and Manetho who was a priest of Heliopolis about 258 B. C. There is a Greek translation of the Treatise of the former on Hieroglyphics still existing; of the latter only some fragments remain of an historical work, written by him at the command of Ptolemy Philadelphus. But chiefly the *Oneirocritica* by Achmet, an Arabian writer, has been quoted. Bishop Hurd supposes that the Israelites derived their knowledge of symbols and hieroglyphic writing from the Egyptians, during the period of their bondage with them; (vol. ii. p. 85.) a notion not at all improbable. But it does not therefore justify the bringing the Egyptian superstitions prominently forward. It is enough to look for the principles and materials for interpreting scripture to the scriptures themselves; and to avail ourselves of the derived knowledge of the Israelites only to that extent, for which we find a sanction in the word of God.

cessary to become acquainted with the principles of the *heathen mythology* before we can be enabled to judge of the accuracy of his statements: which is plainly opposed to the spirit of the divine injunctions in Exod. xxiii. 13. and Deut. xii. 3; by which the children of Israel were required so to abolish idolatry, as not even to take the names of the heathen gods into their mouths, but to endeavour to root out every trace of them.

Mr. Faber has, nevertheless, some valuable matter in his first chapter, on the figurative and symbolical language of prophecy; though even here, the bias of system, aided by a vigorous imagination, have led him into some statements which cannot be borne out. We meet with much, for example, in regard to symbols, concerning zoological consistency or anomaly; but this in symbols is of no force. They are often of such a character as to do violence to all consistency;—witness a sword out of a man's mouth; stars falling to the earth; a woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet. Attention to consistency of figure and illustration may be needful in the exposition of a parable; (though here also it has its limits;) but not in hieroglyphic symbols.\* The principle of *homogeneity*, however, in the use of symbols, which is contended for both by Mr. Faber and Mr. Cuninghame, (though departed from by the former in his *interpretation*,) appears to be one entitled to the serious regard of the student. By this principle it is contended that all symbols of the same class should have congruous and consistent interpretations; unless there be some notation in the text itself directing us to make an exception in some particular instance. Thus in regard to the four horses of the first four seals, if the first is to be interpreted as a kingdom, the remaining three must be interpreted in like manner. And thus in the four metals of the image of Daniel, it appears incongruous to interpret the three latter kingdoms as existing through a succession of monarchs; and the first (as Mr. Faber does) of the limited reign, or rather of

\* Mr. Faber is very unhappy in his illustrations of this consistency, in the observations which he makes regarding zoological propriety. He says that the *lion* and the *leopard* of Dan. vii. are furnished with *wings* instead of *horns*; because though horns may be with propriety ascribed to a *he goat*, they cannot to the above named animals; and that when a *bear* is employed as a symbol, horns and wings being alike incongruous, "no resource is left to the framer of the hieroglyphic, save to represent the two constituent kingdoms of the bear by his two *sides*, the one appearing more elevated than the other," (vol. i. p. 59.) Now, without insisting that *wings* to a leopard or a lion are as preposterous in strict physiology as *horns*, it happens that we have actually described to us by St. John a ten *horned* beast, which monster is a combination of the *lion*, the *leopard*, and the *bear*, the identical three animals excepted to by Mr. Faber, (Rev. xiii. 1, 2.)

the duration of the life, of one monarch only. This violation of consistency or homogeneity is still more apparent when he proceeds to the interpretation of the four beasts of Dan. vii.

There are also some valuable observations in Mr. Frere's *Symbolical Dictionary*, among which the following is selected, as worthy of consideration.—“We must distinguish, in the Revelation of St. John, between that which makes a part of the machinery of the prophecy, and that which belongs to the prophecy itself. Commentators, from not adverting to this distinction, have interpreted the *silence of half an hour*, which immediately precedes the sounding of the seven trumpets, as if it were symbolical; whereas it is only part of the machinery, or a pause in the representation,” (p. 97.) A writer in the *Investigator*, (vol. iii. p. 144,) puts the same matter in a forcible manner: “As the whole time of the visions seen by the apostle was clearly the space of a single day, so *prophetic intervals of time* are never represented as *passing in the vision*, but are simply *stated* for the information of the church; when, for the very purpose of avoiding incongruity, there is a change from vision to narrative, and then to vision again. (See chap. ix. 10, xi. 1, 2, 3, 9, xii. 6, 14, xiii. 5, xx. 7—9.) The *silence* therefore of chap. viii. 1. is single and peculiar, being unlike all other times mentioned, which are prophetic statements for our information. It is an absolute pause in the course of the visions themselves,—a pause as of half an hour, in visions that lasted at the most for a single day, perhaps for only part of a day. If then, instead of reading the *book*, we enter into the spirit of the *record*, the mark of the close and recommencement of the visions would be as striking, as if our eye in reading met with a blank of half a page.—“We can conceive no other reason for which such a pause should be made; a rest in the prophetic actions being never so denoted, but by some voice (as chap. xi. 12) implying an interval of time.” In a note this writer adds—“The above view of the *silence in heaven*, as a pause in the vision before commencing afresh, and not a prophetic period, (which are always *announced*, and not *seen to pass in the vision*,) is strongly confirmed by the indefinite term *ὡς ἡμέρας*, “about the space of half an hour,” in contrast with all the prophetic periods, which are definite; to denote that it was the prophet's estimate of an interval for which he had no certain measure.”

Before the subject of symbolical language in the general is dismissed, it will be proper to observe, that in the Apocalypse, as in Daniel, besides those passages of a literal character which are interwoven with all figurative prophecy, and without which they could have no definite meaning,—there is disposed



throughout the book a complete series of explanatory indices, which, like buoys and lighthouses at sea, are intended to afford us special intimation of our bearings.

Some of these shall be instanced for the information of the reader, the literal expository matter being marked in italic letters.

“The seven stars *are the angels of the seven churches.*” Chap. i. 20.

“There were seven lamps of fire burning before the throne, *which are the seven Spirits of God.*” Chap. iv. 5.

“In the midst of the elders stood a lamb, as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, *which are the seven Spirits of God.*” Chap. v. 6. See also Zech. iii. 9, and iv. 16.

“The four-and-twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, *which are the prayers of saints.*” Chap. v. 8.

“What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?”—“*These are they which came out of THE\* great tribulation, &c.*” Chap. vii. 13—16.

“And I will give power unto my two witnesses, &c.”—“*These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks, standing before the God of the earth.*” Chap. xi. 3, 4. The reference is evidently to Zech. iv. 2, 3, and 11—14, where matter explanatory of the symbols is to be found.

“Their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, *which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, &c.*” Chap. xi. 8.

“Let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast, *for it is the number of a man, and his number is 666.*” Chap. xiii. 18.

“I saw three unclean spirits, like frogs, come out of the dragon, beast, and false prophet”—“*For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, &c.*” Chap. xvi. 13, 14.

“The seven heads *are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth.*” Chap. xvii. 9.

“The ten horns which thou sawest—*are ten kings.*” Chap. xvii. 12.

“The waters which thou sawest, where the whore sitteth, *are peoples, multitudes, and nations, and tongues.*” Chap. xvii. 15.

“The woman which thou sawest *is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth.*” Chap. xvii. 18.

“To her was granted that she should be arrayed in fine

\* The article exists in the original; and it is important to notice it, for some think the allusion in this passage is to *the great tribulation* spoken of in Dan. xii. 1. and Matt. xxiv. 21.



linen, &c.—*for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints.*” Chap. xix. 8.

“I am of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus:—*for the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.*” Chap. xix. 10.

“The dragon, that old serpent, *which is the Devil and Satan.*” Chap. xx. 2.

“*Here is the patience and the faith of the saints.*” Chap. xiii. 10.

“*Here is the patience of the saints.*” Chap. xiv. 12.

“*This is the first resurrection.*” Chap. xx. 5.

“*This is the second death.*” Chap. xx. 14.

The four last of the above instances, it will be perceived, are not so much the interpretation of *symbols* as of the whole of a *vision*, or part of a vision. They are like the descriptive titles under a picture, announcing to us the subject of it. Two others of the examples, viz. the number of the beast, and the seven heads which are mountains, are still explained in an enigma; but this is especially announced to the reader by—“Here is *wisdom*. Let him that hath understanding count, &c.”—“Here is the mind that hath *wisdom*.”

In this manner then, viz. by determining the verbal meaning of the text, by studying the synchronisms and parallel passages, and by ascertaining the meaning of the symbols, the student may be prepared for the interpretation of the *whole*, or *parts* of the apocalypse. And let it not be thought that to be able satisfactorily to determine the meaning even of a *part*, though it be only one single feature or circumstance of a vision, is unimportant. Mr. Frere has remarked that a correct view of the general system and outline of the apocalypse, solves at once many of the minor questions; and that it is consequently much more profitable to endeavour to obtain a correct view of it as a whole, than to consider only detached portions.\* Mr. Cuninghame also considers himself entitled to demand from an expositor the interpretation of the whole, or, at least, an outline and a diagram giving a synoptical view of the arrangement of the entire prophecy, before he will entertain any exposition of a detached part, however plausible. There can be no doubt that superior advantage will lie, where Mr. Frere has justly placed it, in a study of the whole; but in a large and complicated prophecy, like that of the Apocalypse, it appears to be important if we can obtain a sure and fixed interpretation of only one incident of it. The stone which

\* See his exposition in the Investigator, New Series, vol. i. p. 81; where he illustrates his point by shewing that a correct interpretation of the epistles to the seven churches serves to fix the meaning of Rev. xx. 4—6.

the French discovered in 1798 near Rosetta, on which was an inscription in hieroglyphic and in the Egyptian and Greek languages, would be an important step, if it should ever be properly and clearly deciphered, towards the solution of *all* the hieroglyphic writings; and why should not similar results follow, in regard to the visions of St. John, if only we could obtain a clue for further developement by the unequivocal signification being determined of any one part?

The reader may be further assured, that should he be enabled to make no discovery of importance, and apparently but little progress towards understanding the interpretations of others, he will nevertheless derive much personal edification by studying the Apocalypse in connexion with the prophecies of the Old Testament; so true is it that a blessing rests upon "him that readeth, and on them that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein."

---

## CHAPTER X.

### ON TIME MYSTICALLY EXPRESSED.

There is one point connected with the symbolical language of Daniel and St. John, which it may be convenient more particularly to discuss in this place, before proceeding to the consideration of the Antichrist, as being intimately connected with the controversies on that subject; viz. the denotation of *time* by mystical or figurative expressions. Most of the popular treatises on prophecy, particularly those which have obtained since the Reformation, are based upon the principle, that the *dates*, which are for the most part used in these two prophecies, are couched in enigmatical terms; but this opinion has been by the Roman Catholics in former years vehemently opposed, and is in the present day impugned by some Protestant writers of considerable learning, talents, and piety. If their objections to this mode of interpreting prophecy be valid, and periods of time are always to be *literally* understood, unless there be an express intimation to the contrary,—then must those treatises and expositions, to which allusion has just been made, be discarded, since the interpretations which they offer must of necessity be applied to wrong persons and things. It is impossible, for example, that the PAPACY can be viewed

as Antichrist, if it can be shewn that the term of his duration was to be for no longer a period than 1260 natural days; but if the days, months, and times of Scripture may be proved to be susceptible of a more extended signification, then such an interpretation appears necessary as will at least include the mystical view of the dates. Into this subject, therefore, some inquiry must now be made.

The question resolves itself into two principal heads: first, whether time may be viewed at all as symbolically or enigmatically expressed; and secondly, if it may be so viewed, what portion of time do the terms given signify.

1. The examination of the first point will pretty well determine the second; but in proceeding to it, some excellent remarks of Daubuz, in regard to time expressed symbolically, it will be useful to keep in view. He says—"It is not to be expected that we should give *philosophical* demonstrations of these matters; they will not bear it."—"There is no efficient cause in the symbols, upon which alone philosophical reasonings and demonstrations are grounded."—"Affinity and similitude are the principles they go upon."—"But if we may call that a demonstration which fully proves the truth of the proposition by such arguments as are proper to the subject matter, then we may have demonstration even in this matter." Page 53.

We may now turn to a passage in numbers xiv. 33, 34—"And your children shall wander in the wilderness *forty YEARS*, and bear your whoredoms, until your carcasses be wasted in the wilderness: *after the number of the DAYS* in which ye searched the land—*forty DAYS, each day for a year*—shall ye bear your iniquities—*forty YEARS*; and ye shall know my breach of promise." Here it is clear that a limited period of forty days, which were occupied by a certain transaction, is taken as the ground-work for determining a more extended period of forty years, which is the appointed time for another event. It is not to the present purpose to inquire what relationship there is between the searching of the land and the wandering in the wilderness, that the one should be in some sort erected into the *type* of the other; or at least that its term or period should be adopted as the miniature scale by which the latter should be measured. I confess I do not see it; but the Lord inserts nothing in the Scriptures in vain; and as it would have been sufficient, were there no significancy intended by this circumstance, simply to have declared that the Israelites should wander forty years, without any reference to the forty days of searching the land, it does appear to me that occasion is here taken obliquely to bring before the Church

the principle, that smaller revolutions of time may be viewed in certain instances as representing larger measures, into which they may be expanded.

Another instance is to be found in Ezekiel iv. 4—9, wherein the prophet is ordered to lie on his left side 390 days to denote the years of the iniquity of the house of Israel, and also to eat vile bread and drink water by measure for 390 days, and then to lie upon his right side 40 days, to denote the years of the iniquity of Judah: "I have appointed thee (saith the Lord) each day for a year." Here it is equally plain, that a certain number of days are appointed to represent or prefigure the same number of years; so that, as Ezekiel was, in his proceedings in other respects, a *sign* to the house of Israel, (see ver. 3, and compare chap. xii. 6, 11,) so were the *days* likewise a sign, and in this instance a symbolical expression for a like number of *years*.

The Rev. S. R. Maitland, of Gloucester, who is the most able advocate of the system of interpretation which views time as always literally expressed, and to whose opinions and writings I shall consequently have frequent occasion to refer in this chapter, has, in attempting to make the subject more literal than it really is, somewhat *mystified* the question. He considers this latter passage no warrant for the mode of reckoning which *translates* the Hebrew word *day* (יָמִים) by the English word *year*. He seems to consider that it would not constitute a warrant for this mode of interpretation, unless the prophet, when directed to lie forty *days*, had actually lied for forty *years*.\* But the question is not respecting the translation of a word, but the interpretation of a sign or symbol. No man would be justified in translating the word *beasts* (חַיָּוָיָהּ in Daniel vii. 3) by *kings* or *kingdoms*; but we have divine warrant for viewing the expression as a symbol, which in prophetic language may, in certain circumstances, but not in all circumstances, be *interpreted* as kingdoms, (Dan. vii. 17, 23;) and there appears to be no just reason why the word *day* may not be used in a similar manner.† The observation of Daubuz is to the point in hand—*affinity* and *similitude* are the principles upon which these interpretations frequently proceed;—and when we can obtain no express direction in a particular passage for the interpretation of a word, a *sufficient* warrant may be obtained by a careful observation of *other* passages. It may be designedly withheld in the former instance, in order that

\* See "An Enquiry into the Grounds on which the prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1260 years." p. 19.

† See the remarks already addressed to Mr. Maitland's view of this subject in the note at page 97.

the sense may not be too obvious, so that the wicked might understand; (Dan. xii. 10;) yea—in order that it may in some instances be sealed up and hidden for a season from the wise; (Dan. xii. 9;) but the principle of interpretation lies nevertheless inserted *somewhere* in the scriptures: not always in explicit terms, but under circumstances which, when duly considered, constitute a justifiable precedent.

Another circumstance to be considered is, that time cannot be conveniently represented by a *visible* symbol; for where events and circumstances which occur in time are represented by visible symbols, to introduce distinct symbols shadowing forth duration would inevitably lead to confusion; as they would be liable to be mistaken for some of the adjuncts of the other symbols, or as additional circumstances connected with the events set forth in like manner. We have indeed an instance in Genesis xl. 12, 26 and xli. 26, in which *three branches* represent three days, and *three baskets* represent three days; and *seven kine* and *seven ears* of corn represent as many years. But these are not strictly “visible symbols for periods of time;” though they are spoken of by Mr. Maitland as having this signification. (Second Inquiry, p. 2.) The branches and baskets, &c. are, in their primary signification, symbols of the *occupations* of the butler and baker of Pharaoh, and the fat kine and ears of corn denote *plenty*, and the ill-favoured kine and ears denote a season of *scarcity*. That which represents *duration of time* in them is the *number* of each,—the *three* and the *seven*: though why the three branches and baskets should represent *days*, and the seven kine and ears should represent *years*, is not at all obvious; nor would it, I think, have been understood by Joseph without a special interpretation vouchsafed to him by the Spirit of God.\* And then, how inconvenient it would be to represent larger intervals of time in this manner. What should we do, if, instead of *two* witnesses, prophesying for 1260 days, we had 1260, or rather 2520 witnesses, to consider the meaning of?—or if, instead of the *one* little horn of the goat, we had 2300 horns? Besides the difficulty which the prophet who saw the vision would experience of readily counting them, we might be led to multiply the number of the kingdoms or powers intended; which, as before observed, would lead to confusion.

The mode therefore generally taken in the prophecies of Daniel and St. John is to *declare* numbers by a voice,—even

\* It is possible that there may be some affinity between the mystical numbers *three* and *seven*, which bears a corresponding relationship to the smallest and largest natural revolutions of time, comprehended in a *day* and a *year*. But I advance this entirely as conjecture.



though the numbers themselves may in some instances be actually represented. Thus the apostle in the concluding chapter of his visions says, "And I, John, *saw* these things and *heard* them." Thus likewise, although he *sees* a multitude of *sealed ones*, and a multitude of *horsemen*, yet he "*hears the number*" of them declared to him, (Rev. vii. 4, ix. 16, 17;) and so in other instances, the period of the duration of the things symbolized is expressed by a voice declaring it. Rev. xi. 2, 3, xii. 6, xiii. 15, &c. So also in Dan. viii. 13, 14, after the *action* of the vision has been exhibited to the prophet, one saint *speaks* to another saint for the purpose of eliciting the *time* of the vision; and he *hears* the reply—"unto 2300 days."

And here it is important to observe two things. First, the nature of the case requires, that, in general, the declaration of the time or duration of an event should be kept separate from the description of the event itself, and form an appendix to the vision. For the want of observing this, some hypercritical remarks have appeared on both sides the question in dispute. For in regard to some of the terms used it is contended, that they occur in the *explanatory* parts of a vision, and therefore must be as *literally* expressed as the other portions of the explanation. But though they do not occur in that portion of a vision which describes its action, yet are they not a portion of the explanation. Thus in Dan. vii. there is no hint as to *time* in the description of the vision, either by symbol or otherwise, and therefore the *addition* of the time, occurring at the end of the explanatory part, cannot be called an explanation of a symbol which had not been previously given or declared. In the vision of chap. viii. the 2300 days therein mentioned are immediately annexed to the vision, and the explanation follows after; but no explanation is given of the time. And what is still more remarkable, the period mentioned in Dan. vii. occurs again in chap. xii. together with other numbers; and there both vision and numbers are to be "*closed up and sealed till the time of the end.*" Verse 9. From this it is apparent, that the visions could not be fully understood by the generations intervening before the time of the end; and this sealing the visions seems to be principally effected by casting the veil of mystery over the expressions in which time was denoted. Even Daniel says, "*he heard but understood not:*" but could this have been the case had he not been left in doubt in regard to the mystical signification of the terms?\*

\* A friend, who has written several able articles in the Investigator, under the signature of E., has suggested to me an important observation, which I do not remember to have met with; viz. the fact that Ezekiel and Daniel were both children of the captivity; and therefore many who were made acquainted



The other thing which it is important to observe is, that if it be not generally convenient to express time mystically by visible symbols, there remains no other apparent method of concealing, than, as Mr. Cuninghame justly observes, "by couching the number of years under the veil of another division or revolution of time than that of years."\* It is the overlooking this circumstance that causes the fact of time being symbolically expressed to be overlooked likewise. We at once perceive that there is no natural relation between a wild beast and a kingdom, and therefore are immediately led to consider it as a symbol; and so of other symbols. But there is a natural relation between the symbols by which time is designated and the actual period intended, (as between a day and a year;) so that the attention is not immediately directed to the fact of its being a symbol, because there is an obvious and consistent sense in the symbol itself, without seeking for another. But for this cause it is the more likely to be a means of veiling or concealing from generations the meaning of a vision. And though the terms in which time is expressed are not so obviously symbolical; yet are there various considerations which will lead a careful and reflecting reader to discover or suspect that they are to be so understood. There is an excellent remark in Daubuz concerning the analogy which may be expected between the symbols and descriptive expressions of scripture, which will serve, in some measure, further to illustrate this point. "It would be monstrous and indecorous (he observes) to describe a *beast* ravaging during the space of 1260 *years*; or a *witness*, which is a *man*, prophesying so long; or a *woman* dwelling in the wilderness so many years. Therefore, that the *duration* of the events may be represented in terms *suitable to the symbols of the visions*, it is reasonable to expect, that the symbols of duration be also drawn in miniature, or in a proportionable arithmetic to the symbols of the event, which are also drawn in miniature. So that as a *lion*, a *leopard*, a *bear*, may represent vast empires, and a woman the whole church, and the like, it is more proportionable to the nature of those things that are thus used for symbols to express their acts by such short measures of time, as bear the same proportion to the duration of that great event which is represented by such small matters."—"If, therefore, it is proper in the symbolical language to represent the *extent* of things in miniature, why

---

with the visions of Daniel, and also Daniel himself, must have been familiar with the circumstance of Ezekiel's having so recently been lying for 430 days on his side, to typify thereby 430 years.

\* Strictures on Mr. Maitland's Pamphlet, p. 14.

shall we think it improper to represent their *duration* in a proportionable manner, by revolutions of time shorter in proportion than the event represented." Pages 56, 57. As a farther illustration of this he notices that *locusts*, whose natural term of life is only *five months*, are consequently represented in the symbol in the Apocalypse, as lasting only for that period. And this attention to the symmetry and proportion of the allegory may be sustained when there is no intention of veiling the time, farther than the event itself is veiled. For it would appear monstrous (assuming for a moment that a *month* signifies mystically *thirty years*) to represent locusts as living for one hundred and fifty years. Whereas when the millennium comes to be spoken of, and the terms of the allegory involve no such inconsistency, the thousand years are mentioned literally.

2. Passing on now to the second head of inquiry, viz. what periods of time the terms given generally signify when mystically expressed, it would appear from the two passages already quoted from Numbers and Ezekiel, that a *day* in both those places is the term given to prefigure a *year*. And this would lead us to the natural conclusion, that the same *proportion* is to be observed in all symbolical or mystical terms. Thus the expression in Dan. vii. 25. "a time and times and the dividing of time," (or "a time, times and a half," as in chapter xii. 7. and Rev. xii. 14.) forasmuch as it is generally admitted, that the *literal* meaning of a *time* is a year,—may signify, mystically, if calculated by lunar time, a period of 1260 years. And it is remarkable, that this period is reiterated in the scriptures in seven different places, and under three different forms of expression, as 42 months, and 1260 days. See, beside the three places just quoted, Rev. xi. 2, 3; xii. 6; xiii. 5.

Some have considered that a time means mystically a *century* of years; but any other measure than that of a *day* for a year would introduce great perplexity into that relationship, which so evidently exists in the different terms cited above to each other. The month is an easy and natural division of a time into periods of 30 years, and the day into periods of one year. But suppose we adopt the hypothesis of a time signifying a century, then we must understand by a month the inconvenient fractional period of eight years and four months; and by a day, three months, one week, two days and one third. Nothing is more forbidding, and less corresponding with the general simplicity of scripture, than the chronological system of Bengelius, who adopts various arbitrary and fanciful measures of time, and exhibits them in intricate fractional numbers.\*

\* As to *terms*, he has, besides those enumerated, a *chronos*, a *half chronos*,

But an appeal may be made in this matter to symbolical prophecies which are unquestionably fulfilled; and by ascertaining the manner in which the terms expressing time have actually been interpreted by the event, we shall be justified in concluding the same principle to exist in other prophecies. That which is most to the point, and which has therefore been latterly the most vehemently assailed by the advocates of the system which views time as always literally expressed, is the prophecy of the *seventy weeks* in Daniel ix. These have been proved by the event to signify a space of 490 years, as all commentators of any note, both ancient and modern, have agreed;\* and if this be the case, and the original expression does really mean literally *a week of days*, there is decisive proof of the manner in which time may be understood in the book of Daniel.

But there are objections preferred against such a conclusion; the most forcible of which, and indeed the only one worthy of any consideration, is that advanced by Mr. Maitland, who alleges that the original expression (שבעים) being "seventy sevens" means according to the general usage of the Hebrew writers seventy sevens of *years* and not of *days*; and that to sustain the argument which is built on this passage it ought to have been written "*weeks of days*." (Enquiry, &c. page 5—13.) Some exceptions, however, of great importance to the argument, are made by Mr. Maitland himself. He admits that the Feast of Weeks is mentioned eight times in the scriptures as "the feast of *sevens*:" that the word *weeks* in Daniel x. 2, 3, where the prophet says he was sick *three weeks*, is also an exception; that in Lev. xii. 5, a woman after the birth of a

and a *non-chronos*, a *short time* (distinct from "a time") the number of the *beast*, and an *Aion* or *Ævum*. And a day he makes  $190\frac{1}{2}\frac{0}{1}$  days; a month  $15\frac{5}{6}\frac{5}{3}$  years, and a year  $190\frac{1}{2}\frac{0}{1}$  years. (See Introduction to his Exposition of the Apocalypse by Dr. Robertson.)

\* It is remarkable, in regard to the prophecy of the seventy weeks, that there appears to be a similar relation between that period and the duration of a previous event, as between the forty years wandering in the wilderness and the forty days of the searching by the spies. Daniel informs us "that in the first year of Darius he understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish *seventy years* in the desolations of Jerusalem." "And I set (he continues) my face unto the Lord God to *seek* by prayer," &c. And, first, we may ask, what was there to *prevent* his understanding Jeremiah from the first, but some hesitation in his mind, whether he were to understand the period literally or mystically? for Jeremiah xxv. 11, 12, and xxix. 10. are both plainly enough expressed. But, secondly, it is said, that, when he *understood* this number, he still set his face to *seek*; as if he conceived that there was some mystical relation to be found in the period notwithstanding. And then, thirdly, it is revealed to him, that seventy *weeks* are determined; which is a period of seventy years multiplied by *seven*.

female is to be unclean two *sevens* or weeks. These exceptions appear quite sufficient to outweigh the objection in its fullest extent; as they prove, beyond a question, that there is no need for the expression in the Hebrew, "*sevens of days*," in order to convey the sense of our English word *weeks*. And the circumstance that the word *sevens* is used to express the Feast of Weeks, which was an ecclesiastical period, and connected with the Levitical ceremonial, renders the term *sevens* more likely to be adopted for a prophetic date, where a mystical signification was intended.

And as Mr. Maitland, by the exceptions he has himself allowed, has destroyed the force of his own statement, in regard to *sevens*, standing alone, signifying weeks of years rather than of days; so Mr. Cuninghame meets him on the remaining portion of his argument, and challenges the proof of the word שָׁבִיעַ and its plural forms ever signifying in the scriptures a seven or sevens of years. Mr. Cuninghame admits, indeed, that the *Rabbinical* use of the word is in Mr. Maitland's favour; but he insists that the *scriptural* use of it is the direct contrary, and that in all other places where the word *stands alone* in the scriptures it signifies *a week or weeks of days*, and in no case whatever *a week of years*, ("Strictures, &c." p. 6.) In Mr. Maitland's "Reply" to Mr. Cuninghame there is really no answer to this: Mr. M. still asserts indeed, "that the word used in Daniel, and translated '*week*' properly means '*a seven*'—that is '*a seven*' of any thing, and not (as our word *week*) exclusively a seven of *days*—and that therefore that word *may* mean '*a seven*' of *years* without any reference to days, or any pretence of mystical interpretation." (p. 20.) No *instance* however is given by him of its ever having that signification in the scriptures; and therefore how does the case really stand? Mr. Maitland expects to find the annunciation of time, in the prophecy before us, to accord with "the custom of the writers of the scriptures." If then in Dan. ix. 24. it did signify *years* it would actually be a solitary *exception* to their custom, and at variance with the use of the word in other places.

The most then that can be said, in regard to the prophecy of the seventy weeks is, that the Jew who was not familiar with the scripture use of words, but only with the profane or Rabbinical use of Hebrew, might, and probably would in the first instance, understand by the passage in question *seventy sevens of YEARS*. But the Jew, who was versed in scripture, and accustomed to mark carefully the peculiarities which men who wrote and spake by the Holy Ghost had adopted, would in the first instance understand by the expression *seventy sevens of DAYS*. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the history

of the period that intervened between the captivity and the coming of Messiah; but the probability is, that an expectation would be entertained of an *immediate* appearance of the Christ, and that though it failed, yet that with every fresh decree in favour of the Jews, or commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, (Dan. ix. 25.) their hopes would again revive;\* but that when Jerusalem was finally restored and their polity again settled, and yet Messiah appeared not, they would then be forced upon the profane use of the term; or, from its being found connected with the usage of the Levitical ceremonial, they might suspect a mystical sense to be included in the scriptural use of it. See the observations on the Levitical ceremonial already brought forward at page 104. But taking the whole of the circumstance into consideration, and the peculiar character of the various passages which have been brought forward, it does appear to me that the Holy Spirit in using the word שָׁבֹעַ in other places to signify a seven of days, and in making the remarkable use in Numbers and Ezekiel of *days* as the representatives of *years*, did thus designedly but quietly insert the principle by which the church of a future age should be guided into a right apprehension of the mystical prophecies.†

3. It may be well, before we pass on, just to notice the opinions entertained by the ancient church on this subject. It is evident that Josephus did not understand what we may term the *year-day* system; for he applies the vision of the little horn of the goat to Antiochus, as having taken place in the literal space of time (Antiq. b. x. ch. 11. § 7; b. xii. ch. 17. § 6.) And Irenæus likewise thought that Antichrist, when he appeared, would only reign three and a half years, and that he

\* There appear to have been four decrees in their favour.—

1st, of Cyrus,	- - -	E. C. 536.	2 Chron. xxxvi. 22.
2nd, of Darius Hystaspes,	- - -	518.	Ezra vi. 1—12.
3d, of the 7th year of Artaxerxes,	- - -	457.	Ezra vii. 11—26.
4th, of the 20th year of Artaxerxes,	- - -	444.	Neh. ii. 1—8.

† I have laid no stress upon the expression “2300 days” in the vision of the Ram and He-Goat, in Dan. viii. 14. which is in the original “2300 *evenings—mornings*” (See Margin), though some have considered that the *peculiarity* of this form of expression, and also of the phrase “*time, times, &c.*” is a sufficient indication that they are to be understood mystically. But this supposition brings little or nothing in the way of *evidence* to the point contended for.—

Nor have I, on the other hand, taken notice of an objection to the expression “*time, times, &c.*” being understood mystically, brought from the fact of the “*seven times*” of chap. iv. 23. having been literally fulfilled by Nebuchadnezzar’s having been removed for seven years from the sovereignty of his empire: for the relation of an historical fact in literal terms is no reason why those same terms should not in some other instance be mystically used. It may as reasonably be said that *days* cannot have a mystical meaning in chap. xii. because they have a literal meaning in chap. i. The utmost that can be said is, that chap. iv. 23. shows that the phrase “*time and times*” cannot have an *exclusively* mystical sense.



would be destroyed by the Lord from heaven, bringing to the just the kingdom. (B. v. ch. 30.) The same opinion was likewise entertained by others of the Fathers. Nevertheless, they were not without a notion that greater periods of time might be comprehended under the terms commonly used to signify smaller periods. Thus Josephus speaks of an interval of 600 years, which he calls *the great year*. (Antiq. b. i. ch. 3. § 9.) Lactantius makes an extension of the term *day* in a manner still more to the point: "Sæpe diximus, minora et exigua magnorum figuras et præmonstrationes esse; et hunc diem nostrum, qui ortu solis occasuque finitur, diei magni speciem gerere, quem circuitus annorum mille determinat." (De Institut. lib. vii. cap. 14.) And Justin Martyr, at an earlier period, in his Dialogue with Trypho, understands by "a time" a *century*; and conceived therefore that the Antichrist might reign 350 years. (P. 250, edit. Colon.) Vitranga informs us that Techonius, who is supposed to have written about A. D. 390, reckoned the three and a half times in like manner. (In Apoc. p. 464.) Whilst Theodoret interprets the seven times of Dan. iv. 13, of periods of *six months*, as meaning so many *winters* and so many *summers* distinct from each other, and refers to previous interpreters to support his view. Com. on Dan. iv. 13. Cyprian is declared by Pontius to have intended a year by a day in that place where, speaking of the forewarning which he had of his martyrdom, he says: "I understood that the sentence of my passion was come; I began to intreat that I might have a reprieve but for *one day*, till I could dispose my affairs in a legal manner." Vit. D. Cyp. per Pont. Diacon. Daubuz also instances a similar mode of interpreting the term *day* in the acts of the martyrdom of St. Sadoth and others, (in Coll. Theod. Ruinart.) who were Persians, where there is this passage: "Now in that he said—I ascended *yesterday*, but thou shalt ascend *to-day*: this signified, that he had suffered martyrdom the *year* before, and that I should suffer it and die *this year*."\*

The fact, however, that the earliest Fathers, such as Justin and Irenæus, differ in their views of time in this instance, evinces that they had no *apostolic tradition* on the subject; and

\* It does not appear whether, in the two latter instances, the views of the parties are derived from the Scriptures, or from heathenish rules for interpreting dreams and visions: for little account can be taken of the proof fetched by the same learned author from Diodorus and Plutarch, who assert that *four months* or a *season* was called a *year*; nor even of the fact that the Egyptians called a day a *year*. (Daubuz, p. 55.) Mr. Holmes, the Chancellor of Cashel, in his work on "The time of the End," asserts what is more to the purpose, that days for years was the usual ancient *Chaldaic* mode of reckoning; but he gives no authority for the assertion.



therefore their opinions, inasmuch as they concern only their own private judgment, are of little consequence. If Daniel heard but understood not, why should it be supposed that these fathers understood? *This* part of prophecy was necessarily "closed up and sealed" from them; unless it can be shewn that they lived in that period specially intended by "the time of the end."

It was not till after the period of the Reformation, and the application of the prophecies concerning Antichrist to the papacy, that the principles of interpreting time mystically began to assume a more consistent and systematic form. The earlier Reformers appear to have adopted the principle of interpreting a *time* as a *century*. Vitranga informs us that the Waldenses did so, and were consequently, in a late period of their sufferings, led to hope for their speedy termination, from the persuasion that the antichristian power that opposed them could only last altogether 350 years. Bengelius asserts that the Wickliffites and Hussites did the same; and that T. Purvæus, an Englishman, composed from *the Lectures of Wickliffe* an Exposition, in which he reckons the thousand years to have ended in 1033, and adds to this 350 years for Antichrist. Int. to Apoc. p. 300. But after this the *year-day* hypothesis began to obtain. Joseph Mede was one of the principal champions of that system, and he was followed by Homes, Peganius, More, and numerous others, till it came generally to prevail among protestant writers. Not but what there are eminent exceptions: Vitranga set aside both the year-day and the common day. Bengelius deprecates the year-day as the key of interpretation to some passages of scripture, adopts it in regard to another, and makes it a period of about half a common year in a third place.\* And some expositors imagine duration of time to be signified where it apparently is never intended: for example, Mede considers the measuring of the temple and its courts in Rev. xi. to have a reference to time; and Bengelius, and also many others, imagine the same in the number of the beast of Rev. xiii. Daubuz, on the other hand, considers of some places, which are generally supposed to express time mystically, that they do *not* relate to duration;—as the terms, "for an hour, a day, a month, and a year," Rev. ix. 15; which he thinks should be translated, "at an hour, &c." as being only an emphatical expression to shew the *sudden* concurrence of "the four angels" to execute their common design. P. 51.

In the mean while, as we approach toward the great catastrophe, when *time* shall be no longer, the Lord appears to be

\* See pages 147, 258, and 212 of the Introduction to the Interpretation of the Apocalypse translated by Robertson.

casting much increased light upon these important topics;\* so that though the fancies and vagaries of men who give too much rein to the imagination will never be reconciled, yet many apparent discrepancies will be brought to harmonize with the general plan and scope of prophecy. Mr. G. Habershon, in a recently published Dissertation on the Prophetic Scriptures, has demonstrated that there exists in the word of God a principle of *double* commencement and termination in regard to some of the chronological periods; and by analogy he successfully shows that some of the conflicting epochs in the writings of eminent commentators may be brought to concur. Another important principle to be kept in view is, the high probability, that there may be a mystical fulfilment of some of the dates and facts connected with the chronological prophecies, and a literal fulfilment likewise; (see the note, page 96;) for though the proof, that time must always be restricted to the literal acceptance of the terms in which it is expressed, would necessarily shut out the principle of interpreting it mystically; yet the proof, that we may justifiably view it on some occasions as expressing duration in a mystical or symbolical sense, does not necessarily shut out the literal: for that may be held in combination with it, and a two-fold fulfilment maintained. Some indeed have already maintained this. In a published letter of the Rev. John Fletcher of Madeley to the Rev. John Wesley, written on these subjects, he says: "It is worth observation, that as the tyranny of Antichrist will last 1260 years; so *his last raging*, or that tribulation which will be so uncommon, shall last also 1260 common days, and not prophetic ones; 'because, for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened,' according to our Lord's merciful promise. This observation will cast a great light upon all those numbers, and prevent many objections." But this subject will more properly come before us in the next chapter.

\* Mr. Cuninghame has recently published a work in which he endeavours to confirm the great periods of Daniel upon the year-day system, by a remarkable concurrence, in the chief of them, of the principal astronomical cycles. The correctness however of his inductions has been ably combated by Mr. Frere in the volumes of the *Investigator*, and compels that degree of hesitation in regard to them, which has prevented me from bringing them forward here.

## CHAPTER XI.

## ON THE ANTICHRIST.

ON no subject of prophecy has there been more difference of opinion among expositors of all ages than concerning the ANTI-CHRIST, and the principal circumstances and events connected with him. It is indeed chiefly to this subject, that, in some periods of the church, the difficulties of commentators seem to have been confined: for as regards the coming of CHRIST, the manifestation of his kingdom, the restoration of the Jews, the resurrection of the saints, the regeneration of the world, &c. there has been at times, more especially during the two first centuries, a tolerable agreement among orthodox writers. This has doubtless arisen in great measure from the fact of the principal prophecies which concern Antichrist being veiled (as noticed in a former chapter) in symbolical and figurative language; by which the Lord has designedly kept back from ages and generations a clear apprehension of many things connected with his developement; and from the farther fact (as I apprehend,) that the actings or manifestations of Antichrist belong to different periods of the church, in the course of which he assumes *different aspects*, and comes forth to view in connection with different persons and principles. Thus it has happened, that whilst some particulars concerning him have been fulfilled, —if not in a *plenary*, yet certainly in a *primary*, sense,—others, which have had reference to different circumstances and times, or which at least wait for a more exact accomplishment, have been wrested by interpreters, and forced in all their particulars into an accommodation with events to which they do not properly, or at least do not entirely, belong.

Some writers of the present day have been led, from the controversies and discrepancies to which this state of things has given rise, to conclude that *nothing* has as yet been accomplished, and that the whole therefore of the prophecies in Daniel and St. John relates to things future. And some of these writers have given indication of a considerable disposition to return back to the opinions of the primitive fathers, who in like manner are supposed to have considered the accomplishment of the whole to be future in their days, and to have maintained a unison of sentiment on these matters which could only have been the result of apostolical traditions prevalent among them. Both these conclusions I apprehend to be in a measure erroneous. For though many things remain yet to

be fulfilled, far more, I am inclined to think, than the generality of commentators suppose; yet much, I am persuaded, has been accomplished already, as will presently be shown: and though in some particulars the early fathers agreed concerning Antichrist, (in regard to which it is but fair to conclude that there was apostolical tradition prevalent among them, and deferred to as such,) yet on many other points they betray a great variety of sentiments, which shows that they must have been greatly in the dark in regard to them. Some of these have already been adverted to in the two former chapters; e. g. their opinions concerning the fourth empire of Daniel, and also concerning the time or duration of the visions; and other opinions will be noticed as they fall incidentally under observation in the course of the inquiry into this branch of the subject.

I. There are some preliminary particulars which require to be noticed, before proceeding to the application of those scriptures which bear upon the subject.

1. It will be useful to make mention, in the first place, of the principal prophecies which have been supposed more especially to relate to Antichrist.

The Apocalypse, then, appears chiefly devoted to the description of the origin and actings of Antichrist, and of the judgments finally poured out upon him: but more particularly chapters xi. xiii. and xvii. have reference to the Antichristian powers themselves. Other portions, however, are interpreted by different commentators as setting forth the same things. For example, some have thought that the *epistles* to the seven churches contain, under the address to each, a description of the prevailing apostacy and corruptions which were to characterize seven different ages through which the church was to pass;\* numerous commentators have considered the four first *seals* (at least the latter of these seals) as referring to the same; and some are disposed to view some of the circumstances of chap. ix. as intimately connected with the beast of chaps. xi. and xvii.

The principal matters in Daniel which relate to it are the Little Horn, which arises out of the ten-horned beast, in chap. vii; the little horn also which arises out of one of the four horns of the He-Goat, in chap. viii; and all that is said about the "vile" and "wilful" person in chap. xi: though in regard to the latter, there is a considerable difference of opinion, whether the "vile person" of verse 21, is the same as "the king who does according to his will," of verse 36; some conceiving

\* Brightman, Mede, More, Sir J. Newton, Gill, Vitringa, Cuninghame and Girdlestone, have inclined to this opinion.

the description of the Antichrist to commence only with the latter verse.

Isaiah xiv. concerning Lucifer the son of the morning, otherwise termed in this prophecy *the Assyrian*. Dr. Whitley says of it—"The entire passage is prophetic, and is called by the prophet himself מַשָּׁל *Mashal*, a parabolic or figurative prophecy, and was so understood by the Chaldee paraphrast and by the Syriac and Vulgate versions." P. 273. Mr. Begg considers the prophecy concerning the "cruel lord" of chap. xix. into whose hands the Egyptians are given over, to be the Antichrist also: but this has not been generally considered so.

Habakkuk ii. contains a description of him in the "proud (or boasting, ostentatious) man," that enlargeth his desire as *death and hell*,\* and gathereth unto him all nations. Moreover, the vision is for "the end" or "appointed time:" and the next chapter follows with a glorious description of the shining forth of the Lord, and wounding "the head out (or *over*) the house of the wicked."

All that relates to Gog and Magog, in Ezekiel xxxviii. and xxxix. were by the fathers in general referred to Antichrist. So were numerous passages in the Psalms, especially Psalm cix. Likewise in the epistles of St. Paul, 2 Thessalonians ii. 3—10.

Other scriptures abound with references to the subject, or to the congregation or agents of Antichrist; more particularly 1 Tim. iv. 1—3, 2 Tim. iii. 1—9, and various places in the epistles of Peter, John, and Jude.

2. The next thing to be noticed is the name *Antichrist*, concerning the meaning of which, in the first place, commentators differ. For as the Greek preposition *αγτι* signifies in composition both *contrariety* or *opposition* to, and *answerableness* or *correspondency* to; so, whilst some have taken it to signify an opponent, others have viewed it as denoting rather an imitator.

Both acceptations of the word however appear to be perfectly reconcileable. He comes as *ὁ ἀγτιμαμενος*—the *opposer*; (2 Thess. ii. 4.) and *ὁ ψευς*—the *liar*, "who *denieth* the Father and the Son." 1 John ii. 22. On the other hand, whilst there is a marked contrast, there is a striking correspondency between the Antichrist and Christ: wherefore Hippolytus says, in his work *De Antichristo*, "the deceiver wishes in every way to appear *like* the Son of God;" and he then proceeds to show that he comes as a prophet, a priest, a king, a shepherd, a lamb, "the bright and morning star," Lucifer,—but all spurious. And thus our Lord himself leads us to expect that many *false*

\* See verse 5, and compare Rev. vi. 8. and xx. 13.



Christs should arise, and should come in his name, saying, "I am Christ," and should deceive many; (Matt. xxiv. 5 with 24) all which appear to be, like the "many Antichrists" of St. John, types of the hues and shades of character which he who is more eminently to be *the Antichrist* shall assume.

Other names are given to him in the scriptures besides that of Antichrist; as "the man of sin,"—"the son of perdition,"—"the false prophet," and some others which have already been incidentally mentioned. Andreas, Ephraim Syrus, and others of the early Christian writers, commonly denominate him "the beast" and "the dragon."

3. From the various names which are given to him, his character and the nature of the offices he will assume, may be pretty clearly inferred: but in regard to three of those offices, viz. prophet, priest, and king,—in which he more particularly mimics the character of the Lord Jesus, a few observations may be needful; the more especially as some have concluded that he will be altogether void of religious profession. There is no need to show that he is to be a *king*: that is universally concurred in; and the fact that he is described so repeatedly as a *horn*, (which is a type of a king and a kingdom,) and "the *head over the wicked*," and "the king that doeth according to his will," sufficiently bespeaks it. That he is to be a *priest* likewise may be inferred from Psalm cix. which is applied in Acts i. 20. to Judas Iscariot, who was a type of Antichrist, and is therefore called "the son of perdition." He was clearly an *apostle* of Christ, though he proved a deceiver and betrayer of his trust; and the words of the Psalm—"and let another take his *office*," are quoted by St. Peter from the Septuagint, as referring to his ministerial office—"and his *bishopric* let another take." And next, as respects his being a *prophet*, it is remarkable that St. John, though he brings before our view a ten-horned beast, which evidently corresponds with the ten-horned beast of Daniel, does not afterwards proceed, as in Dan. vii., to describe a *little horn* springing up from among the ten horns, but describes instead of it a second beast with *two horns*,\* which he afterwards calls "the *false prophet*." Compare Rev. xiii. 12—17, with xix. 20. Thus he affects the Melchizedec character of our Lord, and appears as a priest upon a throne.

4. The fathers were unanimous in their opinion, that the Antichrist was to be a *person*; nor has the Greek church, which in most respects has maintained the sentiments of the fathers

\* The *horns* are like those of a *lamb*, showing that its power is derived from Christ the Lamb, being in fact an usurpation of his name and prerogative; and for his name and church he affects to exercise it. He comes in sheep's clothing, but is inwardly a ravening wolf.



on this point, ever made a question of it.\* But though the fathers were agreed as to the Antichrist being a person, very different were their sentiments as to the *nature* of his person. Hippolytus, who traces the particulars in which he will mimic Christ, supposes he will really be the devil himself, who will assume the *appearance* of flesh, but not be really so, and boast himself to be born of a virgin. Others, as Lactantius, Sulpitius, and Bede, suppose that he will be the *son* of the devil, and that his mother will be a harlot. Hilary conceives that the devil will actually become *incarnate*, as the Word was in the man Christ Jesus. Jerome inclined to the same opinion, so far, at least, as that Satan would dwell in some one of the human race, by whom he would be ενεργουμενος, or acted upon. Whilst Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Theodoret thought he would be a real man, but the agent of Satan. Most, however, of those who thought he would appear as man, (whether he were to be Satan incarnate or not,) concluded likewise that he would appear as a *Jew*, or actually be a Jew, of the tribe of Dan.† Most of those who held any of the above opinions considered that there was authority for them in the scriptures, however slender; as, for example, in regard to his being Satan incarnate, the fact was instanced that Satan entered into Judas Iscariot;—that he was to be Satan himself, was supposed to be confirmed by the fact, that the Lord said in reference to him, “Is not one of you *a devil*?” and also by the expression κατ’ ενεργειαν τε Σατανα in 2 Thess. ii. 9; and the fact that the tribe of Dan is omitted in the enumeration of the twelve tribes in Rev. vii. was a foundation for concluding him to be a Jew of that family.‡

The circumstance, however, that the Antichrist is viewed as a *person*, does not exclude the idea of a vast political and ecclesiastical power, comprehending multitudes of apostates: for we cannot conceive of any large number of persons, combining together for a work either of mischief or of good, or brought by overruling circumstances into such a combination, without having a head over them;—let them call him king, president, leader, or what they will. It is doubtless by means of numerous evil agents, imbibing his principles and in reality

\* The very titles of Antichrist, as read in the Greek, would necessarily convey the notion of *personality*.—ὁ αντιχριστος, ὁ ἀνθρώπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὁ υἱός, τῆς ἀπαλαμίας, ὁ Ψευστῆς, ὁ ἀρνευμενος, ὁ ἀνομος, &c.

† See Hilary, Chrysostome, Theophylact, Theodoret, Ambrose, and Jerome on 2 Thess. ii. Jerome also on Isaiah xvii. and Dan. xi. Lactantius lib. xvi. cap. 18. Sulpitius, Dialogue ii. Bede in Apoc. vii. and xiii. also Aretas, Primasius, Rupert, Haimo, &c.

‡ There is a portion for Dan in the division of the land, Ezekiel xlvi. 1 and 32; and he is the first tribe enumerated in the division.

constituting his power, that Antichrist will prevail: the means by which he, in the first instance, imposes on some of these, and then they upon others, is a distinct consideration. Dr. Hildrop, to whom is attributed an able treatise "on Antichrist" and "on the three last evils," justly observes, "that as Christ has his *mystical* as well as natural body, so has Antichrist his; and thus Christ and Antichrist may both be individuals, whilst the church of the one and the synagogue of the other are the mystical body." Neither does the notion of a personal Antichrist exclude a succession of men, who may all, in turn, become *head* over the empire of Antichrist, and be animated by the same or similar principles and spirit.

5. Another point of considerable importance in the inquiry is, whether *all* the passages of scripture which have been mentioned, as having a reference to the Antichrist, refer to one and the same power, or to *different* powers and individual heads over them. Mr. Faber would limit "THE Antichrist" to those scriptures only which contain that expression, and such as evidently, from their contexts, treat of the same things: and though this appears to be carrying the principle of discrimination too far, it has at least conducted Mr. Faber to the conclusion, that the last great apostacy, which is to be headed up by Antichrist, is to be of a Socino-infidel character, which appears to be the truth.

It is very clear, however, if the scriptures concerning Antichrist be duly weighed, that *more than one Antichristian power* is revealed therein. The beast of Rev. xiii. having *ten* horns, is manifestly distinct from the beast described in the same chapter, having *two* horns, however they may play into each other's hands. The beast of Rev. xvii. on which the harlot sits, is equally distinct from the harlot who has her seat upon him; for though they likewise appear to be in the first instance in alliance, yet afterwards the power of the beast is turned against her, and she is consumed by him.

In regard likewise to *other* powers, there is evidently a difference in the means by which they receive condign punishment; and if their *end* be different, it necessarily follows that there must be some distinction in the powers themselves. As this matter is of considerable importance to the student of prophecy, the end of some of them shall be noticed.

First, by *fire*.—The harlot of Rev. xvii. has her flesh eaten and is burned with fire. (V. 16.) The beast of Daniel vii. and the beast and false prophet mentioned in Rev. xix. are likewise both judged by fire: but there is a distinction to be noticed even in these three. The harlot is burned by the ten kings who comprise the beast of Rev. xvii. And the beast of

Dan. vii. is first *slain*, and when *dead* his *body* is destroyed, and given to the burning flame; whereas the beast and false prophet of Rev. xix. are *taken captive*, and then cast *alive* into a lake of fire burning with brimstone.\*

Secondly, by the *sword*.—The remnant, who are with the beast of Rev. xix. are said to be slain with the sword. And the end of Gog, in Ezekiel xxxviii. is, that the Lord calls for a *sword* against him, throughout all his mountains;—every man's sword shall be against his brother. And the Lord pleads against him with pestilence and blood, and rains upon *him* AND upon his *bands*, and on the *many people* with him (so that Gog himself appears distinct from his bands and confederates) an overflowing rain and great hailstones, *fire and brimstone*, (verses 21—23) “and I will *turn thee back*, and thou shalt fall upon the mountains of Israel, *thou* AND all thy *bands* and the people with thee, and I will give thee to the ravenous birds of every sort and to the beasts of the field to be *devoured*. Thou shalt fall upon the open field, for I have spoken it.” Chap. xxxix. 2. One or two remarks may be made here. First, the sword, in the latter instance, appears to be literally the sword of carnal warfare; for each *man's* sword is against his brother. Whereas the sword, in the former instance, is that “which proceeds out of the mouth of Christ,” which is evidently a symbol. Secondly, the destruction of Gog and his bands, mentioned in Ezekiel, is apparently different from the destruction of Gog mentioned in Rev. xx. In the latter instance fire comes down from God out of heaven and *devours* them, apparently while they are compassing about the beloved city (v. 9); whereas in Ezekiel, though fire and brimstone is indeed rained on them, yet they are *devoured* by the birds of the air and the beasts of the field, and that upon the mountains of Israel. Even if the latter description be figurative, it must be very different from that of Rev. xx.

Thirdly, by means which are manifestly *superhuman*.—For example, “the Wicked One” of 2 Thess. ii. 8. is to be consumed with the spirit of the Lord's mouth, and *destroyed* with the brightness of his coming.” A consumption or wasting is here first decreed, similar to that of the little horn of Dan. vii. 26. and it is to be accomplished by the Spirit of the Lord's mouth, whatever may be intended by that expression: it may be the same as “the sword out of his mouth,” in Rev.

\* The fire by which the beast of Dan. vii. is destroyed is probably the “fiery stream” which issued and came forth from before the ancient of days. The lake of fire, of Rev. xix. may be the same as this stream: “For Tophet is ordained of old; yea for the king (of Babylon) it is prepared—the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it.” Isaiah xxx. 33.

xix. 21.\* But the final destruction of the wicked one is to be by the brightness or shining forth of the Lord from heaven—  
 τῆς ἐπιφανείας τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ, the epiphany of his coming.†

Again, the little horn, or “king of fierce countenance,” of Dan. viii. 23. is “broken without hand.” V. 25. This at the least intimates that his destruction will not be effected by the hand of man. Some have inferred from it, that as “a house not made with hands,” “a stone cut out of a mountain without hands,” and “circumcision without hand,” signify a spiritual house, kingdom, and circumcision, so the same is to be understood here, and that it implies *the conversion to God* of the power spoken of.‡ Some again have concluded it to be equivalent with Dan. xi. 45. “Yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him;” and therefore that the same person or power is predicated of in both places. There appears however a material difference, in saying that a man shall be “broken without hand;” and that “no hand shall help him.” He might be broken by the hand of man, whilst yet no hand should come to his relief. But these things are left with the reader: it is to the circumstance of there being different modes of punishment and destruction declared, that his attention is principally directed, as being important toward obtaining correct views respecting Antichrist; though it is not intended at present to distinguish between all these different powers, and to assign to each prophecy its distinct and proper person.

II. We may now pass to consider the *fulfilment* of these prophecies.

1. There were few of the older commentators who did not suppose the little horn of the He-Goat in Dan. viii. to have been fulfilled in Antiochus Epiphanes. It has already been shown that Josephus mentions this opinion, (b. x. c. 14. b. xii. c. 7.) which looks as if it were current among the Jews previous to the coming of our Lord. From Jerome’s commentary on Daniel it may be seen, that most of the Christian fathers held the same.

At a later period many of the fathers began to entertain the opinion that the little horn of Dan. vii. was likewise fulfilled in Antiochus, which appears to have arisen from the circumstance that Porphyry, for the purpose of denying the inspiration of the book of Daniel, declared that the book had been

\* The reader would do well to compare and consider in connection with this expression Isaiah xi. 4. Hosea vi. 5. Malachi iv. 6. Ephes. vi. 17. and Rev. xix. 21. which are probably intended to explain each other.

† It has already been shown, at page 129, that the word *παρουσία* is used only in respect to the *personal* coming of the Lord.

‡ Mr. Faber considers that this expression implies the *conversion* of the Mahomedans.

written subsequent to the times of Antiochus, and was in reality a *history* of his exploits. The same remark he applied to the latter verses of Dan. xi. Jerome contends against him, and shows that in regard to the latter chapter, he had falsified some facts, and stated others on no historic evidence. At the same time both Jerome and Theodoret acknowledge Antiochus to have been a *type* of the Antichrist; and in process of time the *typical* character of Antiochus was lost sight of, and many held that his proceedings were the *proper* accomplishment of the prophecies of Daniel.\* Even so late down as the period of the Reformation this opinion was held by Grotius and Erasmus.

The opinion of the fathers concerning Antiochus previous to Porphyry, and of many subsequent to him, who, like Jerome, held that Dan. vii. and xi. related to the future Antichrist, is important as showing, that at this early period it was not considered that *all* the prophecies which have been enumerated referred to *one individual*; but that at least the main subject of Dan. viii. might be separately applied.

2. Typical fulfilments of parts of these prophecies have been frequently supposed to have taken place. Calmet states that some things were applied to Nebuchadnezzar and Cambyses. Herod, Judas Iscariot, and Simon Magus were considered types by others. Most of the emperors, in whose reigns persecution arose against the church, were either supposed to be Antichrist himself or types of him. Lightfoot states, (Chron. p. 104) that when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians about "him that letteth," some understood it of the Emperor Claudius, in whose reign St. Paul is supposed to have written this. Then Nero was thought to be the Antichrist, long after whose death a notion prevailed that he would rise from the dead before the end, and complete *all* that yet remained to be fulfilled concerning Antichrist.† In like manner also Domitian, Marcus Aurelius, Severus, Decius, Gallus, Dioclesian, Julian, were all taken to be either Antichrist himself or his immediate fore-runner;‡ and various other circumstances led different fathers in the early ages to suppose that his coming must be nigh at hand.§

\* Mr. Frere, in his Three Letters on Prophecy, brings forward much interesting matter from the fathers respecting Antiochus, and refers to Aquipontanus for a list of those early writers who imagined Antiochus to be treated of in Dan. xi. and other places. Mr. Frere argues against the interpretation which applied any part to Antiochus Epiphanes.

† See Victoria in Apoc. Ambrose and Chrysostom in 2 Thess. ii. Jerome on Dan. xi.

‡ See Euseb. Hist. lib. v. c. 1; lib. vi. c. 6.

§ For testimonials to this effect, see Calmet's dictionary, under the article *Antichrist*.



Besides this there was scriptural ground to lead the early Christians to conclude, that the rudiments of that apostacy, which was to lead on to the manifestation of the Antichrist, were already germinating and beginning to develop themselves in their days. How plainly St. Paul declares this; "And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the *mystery of iniquity doth already work*: only he who now letteth (or hindereth his revelation) will let, until he be taken out of the way." 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7. St. John goes further, and says: "And as ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even *now* are there *many Antichrists*, whereby we know that it is the last time." 1 John ii. 18. "And this is that spirit of Antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and *even now already is it in the world.*" Ibid. iv. 3. St. Paul appears also to describe the "many Antichrists" of the last days, in 2 Tim. iii; for though he speaks of them as to arise especially in the last days, and to be one of the signs of those times, yet the whole context shows, that such persons were already apparent in the church; and he gives Timothy express directions to avoid such. V. 6. Thus Cyprian was led to call all heretics the precursors of that one and special Antichrist which is to come at the last end of the world.\* And it appears to have been with a view to St. John's description of Antichrist in his first epistle that Hilary augured, from the great progress of *Arianism* in his days, that the revelation of Antichrist was at hand. Cont. Arian.

3. Nevertheless, however the Antichrist might have existed in embryo in the days of the early fathers, and however they might have considered various individuals to have represented him in type, they looked forward at the same time for the manifestation of a person who was yet to be revealed; who was to arrive at a climax of wickedness and impiety, such as had never yet been exhibited on earth; and who was also to deceive and coerce, and by various arts draw after him the great multitude of mankind. So convinced indeed were the bishops of Rome, even after the times of Constantine, that the Antichrist was yet to come, and that he was to appear in the Roman empire, that in order to evade the awkward inference, that he would probably prove to be some apostate emperor or bishop of Rome, they gradually (as has been before stated) fell into the conceit that the *millennium* commenced with Constantine; and then maintained, to reconcile this figment with the *non*-appearance of the Antichrist, that he was not to be revealed until the thousand years were expired;—an opinion which

\* See him quoted to this effect in the Rev. E. Bickersteth's "Practical Guide to the Prophecies," p. 88, 4th ed.



was not only contrary to scripture and to all previous antiquity, but which has been one great means of darkening the counsel of God, so far as it is revealed in the page of prophecy. The Greek church, at the same time that they held the coming of Antichrist to be future, have not departed from the opinion that the thousand years *follow* his manifestation. The Romish church have universally adopted the error just noticed, and do, to this day, consider the coming of Antichrist to be future: though it was not until the council of Florence, in 1439, that they avowedly and formally contradicted the expectation of his coming *previous* to the millennium.

III. The next application of these prophecies which demands attention, is that which refers them, or any considerable portion of them, to the POPE—viewed not as one single individual, living only during the term of the natural life of man, but as the ecclesiastical head of the Roman empire, and therefore as consisting of the succession of popes under whom the papal system grew to its height of blasphemy and impiety.

1. Various circumstances had been paving the way for the ascendancy of this great apostacy. The heresies which disfigured the very first ages of Christianity, and to which St. Paul and St. John allude, may be accounted as one circumstance, growing and increasing as they did with the spread of Christianity, and insinuating themselves like an evil leaven, more or less, throughout all sections of the visible church. To this may be added the flagrant corruptions, ambition, worldly-mindedness, and disorders, which grew up after the Roman empire became nominally Christian. Next may be instanced the abominable superstitions which pervaded almost the whole mass of the church, insomuch that Gibbon declares “the Christians of the seventh century had insensibly relapsed into a semblance of paganism.” Vol. ix. p. 261. Lastly may be noticed the dissolution of the Roman empire by the irruption of the barbarian nations, and the division of the territory into separate states and kingdoms by the conquerors; whereby it came to pass, that space was given for the aggrandisement of the Roman pontiffs by the possession of temporal dominion.

2. Various instances have been adduced, by protestant interpreters of prophecy, of individuals who, during the early periods of the rise and increase of the papal tyranny and superstition, denounced or deplored the antichristian or apostate spirit which prevailed. The declaration of Gregory the Great, so early as the sixth century, has been alleged for this point; viz. “that whosoever stiled himself *universal bishop* proved himself to be the *fore-runner* of Antichrist.” Opera, lib. vi. Ep. 30. Arnulph, bishop of Orleans, is said to have

expressed himself as follows concerning the pope, in a council held at Rheims in the tenth century: "What think ye, reverend fathers, of this man, elevated on a lofty throne, and glittering in gold and purple? Whom do ye account him to be? Surely, if destitute of charity, and elated with the pride of science alone, he is Antichrist, sitting in the temple of God, and shewing himself that he is God." Baronius in *Annales* 992. Clarke in his "Prophetic Records" gives the following in inverted commas; but his work is throughout defective from the want of references.—"There were *numbers* of persons in the communion of Rome, who declared *plainly*, and *without reserve*, that the pope was Antichrist. In the proceedings of the council of Rheims held in 991 it appears that Gonthier bishop of Cologne and Tergand archbishop of Treves were among this number. The clergy of Liege, according to Aventin, (lib. iv.) and Frederick I. called Barbarossa, in the twelfth century, as well as Frederick II. in the thirteenth century, with Everard bishop of Saltzburg, Darsilius of Padua, Petrarch, and several others, have all been pointed out as having designated the bishop of Rome as the real Antichrist, baptizing him, as it were, with this name, and applying to him all the characters in the Apocalypse with a degree of force and accuracy not to be exceeded." Bernard, abbot of Clairvaux in the twelfth century, is likewise instanced as having then declared that the beast of the Apocalypse occupied the chair of St. Peter; (Epist. 125) and Joachim abbot of Calabria advanced similar statements about the same period.\*

Some of the preceding testimonies have been called in question by the Rev. S. R. Maitland of Gloster; and there is doubtless a character of exaggeration in the use that has been made of them.† Genebrand however and Baronius, Roman Catholic writers, call the tenth century an *iron*, a *lead*, and an *unhappy* age: "Chiefly unhappy (says the latter) in that for almost 150 years the popes totally degenerated from the virtue of their ancestors, being more like *apostates* than *apostles*." Proph. Records, p. 32. Of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Vitringa, who is a sober and careful witness, declares, that the language of pious men in general was, that the pope was Antichrist and the church of Rome Babylon. In Apoc. p. 749. The Rev. H. Girdlestone, in his "Analytical Comment on the

\* Roger de Hovendon *Annales*. Edit. Franc. 1601. p. 681. Cave. H. L. vol. ii. p. 278.

† It is easy for a man, when searching for such testimony, and finding only five or six instances, to say "that there were *numbers* of persons—among whom were these five or six." Or first to instance these six and then add, "*and several others*." But one may reasonably question if the others would not have been mentioned if known.

first part of the Revelation," asserts, "that some spiritual men of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, the most eminent of whom were Peter John Olive and Hubert de Casali, denounced the gross body of the church of Rome as the Babylon of the Apocalypse. And it is notorious that in the times of the Reformation the opinion that the pope was Antichrist became general and decided among protestants. Mr. Cuninghame quotes the testimony of Cranmer when about to be committed to the flames: "As for the Pope, I refuse him as Christ's enemy and Antichrist, with all his false doctrine." Ridley also, in his farewell letter written just before he suffered martyrdom, declared: "The see of Rome is the seat of Satan, and the bishop of the same, that maintaineth the abominations thereof, is Antichrist himself indeed. And for the same cause this see at this day is the same which St. John called in his Revelation, *Babylon*, &c." Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, and Knox, have all declared the same;\* and similar testimonies are instanced by Mr. Cuninghame from Latimer and Hooper; and by Mr. Bickersteth from numerous writers.

3. To go into all the circumstances in the history of the papacy, which have been supposed by interpreters to correspond with the scripture delineations of Antichrist, would require a much larger volume than the one now before the reader; a slight sketch however of some of its more prominent features will be necessary.

(1.) There are some *external* features which are remarkable. First, Dan. vii. leads us to expect that before the little Antichristian horn three of the ten horns, or kingdoms, of the beast should be plucked up or subdued. And history testifies, that when the western Roman empire was divided into ten kingdoms,† the pope became possessed of three of them, viz. Ravenna, Lombardy, and Rome, which were plucked up *before* him and *for* him by the French monarch. And in token of this circumstance the pope now wears *three crowns* upon his mitre; and in farther commemoration of it a piece of mosaic work was made for his palace in which St. Peter is represented with three keys in his lap, signifying that they are the three keys of this part of his patrimony. Newton on Dan. p. 86—88.

Another feature is, that in Rev. xvii. the ten horned beast is represented as of a *scarlet* colour, and the woman who is seated upon it is "arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls." Verse 3, 4. The pontifical cope, worn on the eve of St. Peter, is made

\* "Strictures on the Rev. S. R. Maitland's four pamphlets."

† Of the ten kingdoms I shall treat more particularly presently.

of fine red or scarlet stuff. The cardinals are clothed in scarlet. Eight men in long scarlet robes bear the "*Sedia Gestoria*;" and the palfrey whereon the pope rides is covered with scarlet cloth. There is a profusion of gold and jewellery and costly stones likewise displayed: the cope already alluded to is fastened with a hook or buckle of gold, called *pectoral*, enriched with precious stones, which alone is estimated at more than 50,000 crowns.

A farther illustration of the gold and precious stones exhibited on him will lead us to another singular coincidence. It is said in Rev. xiii. that the *dragon* gave to this beast his power and his seat and great authority; and the pope has actually adopted the dragon as part of his armorial bearings. For pope Gregory removed the *cross* from the top of the papal tiara or triple crown, made by pope Julius II. and replaced it by a brilliant emerald supported by two golden *dragons*, and caused his own arms to be quartered therewith, and then his name and title in diamonds;\* so that the dragon became at once his crest and his supporters; thus significantly, though unconsciously on his part, seemed to point out, on whose authority he leaned and gloried.

Those who see in the *two-horned* beast of Rev. xiii. an emblem of the secular and spiritual, or ecclesiastical, power of the pope, point to the farther circumstance of the pope causing to be carried before him upon state occasions *two swords* as the mark of his two-fold sovereignty and dominion. Habershon, p. 315. And it is farther remarkable, that as the two horns of this beast are "like a *lamb*," whilst yet "he spake as a *dragon*;" so, whilst the popes have mounted the dragon as their crest, they have also assumed as the device upon their banner a *lamb passant*.

I am aware that some of these things are merely symbols or emblems in the word of prophecy, and are therefore significant of *other* things; but so are they significant emblems also in the instance of the popes, and apparently shadow forth the very same circumstances and characteristics which are designed in scripture; so that mystically and literally there is a resemblance. And it is difficult to explain the singular coincidence of these circumstantial in the graphical delineations of Antichrist with the outward aspect and insignia of the popes, and at the same time to bear in remembrance the overruling providence of God even in the minutest matters, without coming to the conclusion, either that he permitted this coincidence for

\* See Rabett "on the Number of the Beast," who informs us, (p. 202, 203,) that there is an engraving of this crest in the Voyages of the Sieur A. de la Motraye, vol. i. chap. ii. p. 32, plate iv.

the purpose of *deluding* his church; or, which is most agreeable to reason and piety, that he designed by these outward marks that his church should be enabled to identify the papacy, as the little horn, the false prophet, and the harlot of the scriptures. Had the Romish church but kept the word of God continually before her, a recollection that these things are described therein would have led her, upon every principle of good taste and of discretion, to have avoided them, that there might at least be no *external* semblance betwixt herself and the Antichrist; but having shut up the scriptures, and especially the Apocalypse, she has been led in her pride and infatuation to decorate herself with his very badges and livery, blindly mistaking them for the garments of Messiah.

(2.) Passing, however, now to the actings and spiritual characteristics of Antichrist, a few circumstances must be noticed. And the first which presents itself is the *blasphemy* and *pride* described of him. This characteristic indeed belongs, more or less, to *all* the different persons described; so that it is no wonder if commentators have been led to infer, that they are one and the same; and it may well be questioned whether each antichristian power that has appeared or shall appear has not exhibited a primary or a typical fulfilment of every prophecy relating to Antichrist.

Dan. vii. has "I beheld then because of the voice of *the great words which the horn spake*;"—the horn that had eyes and a mouth that spake very great things;—"whose look was more stout than his fellows;"—"he shall *speak great words against the Most High*." V. 11, 20, 25.

Rev. xiii. has—"There was given unto him *a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies*;"—"and he *opened his mouth in blasphemy against God*, to blaspheme his name, and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven." V. 5, 6.

Dan. xi. 36, has—"He shall *exalt himself and magnify himself against every god*, and shall speak *marvellous things against the God of gods*."

Dan. viii. has—"He *magnified himself even to the Prince of the host*;"—"He shall *magnify himself in his heart*,"—"and shall *stand up against the Prince of princes*." V. 11, 25.

And 2 Thess. ii. 4. has—"Who *opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God*, or that is worshipped: so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, *shewing himself that he is God*."

It may be observed in the above five passages, that the *speaking* blasphemy is only expressed in the first three of them, though it is *implied* in the two last. Whilst the self-exaltation and inflation of heart are described in the three last,



and only to be inferred in the two first. And there is also a climax observable in his exaltation: for he magnifies himself *against* the God of gods,—and *even to* the Prince of the host, and he opposes and exalts himself *above* all that is called God, and exhibits himself that *he is God*.\*

A few instances must suffice of the pope's *magnifying himself* in the manner above stated. But first it may be necessary to observe that some, in reference to 2 Thess. ii. 4. distinguish between those "who are *called* God," or have the title of God, and him who is God by nature.† For in Psalm lxxxii. 6, the Lord doth himself give to the *rulers* of the people the title of *gods*, which is confirmed by our Lord in John x. 34, 35—"Is it not written in your law, *I said, Ye are gods?* If he called *them* gods, unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, &c." 1 Cor. viii. 5. seems to allude to the same thing, when it speaks of gods on earth; and it appears evident that assumption of power and authority over all kings and judges of the earth must be included in the term "*all that is called God.*"

Pope Innocent III. then, in whose reign the inquisition was founded, writes: "Christ hath set one man over the world; him whom he hath appointed his vicar on earth: and as to Christ is bent every knee in heaven, in earth, and under the earth, so shall obedience and service be paid to his vicar by all, that there may be one fold and one shepherd." And Gregory VII. in his epistle says:—The Roman pontiff by right is *universal*. In him *alone* is the *right of making laws*. Let all kings kiss the feet of the pope. His name alone shall

\* Some have inferred, that because he speaks *against* God, and magnifies himself *against* him, therefore the Pope cannot be intended; forasmuch as he has ever acknowledged God and professed to act only in his name. But this arises from a misapprehension in some particulars of the character of Antichrist, and also of the nature of blasphemy. "For it was not an enemy that *reproached* me; then I could have borne it: neither was it he that hated me, that did *magnify himself against me*; then I would have hid myself from him." No, it is a professed friend, whose horn of power assumes the character of a *lamb*, being in fact exercised in the name of the Lamb; and though war is in his heart and he speaks like a dragon, and his words are in reality "drawn swords," yet are they "smoother than butter" and "softer than oil," having a plausible semblance of piety and regard for the interests of God. See Psalm lv. 12, 21, which throughout relates apparently to the Antichrist; and its primary fulfilment in Judas Iscariot shows, as already has been noticed, that what is stated is perfectly consistent with the Antichrist not being an *open* enemy. And Christ was accused of *blasphemy* by the Jews, not because he *denied* the Father, but because he was supposed by them to have unwarrantably magnified himself to an equality with God. Comp. John v. 18; and x. 33. And the Jews are also accused of having *blasphemed* the name of God, because their conduct, as professors of his religion, was calculated to bring that name into reproach. Rom. ii. 24.

† See, for example, Mr. Cuninghame in answer to Mr. Burgh, page 18 of Appendix.



be heard in all the churches: it is the only name in the world. It is his right to depose kings. His sentence is not to be repealed by any one: it is to be repealed by himself alone. He is to be *judged by none.*”\*

“The pope, (says Mr. Keith,) assumed a prerogative and exercised a power, such as no race of kings ever claimed; and, *exalting himself above all*, maintained an unparalleled ascendancy, and prospered during a period which scarcely any dynasty on earth ever equalled.”—“In the ninth century pope Nicholas maintained that he was not liable to the judgment of any man. Pope John claimed the obedience of princes as his due, and threatened them with excommunication. In the eleventh century Leo IX. sanctioned the opinion, that it is very unbecoming that those should be subject to an *earthly* empire, whom the divine majesty had set over an heavenly. He defended alike the spiritual authority and the temporal sovereignty of the popes. Gregory VII. thundered out a terrible excommunication against the emperor Henry IV. in which he anathematized him and all his adherents, declared him to have forfeited the kingdoms of Germany and Italy, together with all regal dignity; forbade all Christians to obey him; bestowed the kingdom of Germany on Radulphus, elected by the princes of Germany; and finally exhorted all of them to take up arms against Henry, and to divest him of his dominions.” Signs of the Times, p. 103.

Various instances are well known of the unparalleled insolence of the popes towards kings and judges of the earth. Our own king John was forced to resign his crown into his hands, and to do homage to him, and to receive it as a gift from the holy see; and the pope’s legate, who retained possession of it for five days, trampled under his feet the money which, in token of his vassalage, was given him by the king. The emperor Henry IV. was made to wait three days at the gates of the fortress of Canusium, bareheaded and barefooted, with nothing but a coarse cloth over him, before Hildebrand (Gregory VII.) would grant him absolution. At the command of another pope, the English Henry II. walked barefooted to do penance at the tomb of Becket. Pope Celestin dashed with his foot the crown from the head of Henry VI; and Pope Alexander is said to have trod on the neck of the emperor Frederick I: though this latter circumstance is not so well authenticated. Keith, p. 110. The bull of the pope, in which the deposition of Queen Elizabeth was pronounced, was couched in these terms: “Him *alone* (the pope) hath God con-

\* See these two instances quoted by Mr. Habershon, in his “Dissertation,” &c. p. 317.

stituted *prince over all nations* and over all kingdoms, to root out, and to pull down, and to destroy, and to throw down, to build, and to plant, &c." Camd. Hist. 1570.

But farther than this, "he opposeth and exalteth himself above ALL that is called God;" which word *all* must include the proper deity of the triune Jehovah himself, who alone is of right "called God." And this is farther evident from its being declared next, "that he *as God*, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. ii. 4. Surely he exalts himself above the authority of God, who supersedes his word, and imposes his own will in its stead,—who takes away one of the commandments from the decalogue, and insists upon the worship of the images of saints;—who shuts up the Holy Scriptures, by which alone God's word and will can be known and followed;—who withholds the cup from the laity, which Jesus desired "all" to drink of;\*—who forbids marriage to the priesthood, which God hath declared to be honourable in *all*;† who commands to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. In which two latter circumstances he is a striking exemplification of that apostate spirit mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 1—3, and which likewise is applied to Antichrist.

Various instances are also adduced by writers on this subject of the blasphemous flattery and adulation which has been addressed to the popes, and which flatteries have been approved, encouraged, and rewarded in the writers of the church of Rome, and the style of which is even adopted in the language of public decretals and acts of council. The Rev. R. Rabett has a pithy collection of them in his work upon the number of the Beast, as—"The countenance of thy *Divine Majesty*;"—"All power is delivered by the Lord TO THEE ALONE, both in *heaven* and upon the earth;"—"Another *God* upon earth;"—"O Pope, thou art not God nor man—but betwixt them both thou art."‡ Mr. Keith has a similar collection,

\* One of the most disgusting instances of the pride of the Popes is mentioned by Mr. Edward Wright, in the narrative of his travels in Italy, and of which he was an eye-witness; viz. that at the ceremony of the coronation of the Pope, he *sucks* the sacramental wine *through a tube*, not deigning to touch with his lips the chalice out of which the other priests and bishops have to drink. Vol. i. p. 191. London, 1730.

† Some commentators consider the statement in Dan. xi. 37. concerning the wilful king, that he shall not regard *the desire of women*, to be the same as that of Paul in 1 Tim. iv. 3, that he should *forbid to marry*.

‡ Mr. Rabett mentions also having himself seen a beautifully enamelled tablet, apparently executed when Popery was in its zenith, which represented a Trinity of persons—consisting of the Holy Ghost, in the likeness of a dove; our Lord Jesus Christ, in the likeness of a man; and the Pope with his triple crown and the keys of St. Peter; and then the following words in Latin under-

from which the following may be added: "Our Lord God the Pope;" (which is the common style of "his holiness" in Italy);—"the power of the pope is greater than *all created power*, and extends to things celestial, terrestrial and infernal;"—"the pope doth whatsoever he listeth, even things unlawful, and is *more than God!*"\* And in regard to the sitting as God in the temple of God, the same Mr. Wright, already quoted, confirms as an eye-witness, what has been often before declared by other writers, that at the inauguration of a new pope, at which he was present, the pope *sate on the great altar*, and received the adoration of the cardinals, who kissed his foot, hand, and cheek."†

(3.) The next conspicuous feature in the Antichrist is that of the *persecution of the saints*. "The same horn made war with the saints and prevailed against them." Dan. vii. 21. "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints and to overcome them." Rev. xiii. 7. "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the Lamb and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus." On this head the short summary of Mr. Scott of the cruelties of the papacy, brought forward by Mr. Bickersteth in his recently published "Remarks on the progress of Popery," is sufficiently to the point, without enlarging further. "No computation can reach the numbers who have been put to death in different ways on account of their maintaining the profession of the gospel and opposing the corruptions of the church of Rome. A million of poor Waldenses perished in France. Nine hundred thousand orthodox Christians were slain in less than thirty years after the institution of the order of the Jesuits. The Duke of Alva boasted of having put thirty-six thousand to death in the

---

neath, "*Holy Trinity, One God*, whether we invoke Thee, whether we adore Thee, we praise Thee; we glorify Thee, *O Blessed Trinity*, under the name of the One God." P. 288.

\* Mr. Rabett refers, for authorities to the titles he cites, to Orat. Puccii. in Sess. 9. Concil. Lateram. sub Leo X. ap. Sur. ipso limine;—Orat. Marcell. in 4 Sess. Concil. Lateram. sub Jul. II. ap. sur.—Clement. Præm. in Gloss. prop. fin. The reader will find most of these likewise in Bishop Newton's work on the Prophecies; who refers to Bishop Jewell's Apology, Downham's Treatise *de Antichristo*, Poole's English Annotations, and Barrow's Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy.

† This account is corroborated by Dr. Conyers Middleton, who observes that Caligula was the first sovereign of Pagan Rome who offered his foot to be kissed by any; which raised a general indignation in the empire.

Mr. Burgh objects, in regard to the phrase "sitteth in the temple of God," that to suit the views of Mr. Cuninghame and other similar interpreters, it is degraded into a *figurative* sitting, inasmuch as the Pope does not *always* sit there. Mr. Cuninghame in reply argues, that it is not more figurative than the phrase, "William IV. now sits on the throne of Britain," whereas at the time he was writing it was not literally so; and never indeed but on particular occasions. P. 31, Answer to Burgh, Appendix.

Netherlands by the hands of the common executioner during the space of a few years. The inquisition destroyed by various tortures one hundred and fifty thousand within thirty years. These are a few specimens, *and but a few*, of those which history has recorded; but the total amount will never be known till the earth shall disclose her blood and no more cover her slain," p. 26. So the learned Dr. John Owen in his "Sermons," sets down in the same summary manner the persecutions of the papacy, thus concluding: "What I pray you hath been their main business for seven hundred years and upwards, even almost ever since the Man of Sin was enthroned? How have they earned the titles 'eldest son of the church,'—'catholic and most christian king?' hath it not been by 'the blood of the saints?'" P. 328.

(4.) One point more shall suffice, which is added chiefly on account of the emphasis that has been laid on it by others; for it belongs not to the description of the little horn, neither to that of the beast of the Apocalypse. It is, that in his estate the wilful king shall honour the god of forces. Dan. xi. 38. The original word *Mahuzzim*, used in this place for *the god of forces*, is translated in the margin of our bibles *gods protectors*; and the word *Mahuzzim* itself is retained in the Vulgate, and some other versions. The word *Mahoz*, in the singular, is translated as a *defender, deliverer, strength, rock of defence*, &c. in the following places: Psalm xxi. 2, 5; xxvii. 1; xxviii. 8; xxxvii. 39. Commentators give different explanations of this word, and of course make different applications of it: that which refers it to the *patron saints* among the Roman Catholics seems best to agree with the meaning of the term as translated in the various passages of Scripture just referred to. There is scarcely a city, town or village in the Romish dominions, which is not placed under the special *protection* of some canonized saint; and these with their relics were honoured with the titles of *towers, walls, bulwarks, fortresses*, in other words, *Mahuzzim*; and were and are prayed to and adored even to this day, *genuflexions* being made before their pictures and images, and *luminaries* and incense being offered before them.\*

The "doctrines of devils," (or *doctrines concerning demons*) mentioned in 1 Tim. iv. 1, is interpreted by Mede and others to have a like signification: *demons* being among the pagans the spirits of departed heroes supposed to be deified, and therefore answering to the spirits of departed saints among the papists. Mr. Keith and others have largely shown that these have been "honoured with gold and silver, and with precious

\* See for ample proofs of this, *Mede's Works*, page 673, and Sir Isaac Newton's *Observations on Daniel*, chap. xiv.

stones and pleasant things;" (Dan. xi. 38.) The riches of the shrine of Thomas a Becket were such, that the gold alone, when it was broken down, filled two large chests which eight strong men could scarcely carry out of the church. And the throng of strangers who brought offerings to the altar of St. Paul at Rome was so great, that Gibbon relates, that two priests stood night and day with rakes in their hands to collect without counting the heaps of gold and silver poured upon it.\* And to this day whatsoever is costly and precious and pleasant, from jewels of great price to the embroidered petticoat, are devoted to decorate the shrines or images of departed saints. Surely here is "that great city that was clothed in fine linen and purple and scarlet, and decked with gold and precious stones." Rev. xviii.

(4.) "What a MYSTERY,† (says Mr. Bickersteth) there is in Popery! Look at some of its pretensions and realities. It boasts of purity, sanctity, universality, and apostolicity, and yet has practised the most horrible wickedness that this world has ever seen. O mystery of mysteries! The shepherd is the wolf devouring the flock. The servant of Jesus Christ, claiming to be his only true follower, sets aside his Master's laws, tramples upon his word, and exalts his own inventions above them. The follower of that lowly One, who washed his disciples' feet, requires emperors and kings to kiss his feet and do him homage. He styles himself servant of servants, and yet claims a direct, supreme, spiritual power; and thereby, indirectly, (as Bellarmine says,) a certain, and that a supreme, power in temporal things. In profession he owns God and Jesus Christ, humility and justice, truth and love; and yet, under this pretence, has masked the very utmost pride, injustice, falsehood, wickedness and cruelty,—dispensing with the laws of God, murdering men, women, and children, who have followed their conscience and the word of God rather than his blasphemous decrees! O horrible scheme of satanic religion! What mysteries it comprehends! To forbid meats as an act of piety, though God himself has commanded them to be received with thanksgiving;—to make it praiseworthy devotion to worship images, which God has called idolatry;—to make it a part of merit before God to adore saints and angels, which God has foretold as beguiling us of our reward;—to make it a part of religion to contrive rebellion against kings, whom God

\* See Burnett's Hist. Ref. p. 244; Gibbon, vol. xii. p. 311, and Keith's Signs of the Times, vol. i. p. 133, &c.

† Mr. Irving considered that the word "*Mystery*" emblazoned on the forehead of the Babylonish Harlot, (Rev. xvii.) was designed to identify her with "the mystery" of iniquity of 2nd Thess. ii. See "Babylon Foredoomed," p. 403.



has called us to honour;—and a proof of zeal for God to perpetrate the most atrocious cruelties that ever man perpetrated on his fellow-men;—for the greatest of sinners to promise to forgive sin;—to pretend to be the very fountain of all peace, harmlessness, spotlessness, and purity, and yet to be full of all wickedness, and stir up wars and ruin countries, and destroy innumerable multitudes;—to pretend to be the vicar of Christ, and instead of being meek, to be clothed with pride; instead of preaching, never to preach; instead of being a sufferer, to sit in all the pomp and glory of this world, reign over the earth, and wear his triple crown, full of precious stones and diamonds.” Prog. Popery, p. 19.

Certainly when we look at this picture and look at those delineations of Antichrist which are contained in the Scriptures, it seems wonderful how any can resist the conclusion that we have a lively imitation of it in the papacy. To deny that these can apply to the papacy, and to conclude that that power has not been contemplated by the Holy Ghost in any of the passages which have been referred to, and that the cloud of interpreters who have so applied them have been mistaken,—seems to be irreconcilable with the ordinary principles of reasoning and just induction. Nevertheless some eminent men have judged contrary. Zanchius and Grotius have both deprecated the making out the pope to be Antichrist. Hammond has done the same; and Archbishop Sheldon in a public disputation at Oxford, undertook to oppugn the common notions respecting Antichrist, and to evince the error of applying that prophetic name and character to the pope or bishop of Rome.\* Thorndyke in his work on the Revelation has also denied it; but he goes with Grotius and Hammond, not only in this particular, but in the limiting prophecy to a primary literal application. Recently, through the writings of Mr. Maitland of Gloucester and Mr. Burgh of Dublin, many have begun seriously to question, whether the pope be the Antichrist; though it is to be feared, that the difficulties which the prophetic system of some of these writers remove out of the way of superficial readers,—by making all these prophecies relate only to the future, and by leading us to expect that, when fulfilled, the agreement of the accomplishment with the prophecy will be so striking and conspicuous that none will be able to question it,—is a great inducement to many to receive their views, who would fain be spared the trouble of reading history and of studying and comparing prophecy, and who now are satisfied to wait supinely for events which are to

\* See Whitley's "Scheme, &c. of Prophecy," p. 10.



speak with sufficient plainness for themselves. Mr. Faber would at first view seem to countenance the statement of these writers; for he says "The donation of the name of *Antichrist* to the pope is purely gratuitous. It rests upon no certain warrant of scripture, and indeed it may rather be said to contradict it. The predicted Antichrist is an infidel and an atheist." Vol. ii. p. 209.\* But Mr. Faber does in reality belong to a very different class of writers: his objection being merely to the *name* of Antichrist, and to the application of Dan. xi. and 1 John ii. 22 to the pope. For he himself applies the Little Horn of Daniel vii. to the pope, as also various parts of the Apocalypse, which other writers have been wont to include among the prophecies which describe the Antichrist.†

That which is most to be feared, and most jealously to be watched, is the tendency of all writers, however pious and able, to carry out their own views to an extreme. Some of

\* He quotes Bishop Horsley's Letters on Isaiah xviii. (pp. 105, 106) to the same effect.

† The following is a brief summary of Mr. Faber's explanation and application of Daniel vii. Vol. ii. p. 93, &c.

#### THE LITTLE HORN

1. is *diverse* from the rest of the ten horns, (v. 21.)
2. has three of the ten horns plucked up before him, (vv. 8, 20, 24.)
3. has eyes like the eyes of a man, (v. 8.)
4. has a mouth speaking great things, and a look more stout than his fellows, (v. 20.)
5. speaks great words against (or *beside*) the Most High, (v. 25.)
6. thinks to change times and laws, (v. 25.)
7. persecutes the saints, (v. 21, 25.)
8. has 1260 years limited for his reign.

#### THE POPE

1. possessed a spiritual power at first, whereas theirs was temporal: afterwards it was ecclesiastical and spiritual as well as civil and temporal.
2. The *Herulo-Turingic*, the *Ostro-gothic*, and the *Lombardic*, were seated in Italy and in the presence of the pope; and they were plucked up for him.
3. claims a universal episcopacy or *overseership*.
4. "has anathematized all who have dared to oppose him; has laid whole kingdoms under an interdict; has excommunicated kings and emperors; has absolved their subjects from their allegiance; has affected greater authority, even in temporal matters, than sovereign princes; and has pronounced that the dominion of the whole earth rightfully belongs to him."
5. is styled *Our Lord God the Pope*, &c. &c.
6. institutes new modes of worship, articles of faith, and rules of practice; and reverses at pleasure the laws of God and man.
7. from age to age has persecuted those who protested against the idolatries of the papacy.
8. has domineered through twelve centuries.

those who refer these prophecies to the *papacy* have doubtless greatly strained certain portions of them in order to force them to apply; and have also, with the same object in view, exaggerated some of the *facts* connected with the history of the papacy. Every departure from truth must prove evil in the end. But whilst there is no need to go to the length of bishops Hurd and Warburton, and to conclude that the whole design and intent of prophecy was to give its voice and suffrage in favour of *protestantism*, strictly so called; yet there is the opposite extreme to which some have been urged, of extenuating and palliating the enormities and blasphemies of popery, for the sake of proving that the prophecies do *not* speak of the papacy; and thus are such writers actually playing into the hands of the enemies of God and his Christ. It is one thing to say that the features of the harlot, with all their bloatedness and deformity, do not seem in all respects to answer to these depicted in the word of God; (which is the prudent limit within which some of this school have confined their remarks:) it is another thing to make comparatively light of her proceedings—to deny her antichristian character, her apostacy, her idolatry, her persecution of the saints of God, which have nevertheless been in part or in whole denied by others. Mr. Cuninghame justly observes, that the proceedings of such writers are calculated “to fill their disciples with a spirit of lukewarmness and indifference to the protestant cause;” and they certainly appear to be preparing the way for the reascendancy of her spiritual domination. I will close this point with an extract from Mr. Bickersteth’s “Practical Guide to the Prophecies,” which is expressed with his usual good sense and piety.\*—

“It has been noticed already, that some modern writers of prophecy (whose powers of mind, established piety, and acuteness of remark, are such as to entitle their works to consideration,) have endeavoured to set aside the Protestant application of the Man of Sin to Popery, and of Babylon to Papal Rome. The author has read some of these works, he hopes not without edification, from their practical character; nor

\* It may be well to observe here, that some, in their zeal to overthrow the application of these prophecies to popery, have declared that they suit as well the *church of England*; which is viewed by many of late, especially among dissenters, as the Babylon and Harlot of the Apocalypse. It is sufficient to observe, in reply, that if the doctrines and practices of the church of England are spiritual fornication, she is just the reverse of endeavouring to make others partake of her fornication; being more obnoxious to the charge of supineness, in respect to propagating her sentiments and in regard to making proselytes, than with zealotry or bigotry. Neither has she been “*drunk with the blood of the saints*,” for among all her sins and defects, it is difficult to find an instance of persecution unto blood.

without increase of caution in the views which he holds; but with no conviction that they have overturned the great mass of argument by which the Protestant Church had established that application. When we consider how explicitly our God has begun and closed the book of Revelation with a blessing, promised to those who read and hear the words of that prophecy, (Rev. i. 3; xxii. 7.) it is surely improbable that the general result to which Protestant writers have, for several centuries, with a great unanimity, come, should be erroneous. The expressions of the Apostle, (twice also repeated, Rev. i. 1; xxii. 6.) lead us to think, that what he foretold would begin *shortly to come to pass*. God greatly honoured this view as a mighty means of confirming the Reformers, supporting them at the stake, and thereby extending the blessed Reformation. Cressener (in his valuable works) has shown that Roman Catholic writers themselves furnish many testimonies strengthening the Protestant application of leading parts of these prophecies to Rome. As it is very improbable that the church should be left to struggle through eighteen centuries of conflict, darkness, and sorrow, without such a lamp as the Revelation giving a light on its path, (yet allowedly a feeble light, shining in a dark place, 2 Peter i. 19) so, in point of fact, devoted Christians, from age to age, during these centuries, have found great support and comfort from the rays of light which this book shed on their course.

It is, however, an advantage to be led to reconsider the ground on which the Protestant interpretation rests, and fresh light will be thrown, not only on fulfilled, but also on unfulfilled prophecy. In this view the works of such writers may be eminently useful. But whatever farther fulfilments may take place in the close of this mystery of iniquity, and in its final destruction, the past fulfilment, in several leading particulars, has been such as to satisfy a large body of the Reformed Church of Christ." p. 94.

IV. It is a question, however, deserving of serious regard, whether any part of the prophecies concerning antichrist have been fulfilled by the false prophet МАНОМЕТ, and by the blasphemous and wicked apostacy of which he was the author.

1. It is remarkable that Sulpitius Severus, so early as the fifth century, speaks of *two* antichrists which should arise—one from the *east* and one from the *west*; (2 Dial. de Vita Mart. Cap. 14.) which seems to lay a sort of traditional foundation for the expectation of *two* persons or powers who should answer in a greater or less degree to the descriptions given in the scriptures of the great adversary or adversaries of God. Prosper advances something of the same kind (De promiss. p.

65.) but he grounds it rather upon the mention of *Behemoth* and *Leviathan* in Job xl. xli. the former arising from the earth, the other from the deep or sea.

Since the period, however, of the Reformation, many have considered, and with great probability, not only that such signal adversaries of the Lord Jesus, as Mahomet and his system, were not likely to have been passed over, but that they are certainly set forth in the prophecies. Some would entirely exclude the pope, and make *all* the prophecies concerning antichrist to relate to Mahomet. Among these the first with whom I am acquainted was Graserus,\* who had many followers, and in later times Dr. J. Whitley of Galway.† Others whose minds were struck with the remarkable coincidence between the acts and events attending the rise and progress both of Mahomet and the pope, were led to conceive that *both* of them might have been intended in the prophecies relating to antichrist. One of the earliest of these is Dr. N. Homes, who draws a parallel on Daniel vii. between the pope and Mahomet, and traces the coincidence in various particulars.‡ A far more numerous class of interpreters, excluding Mahomet from the prophecies which have hitherto been adduced as relating to antichrist, apply to him, and to the Saracens and

\* See his works—"Expositio Visionis Danielis," 1614, and "Historia Antichristi," &c. 1618.

† "The Scheme and Completion of Prophecy," by this writer, has been more than once alluded to in this volume. It is an able work; but abounding in absurdities; and here may be seen, interwoven with it throughout, what has been not long since hinted at—a constant endeavour to palliate and justify the abominations of popery. Yea, the opinions of those protestants who view popery as antichrist are roundly attributed to a *bigotted*, a *controversial*, a *schismatical* and a *selfish* spirit; and protestants are exhorted to cease from controversy with Rome, and to *unite with her* against the common enemy and antichrist—*Mahomet*. Could a Jesuit say more?

‡ See his work "The Resurrection Revealed," 1654. Revised Ed. 1833, page 148. His language is, "That the *answers* to those, who understand by the antichrist *Mahomet*, are not to him sufficient, any more than the *arguments* of those who make it only *Rome*. But (he says,) I would propose this expedient to the learned: viz. to consider the Turk and the pope to be the *main integrals* of antichrist. For upon an exact review of what has been said on both sides touching the little horn, it would appear that all may be accommodated to either, though perhaps more appositely to the Turk. And if they that make it a *Roman* horn may be led thereunto from the fear of omitting any thing that foretels the ruin of the *Roman* antichrist; so must we be jealous of waiving anything that threatens the ruin of the *Mahometan* antichrist. For with me I confess it is a rule, which diligent observation, as I have gone through the scriptures, has irresistibly engrafted into my reason,—that all the scriptures touching the great restoration of the church, &c. do more immediately and directly look toward the *Jews*: consequentially and inclusively only upon the Gentiles: and therefore they do necessarily more directly threaten the ruin of the *Mahometan Turkish* antichrist, who is their more immediate and cruel enemy, inhabiting all their borders; and *next* they extend to the *Roman* antichrist, taking him in under the general notion of a grand enemy to the conversion both of Jews and Gentiles unto Christ, and of the glorious reformation of the church, &c.

Turks, Rev. ix. in which is described the ascent of the Locusts from the bottomless pit, having a king over them whose name is *Abaddon* and *Apollyon*—the DESTROYER. This chapter is indeed almost universally applied to the Mahometans.

Of late years, however, some eminent Expositors have applied the little horn of the he-goat in Daniel viii. exclusively to Mahomet; and thus they separate and distinguish between the little horn of the fourth beast in Dan. vii. making the one the western antichrist or the papacy, and the other the eastern antichrist or Mahometanism. There is an able treatise on this subject in Mr. King's "Morsels of Criticism," published in 1788. Mr. Whitaker took the same view in 1795; he has been followed by Mr. Faber, Mr. Frere, Mr. Keith and others. Mr. Faber was the means of Mr. Scott's adopting that view in the later editions of his Commentary; though he is not disposed to apply it *exclusively* to Mahomet. On the one hand he observes, "It appears to me unaccountable, on mature reflection, that there should be in these concise, yet most comprehensive, prophecies of Daniel, so many repeated and particular predictions of the papal delusions in the west, and not a hint of the Mahomedan delusion in the east, the progress and effects of which have been most extensively mischievous; and are specially and separately noted as such by John, Rev. ix." (Note on verses 9—12.) But on the other hand he says—"No doubt the character here given of this 'little horn,' and the prediction of his exploits, as expositors have copiously shewn in a variety of circumstances, do accord to those of the Roman antichrist: but do they accord to him exclusively? Probably the more any sober-minded man studies the history of Mahometanism, the fuller will be his conviction, that the features of the two delusions, *as of twin sisters*, are far more alike than it is generally supposed." On verses 23—25. The idea of the *twin sisters* is somewhat akin to another figure of speech of Dr. Prideaux on the same subject, who, being struck with the coincidence of the rising up of the Mahomedan apostacy at the same time with the pope being constituted bishop of bishops, exclaimed, that antichrist had at that time set *both his feet* on Christendom together, the one in the east, the other in the west.\* In Faber, vol. i. p. 256.

\* Sir Isaac Newton, and Bishop Newton, and after them Mr. Cuninghame and some others, suppose the Little Horn of the Goat to denote the Roman empire in the east. Mr. Keith expounds Dan. xi. 31. of the standing up of the Roman power in the east, and in this manner endeavours to account for the supposed breaking off of the regular narrative at this verse. "The eras of the Seleucidæ and of the Ptolemies, or Lagidæ, are well known in history and highly useful in chronology, and from the time of the formation of their kingdoms the line of prophetic history is traced down in regular narrative, till



2. There are some obvious considerations which seem at once to evince, that the horn of Daniel viii. cannot be the same power as that of Daniel vii.

First, It seems unaccountable that the vision of chapter vii. describing the rise of a little horn should be immediately followed by that of chapter viii. describing also the rise of a little horn, without any reference at all to the fact (if it be so) of its being the same power already delineated.

Secondly, The horn of chapter vii. arises out of the fourth beast. But the horn of chapter viii. arises from out of one of the four horns which proceeded from the broken horn of the goat; and this corresponds with the *third* beast, or the *Leopard*, of Daniel vii. Moreover, it appears strange to speak of the latter little horn, as arising out of one of the *four* horns, if it were out of an empire which comprehended them all,—that is to say, as out of a *principality*, instead of out of the kingdom or *empire* which included that principality. If indeed the pope had had his principal *seat* in that principality, or first had been exalted therein to universal jurisdiction, there would have been great reason for it: but this not being the case, it is clear that some other power must be intended.

Thirdly, As the rise of the horns appears to be territorially different, so does their end, as already noticed: the one being “*slain* and his body given to the flame;” the other being “*broken without hand.*”

3. There are other points which correspond well with the character and proceedings of Mahomet and his successors.

(1.) The little horn of the goat was to be a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences: Mahomet declared himself both king and prophet; and the Koran abounds with dark and enigmatical sentences, and with inflated hyperbole, in which the Mahometans boast, and call it *sublime*.

(2.) The horn was to wax great toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. This was precisely the direction of the Mahomedan conquests; and “so remarkably (says Mr. Habershon) have these territorial limits been observed, that whenever the Turkish armies have attempted to force their barriers and to penetrate into the kingdoms of *the west*, they have uniformly been unsuccessful.

---

the Romans attained the ascendancy in the east, and established their authority within the boundaries of the kingdom that had been Alexander's, thus connecting these great empires, the Grecian—from which the kings of Syria and Egypt took their rise,—and the Roman,—by which their kingdoms were finally subverted.” Vol. i. p. 51. Luther understood Dan. viii. of the *papal powers*, without any limitation.



For a long period after the conquest of Constantinople in 1453 they were the terror of Europe, and threatened to overrun its fairest provinces; and it has called forth the best energies of the most powerful emperors of Germany and other monarchs to withstand them. In like manner when the combined armies of Western Europe, under the most gallant leaders, and with an enthusiasm almost more than human, poured like a torrent upon the plains of Asia, and at eight or ten different times engaged in crusades to dispossess the Mahomedan power of the holy land, they were equally unsuccessful; and the myriads that embarked in these chivalrous expeditions went almost to certain destruction, either from famine or slaughter or disease. Thus accurately has the scene of this vision been confined within its allotted bounds!" P. 278.

(3.) By this horn "the *place* of the sanctuary" of the Prince of the Host (explained in verse 25 to be the Prince of princes) is "cast down;" and Jerusalem has now been trodden under foot by the Mahomedan power for nearly 1200 years.

(4.) "He shall *destroy wonderfully*;" and hence in Rev. ix. (as just now has been noticed,) he is called *Abaddon* and *Apollyon*, which signify the *Destroyer*. Nothing is more remarkable, of a political character, in the whole history of Mahometanism, than its desolating character. Not only has it laid waste various provinces in the ordinary course of war, and shed the blood of myriads of the apostatized people of God; but even now, throughout its own empire, "*destruction and misery are in its paths.*" The fairest tracts of territory go out of cultivation and become no better than deserts; cities are forsaken of their inhabitants; and the population is continually on the decrease.

(5.) He "stands up against the Prince of princes." What the pope does only in an indirect manner, (for he professes the truth in regard to the person of Christ,) Mahomet has done openly. He puts aside the authority of the Lord Jesus; and he denies that God is a Father and has a son; thus answering in a most literal manner the character of Antichrist in 1 John ii. 22—"Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ?—He is Antichrist *that denieth the Father and the Son.*"

(6.) "Through his policy he shall cause *craft* to prosper in his hand,"—"and by *fraud*\* shall destroy many." Gibbon says of him, "The use of *fraud and perfidy*, of cruelty and injustice, was often subservient to the propagation of the faith."—"In the support of truth, the arts of *fraud and fiction* may be deemed less criminal: and he would have started at the foul-

\* Our Translation has "by *peace*," but the Septuagint and the Arabic have by "*fraud.*"

ness of the means, had he not been satisfied of the importance and justice of the end." Vol. ix. 322, 323.

These are some of the points of resemblance; there are others, which, if not so immediately obvious, can nevertheless be applied to Mahomet and his successors with as much plausibility as they can be applied to the pope and his successors.

4. It only remains to name a few of those particulars in which, according to the opinion of some, Mahomet is *every where* intended in the prophecies concerning Antichrist;—i. e. either exclusively, or jointly with the pope, as has been shewn.

First, he is considered to be "*the Assyrian*," because he possesses the literal Babylon and Assyria within his empire: whence *Euphrates* is also considered as the symbol of the Turkish empire in the Apocalypse.\* Secondly, he showed himself to be a "Lawless One," or "Man of Sin," who legalised by precept and by example fornication and adultery, and enjoined in numerous instances rebellion and massacre. Thirdly, he magnified himself against God, and against all that is called God, by openly exalting himself over the Lord Jesus Christ, as a greater prophet than he; and he likewise called himself the *Paraclete* or Comforter. Fourth, he plucked up three horns; viz. Egypt, Syria, and Africa,—supposed to be pointed out by Dan. xi. 42, 43,—“The land of Egypt shall not escape; the Ethiopians and Lybians shall be at his steps.”† Fifth, the number of his name, when written in Greek, (*Μαχμετς*;) is found to contain 666.

5. There are some points likewise in which his coming and proceedings agree with the expectations of certain of the fathers concerning Antichrist. For example, that he should come in *Circumcision*;—that he should rise up at the period of the dismemberment of the Roman empire;—that he should be a destroyer of idols, and yet be himself the object of idolatrous worship. Thus Mahomet wept over the grave of his mother, because as an idolatress she could not be saved;‡ (thus shewing, as some have concluded, that he did not regard the God of his fathers; Dan. xi. 37,) and he was so greatly the idol of

\* Some try to make out, and have considerable authority for so doing, that Gog and Magog are the Turks and Saracens: others consider them to be the Russians.

† Jerome said that the Antichrist was to subdue Egypt, Africa and Ethiopia; meaning by the latter the *Arabian* Ethiopia of Genesis ii.

‡ Nicholas de Lyra and Paulus Burgensis, who wrote about the beginning of the sixteenth century, thought the Mahometan persecution would be the longest which the church would suffer, and the Antichristian (which they considered altogether different) would be the shortest; and for this reason: viz. that Mahomet was not *idolatrous*, therefore that God would the longer endure with him.

his companions, that they collected his hair, his spittle, and the refuse water from his lustrations, as objects of their veneration.\*

V. The last form of Antichrist, which yet remains to be noticed, is that of *Infidelity*. The conviction that those scriptures which speak of the Antichrist have not in all respects been satisfactorily fulfilled in any one power that has already appeared, has led writers at different periods to apply (as we have seen) some things to the Papacy, and some to Mahometanism; whilst other things they consider not to have been yet accomplished in either of those powers, but to have respect to events which are yet future. And whilst certain writers have inferred, from the defectiveness in the interpretation thus arising, that *nothing* has been fulfilled which regards the Antichrist, but that we must fall back in all respects upon the expectations entertained by the primitive fathers of Christianity; others—being instructed by the remarkable events which have transpired in later years, and by those signs of the times which bespeak that we are entered upon the last days,—have been gradually led to separate and distinguish between what may be termed the several *phases* of antichristianism, and to apply different portions of prophecy to distinct powers.

1. The French Revolution, from its extraordinary character and the awfully important consequences to which it has given rise, has justly been considered to have formed a new epoch in the history both of the church and world; and hence many have been led to date the rising up of the *Infidel Antichrist* from that period;† though others (as Mr. Faber,) trace the workings of infidelity in their avowed and manifest character up to an earlier period. Certain it is, that as the mystery of iniquity, or the principles which led to the usurpation and apostacy of the bishops of Rome, was at work at a much earlier period than the age of Justinian or Phocas, though it has been supposed to have been made manifest or revealed as the Antichrist only from the date of some imperial decree which invested it with power and authority; so has the leaven of infidelity been gradually pervading the mass of European society, more especially in France, for a considerable period previous to its any where assuming a national character in a previously christianized nation.

Mr. Kett, who published his work called “History the in-

\* For the proofs of these latter points, see the work of Dr. Whitley previously referred to.

† Mr. Irving, for example, considers the French Revolution to be “the death-throe—the last gasp and termination of life—to the papal beast of 42 months, and the first breath and act of life to another beast—the beast from the bottomless pit.”

terpreter of prophecy," was among the first of those who marked out any particular portion of prophecy as applicable to the infidel Antichrist;—viz. Dan. xi.—from the 36th verse. At the same time he considered chapters vii. viii. and xi. of Daniel as referable, *in the general*, to Popery, Mahometanism, or Infidelity. Mr. Faber has since more carefully distinguished that which Mr. Kett has applied indiscriminately, and refers Dan. vii. to the Papacy, Dan. viii. to Mahometanism, and Dan. xi. from the 36th verse to Infidelity. Mr. Frere has followed in the same track, with the exception that he commences his interpretation of the infidel Antichrist from verse 21 of Dan. xi. which he applies to Napoleon. He has been followed in these particulars by Mr. Cooper and by Mr. Irving. Mr. Keith finds Mahometanism, Popery, and Infidelity successively described in the second, third, and fourth seals of Rev. vi.\*

Various other modifications of the views of former interpreters have appeared, as the increasing light which events have shed upon the predictions of the prophets have caused them to be better understood; and notwithstanding the apparent discrepancies of interpreters in our own times, the persuasion may be reasonably entertained, that the Lord is gradually unfolding to his church this interesting portion of his word,—by giving to one servant to see some one feature of it; to a second, another feature; and to a third to correct or point out the inconsistencies only of certain interpretations: for in no instance does the Spirit appear to have vouchsafed light sufficient to any one expositor to enable him to interpret with clearness and correctness the whole of prophecy; though it is probable, as Sir Isaac Newton has remarked, that there is no writer of any note but has added *something* to the common treasury.

2. It is important, however, since we are now living in times, the signs of which bespeak that we must be hastening to the last great crisis of events, and consequently to the last actings of the Antichrist, to direct the attention of the reader

\* It has been questioned by some, whether the expectation of an *infidel* Antichrist be founded in truth, and if the Scriptures which are supposed to give countenance to this opinion do more than describe the last desperate proceedings of *popery*. It is not improbable but that there may be a great identification of popery with infidelity, seeing that the priests of the church of Rome are, by the confession of Blanco White, formerly a prophet of their own, in general infidels at heart, though not avowedly so. Certain it is, likewise, that deistical principles have very extensively infected many of the countries of the continent which are professedly Roman Catholic,—as France, Spain, Saxony, Bavaria, Italy, &c. But however these principles may be ready for explosion, and to bring about that state of things which will exist before the last catastrophe, insomuch that popery may after all be considered as the *parent* of infidelity; yet it will be shewn presently that the difference is decided between the reign of infidelity and the tyranny of the papacy.

to some farther particulars calculated to inform him respecting the character of that awful apostacy, and to prepare him for it. For many, it is feared, are now helping it forward, and are more or less under the influence of that "strong delusion" by which it will be accompanied, who ought rather to be warning men of their great danger, and leading them to be jealous of every thing which appears like an approximation to its spirit or principles.

(1.) It is necessary, then, to observe, that the Antichristian power, set forth as the Beast of the Apocalypse, corresponding with the fourth beast of Daniel vii. is presented to us under *three aspects*—so different in some of their characteristics, as to lead to the necessary conclusion that they must refer to different periods of action; whilst at the same time there is a sufficient identity between all three to make it apparent, that it must be the same power throughout, only metamorphosed. They resemble indeed the transmutations of an insect, from the worm to the chrysalis, and from the chrysalis to the fly; which continues the same insect still, though it assumes different forms and functions.

The first of these forms is that of the "*great red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon his head,*" described Rev. xii. 3. This has been by the generality of modern interpreters explained to be the Roman Empire in its *Pagan* state, animated by the spirit of "that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan:" (v. 9.) for *the dragon* is a symbol appropriated in Scripture to idolatrous empires.\*

In chap. xiii. the Apostle sees another vision: "a beast rise up out of the sea, having *seven heads and ten horns*, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy." This beast is evidently the nondescript animal, or *fourth beast*, seen by Daniel, (chap. vii.) combining in his appearance the leopard, the bear, and the lion, which constituted the three first beasts—"and the Dragon gave to him his power, and his seat, and great authority." V. 2. The *seven heads and ten horns* sufficiently identify the power here described to be the same as the dragon: it is indeed the dragon *abdicated*, as it were, in favour of this beast, and transferring, or delegating to him his authority.

In chapter xvii. 3, we have presented to us "a *scarlet-coloured beast full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns.*" On this beast is seated a *harlot*, arrayed also in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones, &c. The *seven heads and ten horns* again serve to identify this with the former beast and the dragon; whilst, at the same time, there are various circumstances which shew

\* See Psalm lxxiv. 13, 14. Isa. xxvii. 1; li. 9. Jer. li. 34. Ezek. xxix. 3.



that it makes its appearance under a different aspect. It is declared in verse 8 to be the beast "that *was*, and is not, and shall ascend out of the *BOTTOMLESS PIT*, and go into perdition." And again, as "the beast that *was*, and is not, and yet *is*." It is clear from these statements, that the beast that *was*, is the beast from the sea of Rev. xiii., who has now passed away, but who is to reascend and come again into life and power; and it is equally clear that this reascension is to be from the *bottomless pit*, and not from the *sea*.\*

Some have thought, and with considerable probability, that Rev. xiii. 3, alludes to this fact of his death and revival—"And I saw one of his heads as it were wounded to death; and his deadly wound was healed: and all the world *wondered* after the beast." The expression of *wonderment* seems, indeed, decidedly to fix it to Rev. xvii. 8—"And they that dwell on the earth shall *wonder*, (whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world,) when they behold the beast that *was*, and is not, and yet *is*."

The different aspect of the beast of Rev. xvii. is farther set forth by two or three other circumstances. The one is, that

\* Some would make the expression *bottomless pit* to be the same with the *sea*, on the ground that the Greek word ἄβυσσος is, by profane writers, used in the same sense with θάλασσα. It is contended also, that it is used in this sense by the writers of the Septuagint version; though all the instances adduced are ambiguous. But what is here contended for is, that in the Apocalypse, where the word is used as a *symbol*, it must necessarily be distinct from θάλασσα; for the use of symbols is precise and definite. It only occurs indeed in two other places of the New Testament besides the Apocalypse—viz. Luke viii. 31, and Rom. x. 37—and in both of these it is apparently distinct from θάλασσα. The one is where the devils entreat not to be cast out into the *deep*, or pit; the other is where Paul contrasts the *deep* with the height of heaven; which, in the Syriac version, (as I learn from Mr. Cuninghame) is rendered by the word ܫܝܫ *shool*, which signifies *hades*. In the Apocalypse, however, the meaning is fixed by another circumstance. In chap. ix. 1, 2, where it first occurs, (and is used as a symbol, the *locusts* being said to arise out of it,) το φρέαρ is used with it, in order more precisely to point out, that it is the *pit of the deep* that is meant; and having received this signification, το φρέαρ is afterwards dropped, (see v. 11,) and ἄβυσσος is used by itself, evidently with the same signification as if it were το φρέαρ της ἄβυσσου; which is plainly the view of our Translators, who uniformly translate it afterwards "*the bottomless pit*." The impropriety of considering the expression the same as θάλασσα will be apparent from the evident absurdity which would arise were we to translate some of the places where the word ἄβυσσος occurs by our word *sea*: e. g. "I saw an angel, &c. having the *key* of the sea, and he laid hold on the dragon and cast him into the sea, and *shut him up*," &c. Rev. xxi. 1—3. At the same time, if this point should be considered as still open to criticism, it would not affect the main position; which is, that the beast of Rev. xiii. has deceased, and is revived in chap. xvii., and that he reappears under circumstances which give him a different aspect.



the *crowns* which were on the heads of the dragon, and which were removed in the instance of the beast of chap. xiii. to the ten horns, have now altogether *disappeared*. Another is, that power is given to the beast of the sea to make war with the saints, and to *overcome them*; (v. 7.) whereas the beast of the pit makes war against the Lamb, and *is overcome*; because he is Lord of lords, &c., and they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. V. 14. A third is, that the characteristic of *blasphemy*, which was witnessed upon the *heads* of the beast of chap. xiii., so that he “opened his *mouth* in blasphemy,” (v. 6,) is now transferred to the whole body, which is “full of names of blasphemy.” Chap. xvii. 3. These are points which may be determined quite irrespective of the application of them to any particular power.

We may proceed another step with certainty; viz. to ascertain what we are to understand, in the general, by the symbol of the *beast*. It sets fourth the political strength and resources of some mighty empire: the proof of which is manifest. For the angel says to John, “Come hither; I will shew thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon *many waters*;” (chap. xvii. 1,) which waters are explained, in verse 15, to be “*peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues*,” which are, as it were, the *matériel* of an empire. But when John is taken into the wilderness to see this whore, she is represented, not as sitting on *many waters*, but as sitting on a *beast*: wherefore the beast is only another symbol for the “*peoples, multitudes, nations, and tongues*.”

Here also I would observe, that the remarkable expression used in describing this beast,—viz. “that was, and is not, and yet is,” and “which shall ascend,”—seems to imply, that at the time of the judgment described in chap. xvii. the beast *had* existed in that form of principles and of political circumstances, in regard to which he is said to arise out of the sea; that then an interval comes in which, as an organized power or empire, he may be said *not* to exist; whilst yet the political *elements*, though scattered, are actually existing at the time when this vision commences, and are only awaiting some crisis to be reorganized; and this reorganization will proceed from principles or circumstances which have their origin from the bottomless pit—whatsoever may be intended by that symbol.\*

\* It is very important to observe the *time* of the re-appearance of the beast. The text of Rev. xvii. 8. says, “The beast that thou sawest *was*, and *is not*, and shall ascend, &c.”—*μέλλου ἀναβῆναι* is *about* to ascend. If the period by which the time is to be adjusted be that of the Apostle’s seeing the vision, (as some commentators argue in regard to verse 10,) then we not only must conclude that in the days of St. John five *kings* were fallen, but that the beast of the sea likewise had already appeared and ceased to exist. This is manifestly not true. The only other period from which the time can be dated is that of the *judgment*, which is the subject of the vision. So that when the judgment com-

(2.) We must now notice the power in combination or alliance with the beast. This is described in chapter xvii. as a *harlot* sitting upon the beast.

It is remarkable, that though John is specially invited to see the judgment of "*the great whore*,"—apparently as being some character who has been previously exhibited under that title,—yet this, the time of her judgment, is the first mention made of her under that name; and we must therefore seek for the power here designated under some other name or description. A comparison of Rev. xiv. 8 and 19, in which "*Great Babylon*" is mentioned, will immediately evince, that *the Great City* and *the Great Whore* are one and identical. Indeed, verse 18 especially declares—"And the *woman* which thou sawest is that great *city* which reigneth over the kings of the earth." This two-fold symbol is intended to set forth an ecclesiastical power. The apostate church, or great city, Babylon, is contrasted in the Apocalypse with "*the holy city, New Jerusalem*;" and the *harlot* is contrasted with "*the bride, the Lamb's wife*." Moreover, a *whore* and an *adulteress* are familiar images in the prophets to signify apostate Israel and Judah; and *fornication* and adultery are expressions frequently used to signify apostacy and idolatry.

But there is likewise reason to conclude that the whore and the false prophet are intimately related. For not only is the mention of the false prophet dropped, when that of the whore is brought before us; but they answer exactly in certain characteristics. One of them is remarkable. The woman is *seated* on the beast, which is emblematical of her being upheld by the power and wielding the resources of that beast, so that his heads and horns are either vassal or tributary states, or powers which are in some way or other made subservient to her. This is evident from its being declared, chap. xviii. 7, that she sits as a *queen*; and in chap. xvii. 18, that she *reigneth* over the kings of the earth. Allowing, therefore, that the woman or city represents a church, it is a church in close alliance with the state; yea, which hath altogether usurped and engrossed the powers of the state. But the two-horned beast of chap. xiii. likewise "*exercises all the power* of the first beast

---

mences, and not till then, may it be said, "The beast *was*, and *is not*, and is about to ascend out of the bottomless pit."

Some modern Expositors have argued that the Roman empire cannot be that which is intended by the fourth beast of Daniel, because it ceased to exist during the wars which arose out of the French Revolution, the Emperor of Germany having indeed formally renounced the title. This, however, instead of being a circumstance adverse to such an interpretation, materially strengthens it, *since there was to be an interval*, during which it might be said of the fourth empire—"it *was*, and *is not*."

before him," (v. 12); and it is difficult to conceive how two different powers can exercise *all* the power of a certain empire, and not be one and the same.\* Moreover, they are both persecutors; for the one causes all that will not worship the image of the beast to be killed, (chap. xiii. 15); and the other is drunk with the blood of the saints, &c. (chap. xvii. 6.)

I must here add what I conceive to be very important to a right understanding of the vision of chap. xvii. or "the judgment of the great whore." I consider the woman to be represented at the opening of the vision as *seated* on the beast, only to shew the position in which she is left at the termination of the reign of the first beast; not as shewing that she continues to exercise the same influence during the career of the second beast. It is exhibited for the purpose of identification, that we may know that she who is here *judged* is the same that has previously *reigned*.

(3.) The object I have had in view, in leading the reader to the preceding consideration of these chapters of the Apocalypse, is to enable him clearly to discern, that supposing *popery*, as the generality of commentators have concluded, is in its combined political and ecclesiastical characters represented by the beast from the sea and the beast from the earth of chap. xiii., and by the harlot of chap. xvii., yet that there is *another* antichristian power in existence, whose career is *subsequent* to the reign of the harlot; and the first of whose acts, like a true wild beast, is to turn and rend her, with whom he has been, under a former aspect, in alliance.—I mean the beast from the bottomless pit. This power *may be* popery become infidel, and thus, as it were, arise out of it; but it has nevertheless its own peculiar aspect or form.

Nothing is more remarkable, in the history of prophetic interpretation, than the manner in which most commentators

\* As my object is principally to give information, I ought not to pass over a view which is taken by some, who conceive that the designation in chap. xiii. 11—"the beast which had a wound by the sword and did live"—shews that the second beast arises during the time of the beast from the bottomless pit, and not during the time of the beast from the sea; and if so, that the period in which the false prophet obtains all the power of the first beast is *subsequent* to the destruction of the harlot. And this is strengthened by the fact, that the false prophet is apparently surviving at the battle of Armageddon, and is taken captive with the beast, and cast into the lake of fire. Chap. xix. 20. At the same time, this latter fact is reconcileable according to the former view. For though I take the false prophet and harlot to be one, I nevertheless consider, because different symbols are used, that different *circumstances* of the same subject are designated. Suppose (for example and by way of argument only) that the *harlot* represents the Romish church as regards her temporalities and political power, and the *false prophet* symbolizes the ministers and members of that church: she may be completely stripped of her temporalities, and overthrown as an ecclesiastical establishment, whilst yet a bigotted popery may continue to exist, as we know is the case in Ireland and in France.

who applied the Antichrist to the papacy, have perverted and misapplied the mention of the *ten horns* of the beast, or *ten kings*, mentioned in chapter xvii. The general interpretation is, that they agree and give their power to the beast for the purpose of maintaining the supremacy and dominion of the harlot, and that they are the kings who commit fornication with her. But the contrary is most plainly and explicitly declared. They receive powers as kings only for "*one hour*" with the beast (which is apparently the short space during which the *judgment* of the whore takes place,\*) for the express purpose of consuming her; for they are said to *hate* the whore, and to make her desolate and naked, and to eat her flesh, and burn her with fire.† And those kings who have committed fornication with her, instead of being the same as those who now judge her, are described "as bewailing her and lamenting for her, when they see the smoke of her burning, *standing afar off for the fear of her torment*," (ch. xviii. 9, 10.) and are evidently afraid of being themselves involved in her judgment.

It is not therefore of consequence to my argument that the reader should agree with me respecting the identity of the harlot with the two-horned beast, and some other minor particulars. The *great* point for consideration, and in regard to which both sides have apparently erred, is, that *some* of those (for it is not all) who apply the beast of Rev. xiii. to the papacy, have lost sight of the fact, that, however this may be correct, a strong antichristian power arises up, toward the end, who is made the instrument of *judgment* on the harlot, and who makes war against THE LAMB, but is triumphantly overthrown; (see chap. xvii. 14. and xix. 11—21.) And that some again have, on the other hand, looking only at this last confederacy, endeavoured to bend to it and concentrate in it *all* that is antichristian; overlooking the important fact, that its first actings are directed against some *previously existing* anti-

\* See the expression *one hour*, in verses 10, 17, and 19, of chapter xix.

† Mr. Faber is guilty of garbling the text in this matter, in a most extraordinary way. In order to make out that they support the papacy, he quotes it thus—"The ten horns which thou sawest are *the ten kings*, which have received no kingdom as yet, but in one hour receive power *conjunctively* with the wild beast. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the wild beast. These shall make war with the Lamb. For God hath put into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree and to give their kingdom unto the wild beast, until the word of God shall be fulfilled. And the woman whom thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth. Rev. xvii." The 14th, 15th, and 16th verses, in which it is said, that the ten horns shall hate the whore, and burn her, are omitted; and the words "*the*" and "*conjunctively*" are inserted, though not in the text, for the purpose of bearing out the assertion that these kings are the same as those mentioned in Daniel, and that they all conjunctively "concur in acknowledging the spiritual supremacy of the Latin Patriarch." Vol. i. p. 148.

christian power, which has already run its race, and become ripe for judgment: and such are at least bound to shew what that power is, which has thus been previously existing, and which has both ruled over and corrupted the Roman earth.\*—Moreover, it appears to be a legitimate conclusion, (if the Roman empire hath now disappeared, and that it is the fourth empire of Daniel vij.) that the “little horn” of that chapter must likewise have appeared.—For though that empire may revive (as I apprehend it will,) yet must those events have transpired which are foretold as to occur during that period of its existence which has already passed.

3. We must now proceed to inquire what are the particular principles by which this last form of Antichristianism is influenced; and these I take to be INFIDEL AND REPUBLICAN. This is first to be gathered from certain peculiarities and circumstantialities to be carefully noticed in these visions.

(1.) The *infidelity* is plainly indicated by the direct and open warfare with “the Lamb,” which is made by those kings who constitute the political and military strength of the beast. The beast being said to ascend out of the *bottomless pit* is also by some supposed to intimate, that it has its origin in infidel principles; and though this is not conclusive, yet is it difficult to give a more consistent explanation of the symbol. The increase of blasphemy against God is also remarkably indicated by the beast being described as “full of names of blasphemy.” The first beast had “upon his heads the name of blasphemy;” but in the instance of the beast from the pit the *body* is filled with blasphemy; from which may be inferred that instead of being uttered so immediately by those who constitute the headship, it has spread itself downwards, and pervaded the *mass* of the population.

The *republicanism* is to be inferred, First, from the significant circumstance already named, that the *crown*, which was first on the seven heads and then on the ten horns, has now

\* The view of Bengelius is remarkable. He says—“The three following positions are agreeable to truth—1st. *The Beast rising out of the sea* is the *Hildebrand Papacy*; and *Babylon* is the city or state of Rome, and consequently, in and along with that, *the Church of Rome*, now so degenerated from her ancient purity. The difference between them is great, seeing many Catholics are zealous for the Church of Rome and its plausible pre-eminence, who yet bear no good will to the Papacy. 2ndly. *The Bear rising out of the bottomless pit*, is that singular *Antichrist* so called—an *individual* under which the Papal power, which owes its growth to so many important innovations, will be more mischievous than ever. 3rdly. Not only against those who worship the beast out of the *bottomless pit*, but also against them who before that time worship the beast out of the sea, is that threatening pronounced which is the greatest in all the scriptures, and which shall resound powerfully from the mouth of the third angel. Rev. xiv. 9—11.” Robertson’s Translation. Pref. xxix.



altogether disappeared. Secondly, from what is said in verses 10 and 11: "there are seven *kings*, &c."—"and the *beast* that was and is not, even *he is the eighth*, and is of the seven and goeth into perdition." For if these kings signify (as the generality of commentators infer,) seven different forms of government, or seven different headships, it shews that the *beast*—which is the whole mass of "peoples, multitudes, &c."—has now become the head; that is to say, that the sovereignty is now in the *people*, and not in some one individual.\* The notion of the *beast* being democratical or republican is farther sustained by his being represented as of *scarlet colour*, scarlet being an emblem of sovereignty, and thus again pointing out that the sovereignty is in the people. And it is farther worthy of remark, that the ten horns or kings only receive power *as* kings one hour with the *beast*; as if they were not really and strictly kings. Their giving their kingdoms to the *beast*, and receiving power with the *beast*, looks as if they will not become revolutionized merely as distinct kingdoms; but as if they will combine together in *one vast republic*, so that the empire will again rise up in its undivided state.

Another circumstance to be noted likewise is, that in that "great earthquake, (or convulsion,) such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great," not only is the great city Babylon divided thereby, but "*the*

\* I have said "if these kings signify, &c." because I am not quite satisfied in my own mind with the interpretation commonly given. The ordinary view is, that the phrase "and there are seven kings," is intended as a farther explanation of the seven *heads* of verse 9; viz. that they are seven *mountains*, and also seven *kings*. Bishop Newton, Daubuz, and many others consequently introduce "*they*" into the translation—"and *they* are seven kings." The original, which is *καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσιν*, gives no direct sanction to this reading, though it will bear it. There is also some little obscurity about the mention of the eighth king or head, which is greatly increased by the criticisms of expositors. Bengelius, speaking of the characteristics of a true exposition of the Apocalypse says—"It must give a reason why the two last of the seven heads of the *Beast* are called, not the sixth and seventh, but the *one* and the *other KING*." (p. 271.) I confess I am not one of "seven men who can render a reason" in this instance, neither can I even give an explanation of what he means; for he appears to create a difficulty where none exists. Mr. Faber considers the eighth king to be *the same as the seventh*; "for the wild *beast* (he says) has in truth no more than seven heads." (vol. iii. p. 181.) But this is to read "the eighth is the seventh," instead of "of the seven;" which is to pass by the obvious distinctions of scripture. Farther, I am not fully satisfied with the usual interpretation which makes the seven mountains and kings, *seven forms of government*; seeing that this is not the meaning of these symbols when used separately in scripture: for *kings* and *mountains* both signify *kingdoms*. (See p. 137.) I agree, however, with Mr. Habershon (if they are to be interpreted of forms of government) that the eighth being "of the seven" will in this case signify the revival of one of the previously existing forms of government—e. g. a dictatorship, or a republic, &c. Whatsoever is represented by these seven *kings*, they are seven things which follow each other in succession; for it is said, "five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come."



*cities of the nations* fell." So that if the city Babylon represent a dominant *church*, which being united to the state has altogether usurped the power over the kingdoms which constitute the beast, "the cities of the nations" (or Gentiles) will be the established churches of all other kingdoms, whether in communion with her or not; and which are, by the effects of this mighty revolution, to be subverted or overthrown.

(2.) Though what has been stated from the Apocalypse, concerning the infidelity and republicanism of the last form of Antichrist, appears to be drawn by legitimate inferences from the symbols and structure thereof, yet should I be slow to receive it in this sense were it not that the whole view here taken of the Antichrist is borne out by other portions of scripture, a few of which must be brought forward.

And first some passages shall be adduced from the Psalms, which allude to some great commotion of the populace of the nations in the crisis of the last times, and in which mention is made of their *infidelity* and their use of the *tongue*, shewing that the beast himself becomes "the mouth speaking great things," and uttering blasphemies.

Psalm x. refers entirely to the last apostacy, as is evident from verse 1, which places it in the troublous times; and from the three last verses, which shew the Lord in the sequel to have become king for ever and ever, to have destroyed the heathen, and to have judged his people. The mouth of the wicked, spoken of herein, is said to be full of *cursing*, deceit, and fraud; under their *tongue* is mischief and vanity; (v. 17.) and they contemn God and say in their heart, God will not require it, (v. 11—16) thus betraying that they disbelieve the judgment. Psalm xii. speaks also of the period when the Lord will arise on account of the oppression of the poor, and set him in safety from him that puffeth at him. (v. 5.) It shews that at this period the *vilest* men will be exalted, and the wicked shall consequently walk on every side;—and that licentiousness in the use of the tongue will be gloried in; for they shall say, "with our TONGUE will we prevail, our lips are our own, who is Lord over us?"—thus also insisting on the sovereignty of the people, and despising government. Psalms xiv. and liii. I may mention together, because nearly alike. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans quotes some sentences from them to prove the general apostasy of the heart of man; but as the former of these Psalms speaks of the time when God shall give salvation to Israel out of Zion and turn the captivity of his people; and the latter, of the time when the wicked shall encamp against God, but when he will scatter their bones and put them to shame; it is plain that they chiefly relate to this

last apostacy. They are described, then, herein as of an infidel—yea, even of an *atheistical*—character, saying, ‘There is no God,’ none of them understanding or seeking after God, their *mouth* being full of cursing and bitterness, their *throat* being an open sepulchre, with their *tongues* have they deceived, the poison of asps is under their *lips*. Psalm lii. begins with thus rebuking these: “Why boastest thou thyself in mischief, O mighty man! The goodness of God endureth continually;” (intimating that the *providence* of God has been denied.)—“Thy *tongue* deviseth mischief, like a sharp razor working deceitfully.” Then at verse 5 it declares, that God will “root them out of the land of the living; and that the righteous shall see it and laugh.” Psalm lxxv. remarkably coincides with what we have considered in the Apocalypse. We have the dissolution of the frame work of the social system, and of all established institutions in verse 3;—the fools dealing foolishly and lifting up *their horn* on high, supposing that promotion and power comes from them instead of from God, in ver. 4 to 7;—the treading the wine-press, or the pouring out the last vial on them, and the *fraying* of their “*horns*” verses 8—10 (see also Zech. i. 21;) and all this is at the time when the “*horns*” of the righteous shall be exalted, and Messiah shall receive the congregation of the saints to himself. (verses 2 and 10.) Psalm xciv. is a call upon God to put an end to this *tyranny*; declaring that the wicked now triumph, that they utter and speak hard things, and boast themselves. Here also *atheism* is plainly charged upon them, in that they are reminded, that he that formed the ear doth himself *hear*, and he that formed the eye doth assuredly *see*. And it is farther intimated, that the Lord shall rise up against them and bring upon them their own iniquity, cutting them off in their own wickedness. And finally Psalm cxx. begins with, “What shall be given unto thee, or what shall be done unto thee, thou false *tongue*?”—(an evident *prosopopœia* for the persons using the tongue,) showing how instrumental the tongue is in this apostacy, and in bringing on the war of Armageddon; for “they are for war.” But there is reserved for them “sharp arrows of the mighty with coals of juniper.”

I must next turn to the important prophecy of our Lord in Matt. xxiv. and its parallel in Luke xxi. At verse 21 of Matthew’s account of it we are informed of a great tribulation, “such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, nor ever shall be.” The parallel place in Luke’s account (verses 23, 24) shews that this tribulation began with the siege of Jerusalem by Titus Vespasian, and continues through the whole time of Gentile domination, or, in other

words, during "the times of the Gentiles." For speaking of Jerusalem being compassed with armies, he says, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled, &c. For there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people; and they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."\* That which however is chiefly important to observe is, that the passing away of this tribulation shall likewise prove its *acme* to the Jews (as will appear from Dan. xiii. 1) and likewise a time of unheard-of tribulation to the Gentiles, whose times are then run out. Matthew speaks of it as *immediately after* the tribulation of those days (v. 29,) and Mark has it, "But *in* those days, after that tribulation." The character of it is thus described by the Evangelists. St. Luke says—"And there shall be signs in the sun and in the moon and in the stars." Matthew and Mark inform us what those signs are: "the *sun* shall be darkened, and the *moon* shall not give her light, and the *stars* shall fall from heaven." To this St. Luke adds, that there shall be upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity; the *sea* and the *waves* roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for

\* I would here take the opportunity of observing, lest the expression—"This generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled"—should prove a stumbling block to the reader, that I consider the word γενεα or generation to have respect to the Jewish nation; that being the mode in which our Lord applies the term, calling them "a sinful generation," "an evil generation," "an adulterous generation," &c. And the precise same phrase, which in Matt. xvii. 17 is translated "a perverse generation, is in Phil. ii. 5, rendered "a perverse nation." I conceive our Lord to mean therefore, that the Jews would continue a people, and remain a perverse nation also, during the whole "times of the Gentiles;" which has been fulfilled in a most extraordinary manner. Dr. Adam Clarke has some excellent remarks in his Commentary on this passage, which are to the above effect. He says: "*This generation shall not pass, ἡ γενεα αὐτων, this race, i. e. the Jews shall not cease from being a distinct people till all the counsels of God relative to them and the Gentiles shall be fulfilled.*—Some translate ἡ γενεα αὐτων, *this generation*, meaning the persons who were then living, that they should not die before these signs, &c. took place; but though this was true, as to the calamities that fell upon the Jews, and the destruction of their government, temple, &c.; yet as our Lord mentions Jerusalem continuing to be under the power of the Gentiles, till the fulness of the Gentiles should come in, (i. e.) till all the nations of the world should receive the gospel of Christ, after which the Jews themselves should be converted unto God, (Rom. xi. 25,) I think it more proper not to restrain its meaning to the few years which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem; but to understand it of the care taken by divine Providence to preserve them as a *distinct* people, and yet to keep them out of their own land and from their temple service." Some, however, instead of ἡ γενεα αὐτων with the aspirate, read ἡ γενεα αὐτων without the aspirate, when the rendering of the verse will be, "*That generation shall not pass away, &c.*" meaning, that the signs which constitute the tribulation of those days should all take place during the lifetime of that generation of men who shall be *then* existing. See on this subject, Investigator, vol. i. p. 56, and vol. iv. p. 341. Also Abdiel's Essays, p. 130.

looking after those things which are coming on the earth." Then all three conclude, "for the powers of *heaven* shall be shaken." I have already had an opportunity (see pages 101, 102) of shewing that the *sun* is, in prophetic language, a symbol of the regal power, the *moon* of ecclesiastical, and the *stars* of the aristocracy or nobles both in church and state, and *the heavens* the combination of them all: likewise that *the sea* and *the waves* are symbols which signify the multitude of the people; even as we have just now seen, that "the *waters*" on which the whole sitteth are peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.\* We have therefore set forth in this prophecy of our Lord, the darkening (i. e. the diminishing or actual putting out) of the regal and ecclesiastical powers, and the fall of the aristocracy; and this is to be effected apparently by the insurrection of the people against their rulers,—“the sea and the waves *roaring*,”—that is, the populace being in a state of commotion and wrath, and thus *shaking* the political heavens.

This is likewise borne out by the Psalms: as for example in Psalm xlvi. we have, “God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble: therefore will we not fear, though the earth be removed, and though the *mountains* (i. e. established and settled governments) be carried into the midst of the *sea*; though the *waters* thereof *roar and be troubled*; though the *mountains shake* with the swelling thereof.” V. 1—3. This in the sixth verse is thus explained: “The *heathen* raged, the *kingdoms* were moved, HE uttered his voice,—the earth melted.” In Psalm lxxv. 7, it is also said of God, that “he stilleth the *noise of the seas*, the *noise of their waves*, and (or rather *even*) the *tumult of the people*.” Isa. v. 29, 30, foretels that “the Lord will lift up an ensign to the *nations* from far, &c. And in that day they shall roar against them like the *roaring of the sea*; and if one look unto the land, behold *darkness and sorrow* (“on earth distress with perplexity”) and *the light is darkened in the heavens thereof*.” Isa. xvii. 12—14 is strikingly applicable to this point,—“woe to the *multitude of many people*, which make a noise like the *noise of the seas*; and to the rushing of *nations*, that make a noise like the *rushing of mighty waters*. The nations shall rush like the rushing of mighty waters: but God shall rebuke them and they shall flee afar off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the wind, and like a rolling thing before the whirlwind. And, behold, at evening time, trouble; and before the morning he is not. This is the portion of them that spoil us, and the lot of them

\* See this subject also set forth at large in Abdiel's Essays, p. 139.

that rob us." The whole falls in likewise with the description of that awful earthquake in Rev. xi. 17—19, which shews also that the events spoken of usher in the first resurrection.—“We give thee thanks, O Lord God Almighty, which art, and wast, and art to come; because thou hast taken to thee thy great power and hast reigned. And *the nations were angry*; and *THY wrath* is come, and the time of the dead, that they should be judged, and that thou shouldst give reward unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name both small and great; and shouldst destroy them which destroy the earth. And the temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament, and there were lightnings, and voices, and thunderings, and an *earthquake, and great hail.*”

(3.) It needs but few remarks in order to point out that “the signs of the times” are awfully corresponding with the state of things here described. Since the French revolution we have seen the thrones of the continental kingdoms shaken to their foundations, and a republican spirit has pervaded the whole mass of the ten kingdoms of the papal beast, and is now ready to burst forth, like an eruption of volcanic matter, and overwhelm them all. We have seen France, Belgium, Italy, Poland, and other places, affected by the revolutionary spirit, the chief incitement to which is the democratic virus. In Spain the struggle is chiefly between republicans and the disciples of ultra-despotism and intolerance. In Portugal Don Pedro was obliged to affect the liberal, and to make large concessions to the popular spirit, before he had any prospect of success. We already, indeed, see in that country and in Spain, what has been previously witnessed in France, viz. the temporalities of the papal ecclesiastical establishments taken from them; thus shewing that the ten kingdoms thereof are beginning to make the whore “desolate and naked, and to eat her flesh, &c.” Rev. xvii. 16. Nor is royalty alone the object of present attack: the nobles of every rank are likewise aimed at. They have been temporarily extinguished in France, and they have more recently been despoiled of their *hereditary* honours, and the cry of “*Down with the Lords!*” in our country is becoming very plain and unequivocal. Still more clearly has the hoarse croak of war against the *prelates*, and against all established churches, been heard; and I fear it will, ere long, be as distinctly heard assailing all that appears to be associated with or to plead for the authority of divine Revelation. When the war against the Lamb commences with the outworks of religion, the attack upon the citadel itself may reasonably be expected. And as thus Europe is threatened with the



darkening of her sun and moon, and the putting out of her stars, so do we clearly see that instrumentality in motion, which is to effect their temporary destruction—"the sea and the waves roaring." The perilous condition of rulers, governments and nobles arises from the revolutionary and levelling spirit which exists among the people; which democratic spirit has been greatly fed and strengthened by the large concessions which are continually making to it. For numbers of men, whose principles, from their rank and station in society, must be opposed to it, are nevertheless found flattering this spirit and crouching to it, as being apparently the surest path to political power; and are actually promoting their own destruction by means of a spurious and infidel liberalism.

I need not enlarge by pointing out the increase of *infidelity*, as exhibited in its public features. Complete toleration is now given to publications of the most blasphemous and atrocious character; and those who pander to the public appetite find, that *they* are the most successful, who are the most bold to "speak against dignities," and to revile what is sacred in religion. Both in this country indeed, and on the continent, there are places opened in the larger towns, upon the Sabbath day, in which infidelity and blasphemy are set forth, and principles are avowedly broached which are subversive of the present order of things.

(4.) There is one other circumstance connected with the character and actings of this last form of Antichrist, as revealed in the scriptures, which must not be passed over: viz. that the last apostacy, out of which he will be matured, will be greatly aided and brought about by professors of Christianity who are *heretics and schismatics*. I feel reluctant to enter on this point, as seeming to reflect on those among whom I believe there are yet many people of the Lord. But I must not allow myself, in a work which professes to place before the reader the elements of prophetic interpretation, to neglect a point of so great importance; and I would fain hope it may prove of use to those who are indeed the Lord's people among them. The character of Dissent is, alas! within these few years, become fearfully identified, in its political actings, with the papal beast on the one hand, and with the liberal-infidel beast on the other; and if the scriptural view which is now about to be brought forward should be the means of startling some, and leading them to get up from about the tents of those wicked men and touch nothing of theirs, lest they be consumed in all their sins, I shall have reason to be thankful.

The first portion to which I would draw attention is the second epistle of Peter, beginning chapter ii. to verses 3, 4 of



chapter iii. In this passage, false prophets are spoken of, who are privily to bring in damnable heresies, “denying the Lord that bought them.” Ch. ii. 1. They are described as moved by *covetousness*, (v. 3 and 14,) in which respect they “follow the way of Balaam, who loved the *wages* of unrighteousness.” Ver. 15. They are farther described as “walking in the lust of uncleanness, and *despising* government,”—“presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities.” Ver. 10. They speak *great swelling words* of vanity, (ver. 18;) they make great talk about *liberty*, but are themselves the servants of corruption, (ver. 19;) and especially they turn to scoff the promise of the second advent of the Lord. Chap. iii. 3, 4. That they are to appear in the “last days” is also declared, chap. iii. 3, and is further apparent from its being said, chap. ii. 3, that their *judgment*, now of a long time, “lingereth not.”

Now whoever will attentively compare the epistle of St. Jude will see, that he speaks of precisely the same persons.\* And he declares of them, “These be they who *separate themselves*, sensual, having not the Spirit.” Ver. 19. So that as Peter describes them to be *heretics*, Jude shews them to be *schismatics*;—persons who refuse to submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake, (1 Peter ii. 13.)—men who prefer their own self-willed notions, and despise the authority of the Lord that bought them. Jude likewise describes them as “denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ;”—as perishing in “the gainsaying of Core,” (or Korah,) who rebelled against the ministers of the Lord’s appoint-

\* This will be evident from the following particulars:—

PETER SAYS—

1. In the last days shall come scoffers, (chap. iii. 3.) who walk after the flesh, in the lust of uncleanness, (chap. ii. 10.)
2. They follow the way of Balaam, &c. ver. 15.
3. They despise government, and are not afraid to speak evil of dignities:—whereas angels bring not railing accusation. (ver. 10, 11.)
4. They, as natural brute beasts, speak evil of the things they understand not. (ver. 12.)
5. They are wells without water, clouds that are carried with a tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved for ever. (ver. 17.)

JUDE SAYS—

1. The apostles told you before, that there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their ungodly lusts. (ver. 17, 18.)
2. They run greedily after the error of Balaam. (ver. 11.)
3. They despise dominion, and speak evil of dignities; whereas Michael the archangel durst not bring a railing accusation against the devil. (ver. 8, 9.)
4. They speak evil of those things which they know not, and what they know naturally, as brute beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves. (ver. 10.)
5. They are clouds without water, carried about of winds; to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever. (ver. 12, 13.)

And other parallelisms may be found, leading to the conclusion that Jude must have written from the epistle itself of Peter.

ment, (Numbers xvi.)—and as “*raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame;*” which, taken with their speaking evil of dignities, confirms what has been said of “*the sea and the waves roaring;*” and he says that they are “*murmurers, complainers, walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men’s persons in admiration because of advantage.*” Ver. 13 and 16. Jude also brings these into the crisis of the last times, by farther telling us, that the Lord cometh with myriads of his saints, to execute judgment on them. Ver. 14, 15.

If we turn next to St. John, we shall find allusion to what are apparently the same men, and they are especially by him declared to be limbs or members of the *Antichrist*. In his first Epistle, chap. ii. 22, he says—“*He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son;*” which is evidently akin to the heresy of those who *deny* (as Peter has it) *the Lord that bought them*, and (as Jude has it) *who deny the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ*. Again he declares of them—“*As ye have heard that Antichrist shall come, even now are there many Antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time. They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest, that they were not all of us.*” Ver. 18, 19. Here it is evident that they are *separatists*; they are also declared to be *false prophets, deceivers, and seducers*, in like manner as Peter and Jude describe them. See 1st epl. ii. 26; iv. 1; 2nd epl. v. 7.

St. Paul likewise seems to speak of the same parties in 2 Tim. iii. 1—5, where he describes the sort of men who shall come in the *last days* and produce the *perilous times* thereof. They are *covetous, proud, blasphemers, heady, high-minded*, combined with various other characteristics described by him; and especially “*having a form of godliness and denying the power thereof.*” They are likened to Jannes and Jambres who withstood Moses, (v. 8,) as “*evil men and seducers, who wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived,*” (v. 13;) and he is admonished that the time will come when men will not endure sound doctrine; “*but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;*” (iv. 3) which sentence is evidently pointed at the *animus* which produces *dissent and schism*.\*

\* The Reader is referred to an exposition at length of this passage of the epistle to Timothy, contained in “*Abdiel’s Essays,*” page 201; and to an admirable paper in the “*Investigator of Prophecy,*” vol. i. on the typical character of the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. Dr. Hildrop also in his work on Antichrist; seems to think that Dissenters will be the chief means of bringing in the Antichrist.

The special duties in regard to these men, which are required of those who fear God, are earnestly to contend for the faith, (Jude 3,) to take special heed unto prophecy, (2 Peter i. 19, and iii. 2) to continue in the diligent study of the scriptures, (2 Tim. iii. 13—17,) and to “turn away” from those who are seduced by this spirit of Antichrist; (ibid. iii. 5, and 2 John 10,) yet “of some to have compassion, making a difference; and others to save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh.” Jude 22, 23.\*

---

## CHAPTER XII.

THE TEN KINGDOMS;—THE NAME OF THE BEAST;—THE TWO WITNESSES;—THE PROPHETICAL DATES.

THERE are a few important features connected with the prophecies concerning Antichrist, as contained in Daniel and St. John, which were not dwelt upon in the former chapter, in order that the main subject of inquiry might not be interrupted: they cannot however be passed over without a more distinct notice, and it is purposed therefore to advert to them in the present chapter. The first to which the attention of the reader is requested is—

### THE TEN KINGDOMS.

I. The fourth beast of Daniel vii., it will be recollected, is represented to the prophet as having *ten horns*, (v. 7;) which horns are explained to be “ten kings that shall arise,” (v. 24;)

\* I have not taken notice of the particulars in Daniel vii. viii. and xi. and other prophecies brought forward in the previous sections of this chapter which may be considered to apply specially, or else in a secondary sense, to infidel antichristianism. For as particular features of the prophecies seem more especially to suit popery, or Mahometanism, though a sort of family likeness may be traced in all; so is it in regard to the infidel Antichrist; some portions appear intended for it more especially, though a certain similitude will doubtless be found in many others. When, e. g. at the French revolution, the Christian Era was abolished, and weeks were changed to Decades, we seem to see the horn that thinks to change times and laws. At that time also we especially see “a mouth opened in blasphemy,” and *the majesty of the people* exalted “above every thing that is called *God* and that is worshipped,” as is stated of the Man of Sin. And various similar points of resemblance may no doubt be traced.

and from a comparison of verses 17 and 23 it will be seen that the word *king* is used synonymously for *kingdom*. The beast of Rev. xiii. is likewise represented as having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten *crowns*, (v. 1:) on which beast, with some alterations in his aspect, the harlot, as we have seen, of chap. xvii. is represented sitting "as a queen;" and in this chapter again, the ten horns are explained to be ten kings who had received no kingdom as yet. V. 12.

1. From these premises the early Christian fathers concluded, that, as the Roman empire in its entire state corresponded to the fourth beast of Daniel, so it was to be broken up into ten different states; and (what is of still greater importance to observe,) they concluded, that, however the mystery of iniquity were already working, yet that Antichrist would not be manifested to the church in those decided characteristics whereby he should be known, until after this partition of the empire. They concluded indeed, that, as Antichrist was himself to obtain the dominion and exalt himself above all that is called God and that is worshipped, so the withholding cause mentioned in 2 Thess. ii. 6, which prevented the man of sin from being revealed, was no other than the continuance of the Roman empire in its integrity.

As regards the expected division of the empire into ten kingdoms, Jerome, upon Daniel vii., declares it to have been the opinion of *all* ecclesiastical writers before his time. And abundant testimony may be adduced, that they likewise considered the Empire in its entire state, (or, in other words, the supreme power of the emperors,) to have been *that which withheld*. Thus Tertullian, asking this question, Who is it that "*letteth?*" answers—"Who but the *Roman State?* the division of which, when it is scattered among ten kings, shall bring in Antichrist, and then shall that *wicked one* be revealed." De Resur. Carnis, Cap. xxiv. Chrysostom, in his fourth Homily on 2 Thess. ii. says of the same words—"That is the Roman Empire: when that is taken away, then *he* (the antichrist) shall come." Many others might be instanced; but I come down again to the times of Jerome, because it was in the latter period of his life\* that those irruptions of the barbarian nations into the Roman Empire took place, which finally terminated in its entire conquest and dismemberment. And that he held the opinion just stated, and considered that he now beheld that very event come to pass which was to bring in the manifestation of Antichrist, is evident from the following passage in his epistle to Gerontia, written when Rome was taken by Alarie: "He who hindered is taken out of the way, and we consider

\* He died about A. D. 420.

not that *antichrist is at hand*, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth."\* Certainly it is from the period of the breaking up of the empire by the Gothic and Vandalic powers that we may trace the great advance of Papal usurpations, and the recognition and establishment of some of the most marked features of it by authoritative decrees.

2. With regard to the *number* of kingdoms into which the empire of the Beast was to be divided, some interpreters consider that the number *ten* is to be understood in a figurative or tropical sense, as signifying an indefinite or large number; which meaning it undoubtedly has in some places of scripture; e. g. Gen. xxxi. 7. Numbers xiv. 22. Neh. iv. 12. Job xix. 3: Zech. viii. 23. Such was the view taken by Dr. W. Fulke, in 1557, as may be seen in his exposition of the New Testament on 2 Thess. ii. 6; and Mr. Cuninghame, in the present day, lays it down as the chief principle which he regards, and all that can be reasonably required of an Expositor to prove; though he proceeds nevertheless to shew, that these kingdoms have actually been about ten in number. The principal objection to viewing the number *ten* in this instance, as an indefinite but large number, is the circumstance that such a mode of interpretation violates the principle of homogeneity. For if the *ten horns* are to be explained on this principle, why should there not be a mystical interpretation given to the number *seven* in the *seven heads* of the beast? Besides which, the fact that the little horn, which arises in the midst of the ten, plucks up *three* of them, seems clearly to indicate that the numeral *ten* is not to be understood in a mystical, but in a literal sense.

3. Most interpreters, therefore, look for ten kingdoms exactly, and seek them in the western empire, which they consider to be more properly Rome, but some discrepancy exists in the lists which they have brought forward, arising principally from their fixing on different periods at which the enumeration ought to be dated. Mede and Whiston, for example, date the final division of the empire from A. D. 456, Dr. Allix places it in A. D. 486, Mr. Faber fixes on A. D. 568,† and Bishop Newton dates from the beginning of the eighth century.‡ The principle of *territorial division*, which supposes

\* See more to this effect in Mede and Bishop Newton.

† Mr. Faber fixes on this date as being that of the establishment of the last of the ten Gothic horns; the Lombards having then settled themselves in Pannonia. But Mr. Cuninghame, in his "Critical Examination of Faber," &c. successfully shews that he errs in this respect by 42 years, and that the true date of their establishment is A. D. 526.

‡ The Rev. S. R. Maitland lays considerable stress upon this circumstance, as an argument against the application of the prophecy to those kingdoms into which the western empire was divided at the period which has been named; and observes:—"Let the reader only look at the *various* lists which



the ten kingdoms, as at first divided, to continue through all their political mutations, appears to be the correct mode of proceeding in this matter. Sir Isaac Newton advocates this principle in reference to the four *beasts* of Daniel vii., (Obs. on Dan. p. 13.) on the ground that the lives of the three first beasts are said to be prolonged for a season and time, (Dan. vii. 12.) after their *dominion* is taken away. And so likewise the gold, the silver, and the brass, in the image of Dan. ii. are said to be broken *together* with the iron and clay: (v. 35.) therefore they must be viewed as having still existed according to the ancient territorial boundaries of those empires.\* Bishop Newton and Bishop Hurd both follow this principle, in their interpretation of the image and the four beasts; and Mr. Frere, who likewise adopts it, extends its application to the ten kingdoms.† (Comb. View, p. 160.) On no other prin-

---

have been made by learned men, and I think he will have no doubt, that if the number mentioned by Daniel had been *nine* or *eleven*, the right number would have been found among those petty kingdoms, whose unsettled state renders it so easy to enumerate them variously." Enquiry, &c. p. 41. The same argument might be applied with equal force to the tribes of Israel, which yet are always spoken of as *twelve*, notwithstanding their temporary changes. Sometimes we find, in the holy scriptures, in the enumeration of these tribes, Joseph divided into Ephraim and Manasseh, and thus made *two* of; sometimes Dan is omitted, and sometimes Levi; so that in *this* instance the lists do not agree, and had the number been *eleven* or *thirteen* it might have been found. There are great discrepancies also among interpreters in the enumeration of the four kingdoms which comprised the four horns which arose when the great horn of the goat was broken, Dan. viii. 8. Certainly a *fifth* might, in this instance, be found, were it needful; and yet we know that the goat was Greece, from the text itself; and that the partition must be dated from the death of Alexander. This objection therefore has no weight in reference to the ten kingdoms.

\* It may be well here to make another observation respecting the image of Daniel ii. Some writers consider the "*toes*" of that image to symbolize the same ten kingdoms as the *ten horns* of the fourth beast of chap. vii; to which it is objected, that in such case the ten kingdoms should be divided among the eastern and western empires, supposed to be symbolized by the two legs, and not that the ten toes should be all on one foot. It appears, however, questionable to me, whether the Holy Spirit has here intended us to look for an enumeration of *ten* kingdoms in the toes, any more than for ten kingdoms in the second empire, symbolized by the breast and arms of silver, because those arms must have had *ten fingers* appended to them. The numeral *ten* is not mentioned in the vision, but only "the toes" of the image indefinitely; and the object of their mention appears to be merely to shew to the church the character of the fourth empire in the last days of its existence, just before it is pounded to pieces by the little stone; viz. that though there will remain the *strength of iron* in it, yet that there will likewise be found a principle of *weakness and disunion* in the kingdoms which comprise it, so that though they may combine together for certain political ends, they cannot cordially cohere.

† Mr. Frere makes the following remark relative to the four beasts, as an additional argument for applying the principle of territorial division, viz. "that because the kingdom of Babylon formed the first beast, and Asia Minor with Upper Asia formed together part of the third beast, therefore these three provinces are decidedly *excluded from the second beast*, and are represented as



ciple can the prophecy be successfully applied to Papal times. For the kingdom of the Heruli, in Italy, which has been numbered among the *ten*, was overthrown within twenty years after its establishment. That of the Visigoths in Spain is considered to have ended in 714: the kingdom of the Angles, in Britain, was broken by the Danish and Norman conquests;\* and indeed the Franks or French may be considered as the only people of Europe whose succession from the original conquerors of the western empire has not been interrupted.

4. In the mean while, however the application of this partition of the empire into ten kingdoms may seem to want exactness, as applied to the condition of papal Rome at some particular periods, there are two or three remarkable facts which must not be lost sight of by the student of prophecy, and which are far more difficult to account for, if we reject this application, than are the discrepancies already noticed. *First*, there did occur, just previous to or about the period from which the most respectable expositors have dated the revelation of the papal Antichrist, a disruption of the Roman empire, which was divided into several petty kingdoms. *Secondly*, the number of these kingdoms has been enumerated at *ten*, in the general, by writers whose prejudices would naturally have led them to dispute the fact, and by writers also who have had no eye to prophecy. Among the former class may be named the Roman Catholic expositors; as Calmet, who on Rev. xiii. 1, admits that the Roman empire was by the incursions of the northern nations dismembered into ten kingdoms: and he refers to the testimony on this point of Berengaud, Bossuet, and Du Pin. Bishop Walmesley likewise,

---

*three ribs* in the mouth of the bear, or flesh that he had seized to devour; the representation pointing out, that these three provinces would be overrun and subdued by the Medes and Persians." Page 138.

\* A consideration of considerable interest to the inhabitants of this country is, whether *Britain* can with propriety be at all considered as one of the *ten horns* of the western Roman empire. A series of prophetic papers, evidently written by an able hand, appeared in the Christian Guardian for 1830, the author of which contends for its exclusion principally on the ground that England was only subdued by the Romans A. D. 78, and was abandoned by them about the time of Theodosius, and that the *western* or proper Roman empire, as left by Theodosius to Honorius, never exercised any dominion in the island. Page 135. It is surprising that Mr. Faber did not likewise exclude Britain; for he says—"In regard to the Anglo Saxon horn, I conceive, on every just principle of consistency, that we have no *prophetic* concern save with Hengist's original kingdom of *Kent*. The common idea, that the *seven* kingdoms of the Heptarchy constitute jointly the *single* Anglo Saxon horn, strikes upon my own apprehensions as intolerable." Sac. Cal. vol. i. p. 152. And yet the awkwardness does not seem to occur to Mr. Faber, that on this view, in all the transactions of this country with the papacy as a horn of the Papal beast, the guilt was incurred, and the judgment was consequently provoked, on the inhabitants of *Kent* only, and not on Britain in general.

(the Roman Catholic author of a modern treatise on Prophecy under the assumed name of Signor Pastorini,) admits that the ten horns on the head of the Roman beast is the dividing of the western empire by the ten barbarous nations that invaded it in the fifth century. P. 132. Among the latter class is Procopius, (largely quoted from by Bishop Walmesley, and whom Dr. Worthington calls "half christian, half heathen;") Machiavel, who was also a papist, (Hist. Hor. Lib. i.) and Gibbon, who will not be suspected of leaning to the protestant system of interpretation. The *third* fact is that *three* of these kingdoms became the immediate temporal possessions or patrimony of the popes; even as it was foretold in Daniel, that before the little horn three of the ten should be plucked up by the roots.

5. The three horns thus plucked up are with tolerable unanimity declared to be Rome, Lombardy, and Ravenna, which have now formed the papal territories for more than a thousand years; though some few interpreters consider these now as forming only one kingdom, or horn, and look out for nine others in addition. The following table, which is taken from an interesting and forcible "Treatise on the 1260 days of Daniel and St. John, &c." by the Rev. W. Digby, will shew how far the more eminent writers concur in regard to the remaining seven. The *dash* intimates the instances in which they are not unanimous. —

Number.	Names of the Kingdoms.	Machiavel.	Mede.	Bishop Lloyd.	Sir J. Newton.	Bishop Newton.	Whiston.	Faber.	Total.
1	Vandals . . .	1	1	1	1	—	1	1	6
2	Suevi . . .	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
3	Alans . . .	1	1	1	1	1	—	1	6
4	Burgundians .	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
5	Franks . . .	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
6	Visigoths . .	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7
7	Anglo-Saxons	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	7

To the above may be added, with as little discrepancy as to specific designation, only substituting in some instances the modern names of those kingdoms, the lists presented by Bishop Chandler, Daubuz, Dr. Allix, and Messrs. Cuninghame, Frere, and Habershon.\*

\* I must not pass over the enumeration of those who have looked for the ten kingdoms in *both* legs of the image. In 1240, Eberard, bishop of Saltz-

## THE NAME AND NUMBER OF THE BEAST.

II. The next particular which comes before us is, *The name and number of the beast*, mentioned in Rev. xiii. 18; and which has perhaps been more discussed and controverted, and still remains in greater uncertainty, than any other prophetic problem.

1. The first point necessary to be determined is, to which of the *two* beasts in that chapter does the name belong, the *ten-horned* beast, or the *two-horned* beast. Great names are arrayed on both sides the question;\* but the following arguments, the substance of which may be found in Dr. A. Clarke's Commentary on this place, appear to have some cogency. First, that in Rev. xv. 2, mention is made of them that had gotten the victory over the *beast*, and over his image, AND over the *number of his name*: and which is supposed to indicate two distinct anti-christian powers,—viz. *the beast*, and also the number of his name, or the second beast. *Secondly*, from a comparison of this latter passage with Rev. xix. 20. In the latter the words are,—“And the beast was taken, and with him the *false prophet*, that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that received the mark of the beast, and them that worship his image.” Here nothing is said of *the number of his name*, so particularly mentioned in chap. xv. 2, whilst in that chapter nothing is mentioned of *the false prophet*; the reason of which is assumed to be, that what is termed in one passage *the number of his name*, is in its parallel one called *the false prophet*; and consequently that it is this beast which is numbered.† Thirdly, “the number of the *beast*” being in chap. xiii. 18. explained to be “the number of a *man*,” is thought to add the last degree of certainty to the

burg, in the diet at Ratisbon said.—“Reges decem pariter existunt, qui orbem terræ, Romanum quondam imperium, non ad regendum, sed ad consumendum partiti sunt. *Decem cornua*, id quod D'Aurelio Augustino incredibile visum est,—Turci, Græci, Ægypti, Afri, Hispani, Galli, Angli, Germani, Siculi, Itali,—Romanas provincias possident, &c.” (apud Aventin ex Catalog. Test. Lib. xvi.) And at the time of the Reformation, the following have been numbered, viz.—1 Italy and Germany, 2 France, 3 Spain, 4 England and Ireland, 5 Scotland, 6 Hungary, 7 Poland and Lithuania, 8 Denmark with Sweden and Norway, 9 Portugal, 10 the Greek empire devolved on the Ottomans.

\* Lord Napier, Whiston, Bp. Newton, Faber, &c. assign it to the *first* beast: Dr. H. More, Pyle, Kershaw, Galloway, Bicheno, Dr. Hales, &c. refer it to the *second*. Drs. Gill, Reader, and Clarke think it belongs to *both*.—See Dr. A. Clarke's Comm. *in loco*.

† This argument is not altogether conclusive; for the *false prophet* is said (Rev. xix. 20) by his miracles to deceive them that had received the *mark of the beast*, meaning evidently of the *first* beast; and it is probable, as will presently be shown, that this *mark* is no other than the identical *number* of the beast, seeing that the *number* itself is not mentioned.

matter: because the ten-horned beast is never called, or spoken of, other than as a *beast*; whereas the two-horned beast is styled *the false prophet*, which gives to it the character of a *man*.

2. The next point is, what are we to understand by the *name* and *number of the name* of the beast. Some interpreters have treated this matter as if the *name* were one thing, and the *number* altogether different and distinct from it. Learned commentators however (as Grotius, Cressener, Daubuz, Newton, Clarke, and others,) have abundantly shewn, that in St. John's time it was customary for every heathen god to have a particular fraternity or society belonging to him; and the mode of admitting into these societies was, by giving them some hieroglyphic mark in their hands or foreheads, which was rendered sacred to that particular god: as, for example, an *ivy-leaf* to shew that they belonged to Bacchus; or, by marking them with the letters of the name of that god, which were commonly transposed; or with the *numeral cyphers* which the letters of their name numbered. Thus the name of Jupiter, as  $\text{H} \alpha \rho \chi \alpha$ , or *the beginning* of things, was signified by the number 717, &c.; the name of the sun, as *νυς, good*, by the number 608.\* And Barnabas in his Epistle (cap. vii.) says, the Christians first wrote the name of Jesus by a cypher or abbreviation, thus  $\text{IHT}$ , which, he says, expresses the number 318; the  $\text{T}$  being placed for the *cross*, and the  $\text{I}$  for *Jesus*. The object was to *conceal* the name, so that none but those initiated into their mysteries might understand its meaning; and this might easily be effected by means of the sum of the numerals.

Thus then the number of the beast is declared in Rev. xiii. 18, to be  $\chi \xi \epsilon'$ —which is evidently propounded as a mystery; and the mind that hath wisdom is invited to count or explain it. And it has a threefold character. For, first, it is the *mark*, or *charagma*, of the beast, which is imprinted on the forehead or in the right hand of his subjects; (v. 16) which is what led me, in the note on the last page, to observe that the *number* is not mentioned in chap. xix. 20, seeing that the *mark* is mentioned.† For, secondly, the mark is the *number*, these three letters being three *cyphers*. And, thirdly, under the number expressed by these three cyphers, viz. 666, is comprised the *name*.‡

\* Numerous examples are to be found in Martianus Capella. lib. ii.

† Verse 17 appears to be explicit on this point—"And that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name; which if compared with verse 16 do not seem to mean three distinct things, but *one* thing; each term being expletive of the former.

‡ It must be borne in mind that the Arabian characters for numerals were not introduced till about the tenth century; so that in the apostle's time there

3. Passing on then to the *interpretation* of this number, the early Fathers seem never to have thought of any other mode than that of bringing forward some word, the value of the numeral letters of which, when added together, makes 666. Those of them who lived nearest to the times of the apostles, seem to have taken the *Greek* language as the basis of the calculation, all the letters of which have a numeral signification; but afterwards it came to be disputed whether the enumeration should be in Hebrew, Syriac, Greek, or Latin. Those who adopt the *Hebrew* do it on account of the Hebraisms contained in the Apocalypse, and more particularly on account of the express allusion to words in "the Hebrew tongue," as *Abaddon* and *Armageddon*. Rev. ix. 11; xvi. 16. Those who advocate the *Syriac* do it on the ground, that Syriac was the vernacular tongue of Palestine, as is supposed. The *Latin* seems to be sustained by no argument beyond its being the prevalent language of the Roman empire. The *Greek* claims the decided preference; first, from the circumstance of the Apocalypse having been written in that language; and, secondly, from the fact that the Greek has ever been the standard of reference among critics, so far as the New Testament is concerned, throughout the Christian Church. Moreover, there are references equally express in the Apocalypse to the signification of words in the Greek tongue, (if that be considered of moment;) as *Apollyon*, Rev. ix. 11.

Other modes of interpreting the number of the beast have been suggested in later periods of the Church.\* Many have supposed it to have a reference to *time*, comprehending a period of 666 years. In the year 1213, Pope Innocent III. exhorted the Christians to the recovery of the holy land, in the hope they should be more successful since the 666 years from the rise of *Mahomet* were then run out; thus taking the Saracens to be the beast. In 1481 Joannes Viterbiensis, who took the *Turks* to be the beast, gave Sextus IV. great hope on simi-

---

was no other means of expressing a number but by letters as cyphers, or by writing it in full,—as *six hundred three score and six*. Grotius and Mill have affirmed, that the original MSS. of the apostles were not written with *cypher* letters, or abbreviations, and that they were not used till after the third or fourth century. This is however a palpable oversight; for in the times of Irenæus he accounts for the circumstance that some MSS. had 616 instead of 666, by supposing, that, by mistake, 1 had been substituted for 6, and thus that it had been written  $\chi\iota\varsigma'$  instead of  $\chi\zeta\varsigma'$ . Moreover he states that the latter reading was found in all the best MSS. and that it was the same in the time of St. John. Lib. v. cap. 30. And this I consider all that need be said in order completely to refute the system of Archbishop Laud, now revived by Professor Lee, &c. who adopt this exploded number 616 on the authority merely of the Codices of Petavius, a French Jesuit.

\* Some of the early Fathers also distinguished between the *mark* of the Beast and his *number*; and accounted the *mark* to be *circumcision*, which together with the burdensome obligations of the Mosaic ritual they thought Antichrist would restore. See Montague's "Appello Cæsarem."



lar ground. Luther afterwards expounded the duration of the *papacy* as 666 years, beginning with Pope Hildebrand: and so likewise did Bibliander and Capellus.\* Their system however has been sufficiently disproved by the event.

Mr. Francis Potter, a clergyman of Somersetshire, published in 1642 a treatise on this number, which has been greatly eulogized by Mede and Dr. H. More. The principle of it is, the extracting the *square root* of the number, (which he makes 25,) and then tracing a number of far-fetched coincidences in the papal system, combining with the number 25. The number 25 however is not strictly the root of 666, leaving as it does a residue of 41: the number 26 would have been nearer as a root, since the difference would then only have been 10. But this system has likewise fallen into neglect, and almost all modern expositors now seek for some word or sentence, the numerical value of the letters of which corresponds with the number 666.

4. Numerous are the words and phrases brought forward, which claim to be the proper solution. First may be named three, which are mentioned by Irenæus, viz.—*Ευαγγελος, Λατρευος, and Τετραν*, which are selected by him from various others which are not named; so that numerous guesses must have been advanced at that early period. The former he dismisses as scarcely worthy of notice: the two last he regards with some complacency. He *seems* to give the preference to the word *Τετραν*, because it has *six* letters only, and in each syllable three letters;† and because *none of the kings* of the Roman Empire

\* For more of this matter the preface to Bengelius may be consulted, (p. 302) who himself makes considerable use of the number 666, as a chronological notation, in the arrangement of his periods.

† The numerical value of the Greek, Hebrew, and Roman letters is as follows:—

GREEK.			HEBREW.		ROMAN.
γ — 1	ι — 10	ρ — 100	א — 1	ב — 30	I — 1
α — 2	κ — 20	σ — 200	ב — 2	ד — 40	V — 5
β — 3	λ — 30	τ — 300	ג — 3	ה — 50	X — 10
δ — 4	μ — 40	υ — 400	ד — 4	ו — 60	L — 50
ε — 5	ν — 50	φ — 500	ה — 5	ז — 70	C — 100
ς — 6	ξ — 60	χ — 600	ו — 6	ח — 80	D — 500
ζ — 7	ο — 70	ψ — 700	ז — 7	ט — 90	M — 1000
η — 8	π — 80	α — 800	ח — 8	ק — 100	The re-
θ — 9	ς — 90	β — 900	ט — 9	ר — 200	maining
			י — 10	ש — 300	letters have
			כ — 20	ק — 400	no numerical

These, when used as cyphers, have always a dash above them; when the dash is beneath it adds three cyphers to their value: as  $\acute{\alpha} = 1$ .  $\grave{\alpha} = 1000$ .



had borne the name of *Τειταν*,\* and for various other unsatisfactory reasons. Whereas in regard to *Λαττεινος*, he says, "it is very likely to be the true one, because they were *Latins* who then reigned."† By his thus readily applying the name to the Roman Empire, he seems to consider it as generally understood, that that was the *kingdom* symbolized by the beast of the Apocalypse; but he at the same time affects to deprecate the application of this number to it, and even the inquiry itself, until the kingdom should first be broken up and divided into ten; and his whole proceeding in regard to it looks as if he had been influenced by the prudential consideration, not needlessly to provoke the wrath of the powers that be, upon a subject that was involved in so much obscurity.

This word *Lateinos*, has been since adopted by some of the most eminent commentators in different ages; but the papists having been pressed by it, as a proof that the Latin Church is the apostacy described in the Apocalypse, Bellarmine objected that it was incorrect to write the word *Lateinos* with the diphthong *u*, and that it ought rather to be written *Latinos*. Passages from Hesiod, Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Plutarch, Dio Cassius, Photius and the Byzantine historians have been alleged, which adopt the latter orthography. The Rev. R. Rabett, however, in his recent treatise on the number of the beast, has ably vindicated the reading of Irenæus: in regard to which he argues, that the question is not whether the parties just enumerated used the *u*, but whether that mode of writing the circumflexed *i* among the ancient Greeks or Romans, in the names of men, was genuine orthography in the time of Irenæus. In proof of this he produces an overwhelming mass of evidence.‡ Besides this, the authority

\* Wetstein appears to adopt this word for a reason directly opposite to that of Irenæus, viz. because it is a name that *had* been borne by some of the sovereigns of Rome; for he applies the whole vision to the destruction of Jerusalem by *Titus*, whom he makes the same as *Teitan*; and the same as *Teila* also, in order to adapt it to the possibility of 616 being the correct number.

† His words are, *Λαττεινος* nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum; et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum; Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant." Lib. v. c. 30.

‡ Scaliger asserts that the Greeks always write the letter *iota* with the diphthong *u*, when they pronounce it before an *v*, as *Ανταρεινος*, *Συβεινος*, and *Λαττεινος*: "that, therefore, (saith he,) which custom hath established, not only is no fault to write it so, but it would appear *necessary to make it so*." Animad. ad Chron. Euseb. 106. Mr. Rabett farther cites examples of the *i* being written *u* before other letters; as in the instance of Eusebius, who writes the name of Irenæus, *Ειρηναιος*; with various other examples from Varro, Plautus, and Lucilius; and quotes Scapula, declaring the practice to have been common in the time of

of Ennius (lib. vi. 26) has been quoted, by Dr. H. More and Bishop Newton, who uses the identical *Lateinos*; and Irenæus himself must be considered as no mean authority, seeing that he writes both *πειταν* and *λατεινος* with the diphthong, and without any intimation that he is deviating from the ordinary usage.

Many solutions of this number, by the ancients, are preserved in the Commentary of Arethas of Cappadocia, among which the following are examples: *ὁ νικητης*, the victor;—*κακος οδηγος*, the wicked guide;—*αληθης βλαβερως*, truly hurting;—*παλαι βασκανος*, the old enchanter, or slanderer;—*αμνος αδικος*, the unjust lamb;—*λαμπητις*, that which is *lucid*, in the sense of *Lucifer*. Primasius also gives from Hippolytus, *αρουμε* for *αρουμεναι*, I deny, or apostatize. From Ticonius the same Primasius gives *αντημος*, and Rupertus *γενσηρικος*; which, though they make the number, I confess I see not the point of: *θεος εμει επι γαιης*, I am God upon earth, is easier to be understood.

Various of the *Roman Emperors* were supposed to be Antichrist, and the names of some of these answered to the number: as *Ουλπιος* for *Ulpus Trajanus*. Bossuet makes it out to be *Dioclesian*, whose name was at first *Diocles*, and which on resigning his empire to Maximian he resumed again. To make the number 666, the letters which are Roman numerals must alone be counted; and it must be written thus: *DIOCLES avgvstvs*. *Julian* the apostate has been also made to suit this number by a little twisting and humouring his names; as may be seen, together with the two previous examples, in Calmet.

Numerous epithets, besides that of *Lateinos*, have been brought forward to suit the papal empire, or church, and in various languages. The names of some of the bishops or popes have suited; as *Linus Secundus*, who is supposed to have been the second Bishop of Rome. He is adduced on account of the following sentence in the Sibylline Oracles, (Lib. viii.): *Δινος αυτου ολιγται*, which by many was supposed to point at him. *Silvester Secundus* was brought forward by Caspar Heunisch, (mentioned by Bengelius;) which name, together with *Linus Secundus*, must be calculated by the Roman numerals. Benedict the Ninth came in for the same honour; but it is written

---

Cicero. He also brings forward numerous instances of Greek inscriptions from the medals of the Roman Emperors, in the *Thesaurus rei Antiquariae* of Hubert Goltzius, and from the *Voyage to the Chersonesus*, &c. of the Sieur A. de la Motraye. It may be here added, as affording testimony at the same time to the use of the diphthong, and to the mode of calculating names, that Jerome asserts in regard to the word *μυθρας* for *μυθρας*, a name given by the Persians to the sun, that it must be written *μυθρας*, and not *μυθρας*, otherwise its letters will not give 365, the number of the days of the solar revolution.

in Greek, *βενεδικτος*. The former of these two was fixed on from the circumstance of his living at the distance of about a *millenary* of years from the nativity of Christ; and the latter, from his living at about the same distance of time from the suffering of Christ. Passing from the mention of particular individuals, Osiander was, I believe, the first who sought for the number of the beast in רומית, *Romith*, or *Roman*; and he has been followed by Daubuz,\* and some few other eminent expositors. Piscator, Brightman, and others, have ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ ΙΤΑΛΙΚΑ, *the Italian Church*; and Dr. A. Clarke, ἡ ΛΑΤΙΝΗ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙΑ, *the Latin kingdom*. Seebachius was, I believe, the first that fixed upon *Ludovicus*, on account of France being considered the principal of the kingdoms of the beast; but many others have adopted this name. ΑΠΟΣΤΑΤΗΣ has been applied to the papacy by Mr. Faber, Archdeacon Wrangham, &c. †ΠΑΠΙΣΤΟΣ for ΠΑΠΙΣΚΟΣ has also this number; and so have the following sentences' in Hebrew פִּי אַבִּינוּ הַקְּדוֹשׁ אַא *Abinu Kadersha Papa*—"Our Holy Father the Pope;" יְהוָה אֲדוֹנָי אֵלֵינוּ *Elion, Adonai, Jehovah, Kadosch*;—"the Most High, Lord, holy God."

\* Daubuz brings forward as many circumstantials to favour his adoption of the word *Roman*, as Mr. Rabett does in behalf of the epithet *Latinos*. The latter instances the facts, that the *Latin* language has been canonized by the Council of Trent and adopted for the use of the whole Church, instead of the *Italian*, which is the vernacular tongue of Italy;—that they allow of no exercise of religion but in *Latin*;—that the Pope still considers himself the head of the *Latins*, and that the Church and Empire is distinguished by the adopted epithet of *Roman*. This latter point, however, rather belongs to Daubuz: the heads, he says, are still *Roman*; and the language is *Roman*, both in the East and West: "For the *Latin* is really the *Roman*, and the modern Greek is called *Roman* by themselves, and they call themselves *Roman*, and are so called by the Eastern nations." So that, as to the thing, or notion of the name, he finds it *Roman*.

† This word is opposed by Mr. Rabett, with several formidable arguments. But that which appears entirely destructive of its pretensions is, that it is written ΑΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΣ, instead of ΑΠΙΣΤΑΤΗΣ; and the episemon ς' he asserts is not a contraction of στ, but is derived from the double ΓΓ, or F, written ς, and that it has no other power but the detonation of number, any more than two other characters used as numerals, viz. κκπα and σσνι. These are never met with other than as numerals and in calculations; and Mr. R. therefore contends, that had it been customary for the Greeks to make use of an *episemon* as a *letter*, we should meet with examples of the other two in words; and if, on the other hand, it were usual to make use of any of the numerous stenographical contractions of the letters of the Greek alphabet for *numerals*, we should meet with other instances besides that of ς. The accidental circumstance of resemblance between the contraction ς' and the episemon ς has misled those who have adopted this word, which is like using in English the cypher 0, for the letter o. If, therefore, it be really written στ, the number is 1168.

The papists however have not been remiss in turning round upon the protestants; for they apply to the latter the term *αποστατης*, and Feuardentius hesitates between *Μαχμετις*\* and *Martin Luther*, which he writes *Μαρτιν Λαυτερ* (Annot. in Iren.) and the same is found in Calmet, made out in Hebrew, לולתר *Luther*.†

Mr. Rabett, in his treatise before alluded to, has narrowed the grounds of discussion on this subject, by pointing out the *terms* of the proposition as contained in the scriptures. 1st. He considers that the name must be written and calculated in Greek; 2. That it must form the proper "name of a man;" 3. That the name must contain the number 666 and no other. To which may be added, 4thly. That as the beast is the symbol of a kingdom, so it should be the name of a *kingdom* also. If these principles of interpretation be followed, they will sweep away all the examples adduced excepting *Lateinos*; which has the farther advantage of having been hit upon previous to the event having given that peculiar plausibility to it which it now enjoys, and by an individual whose prejudices evidently

\* As the word *Μαχμετις* must be regarded with complacency by those who consider Mahomet to have been the Antichrist, it will be proper here to state the objection to it, which is principally on account of the *Orthography*. The Romish bishop Walmsley adopts it as written above, on the authority, as he says, of Euthymius, Zonaras, and Cedrenus; and considers that it will be some *future* Turkish antichrist who will adopt the name of *Mahomet*. Mr. Faber however has shown that the authorities of the bishop are a daring fabrication of his own, as they all write the word differently from each other, and from him; thus

Μουχουμμετ —Cedrenus.

Μαχμεθ —Zonaras.

Μαχμεθ —Euthymius.

The latter also writes it as Zonaras. The following are additional instances of different modes of writing it adduced by Mr. Faber—

Μαχμεθ —Nicetas.

Μεχμετης —Chalcocondylas.

Μαχμετ —Cantacuzenus.

Μεχμετ —Ducas Michael.

Μαχουμμετης—Joannes Cananus.

In none of the above instances is it *Μαχμετις*; and Mr. Rabett farther contends that this is not a proper Greek termination, as it should be either *τος* or *της*.

† Some other examples might be brought forward, but they are not of a character to claim the serious attention of the reader. Some have found it in the names or titles of *Napoleon*; Mr. Croly makes it out in the *Inquisition*. The name fixed upon by Vitringa must not be passed by, being the more extraordinary from such a writer. It is אדוניקם *Adonikam*, because he is said in Ezra ii. 13 to have had six hundred and sixty-six children or descendants.

lead him rather to reject than to entertain it. But having thus brought before the reader that information which I have gleaned upon the subject, I must leave him to form his own conclusions.

#### THE TWO WITNESSES.

III. The two Witnesses mentioned in Rev. xi. are involved at present in as much uncertainty and obscurity as the name of the beast, and have given rise to nearly as many interpretations and conjectures.

1. The first point questioned is the *number* of the witnesses.

(1.) Some understand it literally that there are only to be *two*; and consequently they look only for *two individuals*. Of those who have been thus fixed upon may be instanced Enoch and Noah,—Enoch and Elijah,—Moses and Aaron,—Moses and Christ, Caleb and Joshua,—Elijah and Elisha,—Ezra and Nehemiah,—Joshua and Zorobabel,—Elijah and John the Evangelist.

The opinion that Enoch and Elijah would return again to earth, and be actually put to death, seems to have been founded on the circumstance that neither of them have seen death, and on the promise in Malachi and by our Lord, that Elijah should again come. (Mal. iv. 5. Matt. xvii. 11.) Many of the early fathers fixed on these two, as the two witnesses of Rev. xi. and they have been followed by some of the popish writers.\*

Moses and Aaron, Caleb and Joshua, Elijah and Elisha, have been fixed upon as having been eminent witnesses for God during times of the rebellion or apostacy of God's people: Ezra and Nehemiah, with Joshua and Zorobabel, as having witnessed during a period of great depression of the church immediately preceding a revival: all which circumstances are supposed to be indicated by the context of Rev. xi. though, in regard to Moses and Aaron, Elijah and Elisha, Zorobabel and

\* Among the Fathers who entertained this opinion were Hippolytus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ephraim Syrus, Ambrose, and St. Jerome; also Augustine, Prosper, Gregory, Damascen and Aretas. See Dr. Hildrop on Antichrist, p. 175.

The belief that *Elijah* was personally to appear again was almost universal among the early Fathers, (as may be seen in the treatise on this subject, of Dr. John Alsted, translated by Burton,) for many held it who did not account him to be one of the two witnesses. The expectation was grounded upon our Lord's words—"Elias *truly shall first come* and restore all things;" which words are concluded to be independent of the accommodation of the words of Malachi immediately after by our Lord to John the Baptist, which was considered only as a typical accomplishment. Moreover the *Septuagint* reading of Malachi iv. 5 is "Behold I will send you Elijah *the Tishbite*," which they considered as distinguishing it to be that prophet who is to come in *propria persona*, and not by his spirit in another.



Joshua, more circumstantial marks of resemblance have been pointed out.\*

It is evident that, with the exception of Enoch and Elijah, these pairs have been viewed as *types* of the two witnesses, rather than that their personal coming was looked for in order to witness again. To the case, however, of Enoch and Elijah may be added that of Elijah and St. John the Evangelist, whose expected re-appearance rests upon peculiar ground. The instance of Elijah need not be again largely entered upon; it is evident from 2 Kings xi. 1—11. that he did not die, but was taken up into heaven by a whirlwind; and we have also seen from Mal. iv. 5, that there is a foundation for the expectation of his return. John the Evangelist is supposed to have been removed from the earth in some similar extraordinary manner, first from what is said on John xxi. 21, 22, of a rumour among the disciples that John was not to *die*, which is corrected by John himself thus—“Yet Jesus said not unto him, He shall not *die*; but, If I will that he *tarry till I come*, what is that to thee;” and, secondly, from there being no authentic accounts of the death of John. From this therefore it is concluded, that he is still miraculously preserved, and will reappear in the flesh, and be actually put to death, and then rise again. This is supposed to be farther confirmed by the verse which immediately introduces the account of the two witnesses, Rev. x. 11, and which is viewed as a kind of text, of which that description in chapter xi. is explanatory—viz. “*Thou (John) must prophecy again before many peoples and nations and tongues and kings.*†

\* The following points of resemblance are noticed by Daubuz:—

Moses and Aaron.	Elijah and Elisha.	Zorobabel and Joshua.
Have power over waters to turn them into blood, and to smite the earth with all plagues as often as they will. Compare Rev. xi. 6 and Ex. iv. 9 and vii. 17, &c.	Clothed in sackcloth and prophesying. Compare v. 3 and 2 Kings i. 8 and ii. 12, 13, which shews that Elisha was clad as Elijah.	These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the whole earth. Compare v. 4 with Zech. iv. 3, 11, 14.
If any man will hurt them, &c. Compare v. 5 and Numb. xvi. 3, 35.	Fire devoureth their enemies. Compare v. 5 and 1 Kings xviii. 38, 40; 2 Kings i. 10—14 and vi. 17.	Clothed in sackcloth. Compare v. 3 and Zech. iii. 3.
	Have power over waters, &c. Compare v. 6 with 2 Kings ii. 8, 14.	
	Have power to shut heaven, that it rain not. Compare v. 6 with 1 Kings xvii. and xviii. 1.	
	Taken up into heaven in a cloud: true of Elijah. Compare v. 12 and 2 Kings ii. 11.	

† This view is ably discussed in a work called *Paradise Regained*, published in 1764. The Author interprets the period of their prophesying *literally*.



There have been individuals adduced in pairs from among those saints who have been eminently witnesses for God subsequent to the period of scripture history: the most remarkable of which are John Huss and Jerome of Prague. The circumstance that the testimony of any of the foregoing has not suited, as regards *time*, to the particular period to which the prophecy in Rev. xi. is applied, is not considered as militating against the propriety of viewing them as witnesses; for on the ground that Abel though dead is said *yet to speak*; (Heb. xi. 4.) so is their testimony supposed to continue and exist in other times than the period of their actual life, and to be heard in Huss and Jerome, or any other.

(2.) The more general mode, however, among modern interpreters is to consider the numeral *two*, according to the view of Mede, as being itself symbolical of a small but competent number of witnesses. 1 Kings xvii. 12. Isaiah vii. 12. and Hosea vi. 2. are considered a sufficient warrant for considering *two* as a small but indefinite number; and Deut. xvii. 6. and 2 Cor. xiii. 1. for their's being a sufficient or competent testimony.\* Mr. Cuninghame, therefore, who considers them to be "a small number of faithful men, a truly spiritual church, that should witness for the truth, &c.," concludes that they are to be found wheresoever there are persons testifying for the truth of God against the surrounding ungodliness or superstition. Others have rather comprehended a like indefinite number of witnesses under the more formal and precise notion of *two churches* or communities. Thus Dr. N. Homes considers them to be the Jewish and Gentile *churches*, principally on the ground that Rom. xi. 17, 24 likens the Jewish church to an *olive-tree*, and Rev. i. 20 explains a *candlestick* to be likewise the symbol of a church, and the people of Israel are emphatically declared in Isaiah xliii. 10, to be God's *witnesses*. The Gentile church is supposed to be designated, from the circumstance of her being likewise alluded to in Rom. xi. as a *wild olive-tree*; and because in Zech. iv. 2 only *one* candlestick is seen, when the Jewish church alone was witnessing, yet two candlesticks are named in Rev. xi.† Sir Isaac Newton con-

\* The circumstance of our Lord's ordaining his witnesses to go forth two and two, as when he sent out the *seventy*, may also be considered a foundation for the number *two* being named.

† See the whole subject treated and the Jewish testimony even in Christian times pointed out at length, in the Appendix to Dr. Home's "Resurrection Revealed," revised edition, p. 316. The same subject is also discussed by a writer in the Investigator, vol. ii. p. 137, under the signature C. S. He considers the Jewish witness to have been in the first instance more especially the *two tribes* of Judah and Benjamin, who remained faithful to their king when the *ten tribes* revolted; and who continued to serve at the *Tabernacle of witness*, when the ten tribes lapsed into idolatry. They are nevertheless spoken

sidered the churches of Smyrna and Philadelphia (Rev. xi.) to be *types* of the two witnesses, who were more immediately set forth by the 144,000 sealed ones, whom he takes to be derived from the *two wings* of the woman, i. e. from the eastern and western empires. Many other expositors, as More and Fleming, and also Mr. Faber of the present day, consider the two churches of the Albigenses and Waldenses to be intended by the two witnesses.\*

(3.) There remains one other view, which in a measure sets aside the number two, and regards the *testimony* only. Such is the view of a writer in the Investigator under the signature of H. S. L., who applies the whole subject to the *standing ministry of the word or gospel* during the Gentile dispensation. This view is ably and scripturally supported, and its analogy with the references in Rev. xi. to Elijah and John the Baptist are pointed out. (Vol. i. p. 323. Vol. iii. p. 217 and 311.)

Others who regard the testimony make it rather the *written word*, and discover the number *two* also in the *Old and New Testaments*. Brightman is one of the earliest who took this view; though he included in it the body of Protestant Christians, as being the preachers and proclaimers of the testimony contained in them. Vitranga inclines to unite in like manner the two Testaments, or covenants, with the testimony of the *Waldenses*; and considers the *reed* also, with which the temple and altar were measured, to be the *rule* of the Law and Gospel. Mr. Frere and Mr. Irving have in our own times considered it to be the two Testaments or covenants only, as contained in the Scriptures.

2. The next point upon which great difference has necessarily existed has respect to the *period* of the *death and resurrection* of the witnesses. This of course relates only to those who consider their death and resurrection to have already occurred,† and to have continued three days and a half, or

---

of as *one* tribe, Benjamin being absorbed by Judah; and thus the Gentile is in like manner viewed as incorporated into the Jewish church, and become as *Benjamin*, i. e. "Son of my right hand."

\* The Rev. S. R. Maitland has very strenuously endeavoured to overthrow the latter opinion in an elaborate work called "Facts and Documents illustrative of the History, Doctrine, and Rites of the Ancient Albigenses and Waldenses;" which has called forth a reply by the Rev. J. King of Hull, and a rejoinder by Mr. Maitland. The documents are too long to give even an abridged view of them here. Mr. M.'s object however is to show that the Albigenses were nothing but *heretical fanatics*, and that the Waldenses, though true Christians, were not sufficiently ancient to answer Mr. Faber's views as to chronology. These points are ably controverted by Mr. King: which has the best of the argument it would be unfair to state without going more largely into the discussion.

† Among those who consider the slaying of the witnesses to be yet future are Bishops Newton and Horsley, Archdeacon Woodhouse, Dr. Gill, and Messrs. Scott, Keith, &c.

rather (understanding the time symbolically) three *years* and a half.

The death of John Huss and Jerome of Prague is necessarily dated A. D. 1415. The view of another writer in the Investigator, under the signature of E., (which view I shall presently notice more particularly) dates the slaughter of the witnesses in A. D. 1514, at the chief session of the Lateran general council; and their resurrection at the protestation of Luther in 1517; just three years and a half afterwards. Brightman considers that the scriptures were reduced to a dead letter by the council of Trent, A. D. 1546, and that the German Protestant churches were soon after silenced by the dissolution of the Smalcaldic league by the Emperor Charles V. in 1547. Mr. Cuninghame adopts the latter event mentioned by Brightman, though he does not exactly date from it; for he considers the death of the witnesses to have been effected by the promulgation of the doctrines of the *Interim*, presented and read in the diet 15th May, 1548; and their resurrection to have taken place in 1551, in the latter end of which year Prince Maurice suddenly took arms for the relief of the Protestants, and made such a rapid progress that the emperor fled with the utmost consternation, and likewise the members of the council of Trent, which was thereby broken up.\* He considers their ascension into the symbolical heaven of government to be fulfilled by the treaty of peace signed at Passau in 1552.†

Mr. Faber formerly held with Mr. Cuninghame in adopting the events just instanced, as prefigured by the death and resurrection of the witnesses, but he has since abandoned them, and taken up a view once entertained by Dr. Gill, and subsequently rejected by that writer. According to this, the

\* Among the quotations from history whereby Mr. Cuninghame supports his view of the character of this period is the following striking one from Fra Paoli Sarpi, the Catholic historian of the council of Trent; who, speaking of the Protestant ministers and doctors restored to the churches and schools at this time, says: "Although it might have been thought that there remained very few of the doctors and preachers, (who had taken refuge under the protection of princes,) and that banishments and persecutions had almost exterminated them; yet, as if they had been again raised from the dead, a sufficient number were found to supply all the places." (Tom. i. p. 612.)

† Some date their death from the battle of Muhlburg, April 1547, when the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse, the two Protestant champions, were taken prisoners,—to December 1550, when they defeated and took the duke of Mecklenburgh prisoner at Magdeburg. The dates selected by Mr. Cuninghame are by no means satisfactory; for, if the *Interim* be dated from, it ought to terminate with the treaty of Passau, August 2, 1552, which is above *four* years after. And if it terminate with the standing up of Prince Maurice, at the end of 1551, it ought to commence with the overthrow of the princes of the Smalcaldic confederacy in 1547, which again is about *four* years.

Vallenses and Albigenses, having after many centuries of bloody persecution, in which they separately and jointly bore a faithful testimony, were forbidden to exercise their religion, by a decree of the French king dated 31st Jan. 1686; by which decree also their pastors were banished and their places of worship commanded to be destroyed. In this state they continued during the space of three years and a half, when an intrepid body of them under Henri Arnaud secretly crossed the lake of Geneva, Aug. 16, 1689, and recovered their possessions. Their ascension he dates in June 4, 1690, when the duke issued an edict recognising their independence.\*

The persecution of the protestants by Mary queen of England, commencing about the year 1553, and the more horrible effusion of their blood in France, commencing with the massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1752, have both been remarked to have extended over a period of about three and a half years. But I pass over particulars, and just note in conclusion, that those who now consider the Old and New Testaments to be the Witnesses, refer their death to the suppression of Christianity in France in 1793, when the Scriptures were first dragged through the cities and towns and then burnt by the common hangman, and their resurrection to the law passed about three years and a half afterwards for the regulation of public worship.†

\* Some discrepancy also exists among writers in their selection of the particulars connected with *these* events. For Cressener and Jurieu date the three and a half years from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685. Lloyd and Whiston from the actual destruction of the protestants by the Duke of Savoy in Dec. 1686, until June 4, 1690, when he re-established them. Mr. Whiston states that Bishop Lloyd gave this application, or rather interpretation, of the subject *before the event took place.* Both in regard to this view, and to that pointed out in the preceding note in reference to Mr. Cuninghame, it will be observed, that the one party date the *ascension* into heaven from that event which the other party considers as the *resurrection.*

† Having more than once mentioned the editor of the "Illustrations of Prophecy," and his republican sentiments, I cannot altogether pass by *his* view of the Witnesses. He considers that they are *two classes* of witnesses. He entirely denies that *both* are religious, but only *one*, and the other *civil*, witnessing against and opposing "the tyrannies of princes and priests," and "bearing testimony against *civil* as well as *religious* tyranny." But in reality he makes them only *one*, for having largely insisted on those who were *political* witnesses, he asks, what has become of the *religious* witnesses? and replies—"Wherever *freedom* is established on a foundation sufficiently broad, there religious as well as civil rights will be secured." Vol. i. p. 109. The religious witness is therefore absorbed in the political, which is thus made to appear as the more valuable testimony of the two. The allusions to Moses and Aaron, and to Joshua and Zerubbabel, already noticed as existing in the prophecy, are pressed and distorted into this view:—"Moses emancipated the people from a civil despot; Aaron's object was to preserve their religious independence inviolate;" and so it was with Joshua and Zerubbabel. P. 104. Their being compared also to a *condlestick* is to shew, "that they *enlighten* the public mind on the rights of conscience and on the rights of citizens." *The promoters of the French Revolution* were the witnesses who *propheesied*—i. e. they bore

3. Considering the view taken by the Rev. E. B. Elliot, in the papers in the Investigator under the signature E, as decidedly the most complete and precise of any hitherto advanced by those who consider the death and resurrection of the witnesses to have *already* taken place, I proceed to lay a brief outline of it before the reader.

He considers that the period selected for their death ought to be that at which, by *common consent of historians*, the voice of *anti-papal testimony* was most effectually silenced throughout Europe; and the papacy, supported by the ten-horned beast, was most triumphant against it; which consideration he thinks a decisive objection against any solution which refers for the fulfilment to events subsequent to the Reformation,—the partial suppression of that testimony in 1547, by the dissolution of the Smalcaldic confederacy being in no wise comparable to the death-like silence that existed just before the protest of Luther.\* Bost's *Histoire de l'Eglise des Frères* is quoted to shew, that in 1489 the deputies sent by the Bohemian churches to search throughout Europe for faithful teachers and reformers of the Church, with whom they were desirous of making common cause, returned *unsuccessful*. Vol. i. p. 106. In the year 1510 the Bohemians and Hussites were themselves all but silenced by a persecuting decree of the diet and king Wladislas against them; and Milner is quoted as testimony "that the sixteenth century opened with a prospect of all others the most gloomy in the eyes of every true Christian."—"The Waldenses were too feeble to molest the Popedom; and the Hussites, divided among themselves, and worn out by a long series of contentions, were at length reduced to silence."

---

testimony against error and corruptions in an eminent degree and in the most public manner. He considers farther, "that the three and a half days of their death answers to three and a half lunar *prophetical* months, or 105 days, which he counts as years; and he dates this period from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 to the French Revolution, which 105 years was the period during which liberty of speech was, with more than usual rigour, subjected to all the shackles of despotism, &c." P. 113. The French Revolution was therefore their resurrection; and the invitation or command from Louis XVI. to the Tiers Etat to assist in the national deliberations, from which they had been long prohibited, was the voice from the throne saying, "*Come up hither.*"—!!!

\* It is indeed one of the serious objections to the view taken by Mr. Cunningham, that in the very year 1547 is to be dated the accession of Edward to the throne of England;—an event which was the occasion, in another part of Europe, of reviving the hopes of the people of God, and of giving free course to their testimony for the truth. Mr. C. himself considers this event as the falling "in the same hour" of a tenth part of the city; not perceiving that it militates against that temporary triumph of Babylon and suppression of the truth, which the terms of the prophecy seem to require. The fall of the city appears to be the immediate effect of their resurrection and ascension; with which the phrase—"the same hour"—is evidently connected. It must therefore follow on or accompany their *ascension*, and not accompany their *death*.



And Mosheim says—"The commotions previously excited by the Waldenses, Albigenses, and more recently by the Bohemians, were *entirely suppressed*, and had yielded to the united powers of counsel and the sword." The language of Mr. Cuninghame himself, who, with another object in view, delineates the character of this period, is remarkable to the point,—“At the commencement of the 15th century Europe reposed in the *deep sleep of spiritual death* under the iron yoke of the Papacy. That haughty power, like the Assyrian of the prophet, said in the plenitude of its insolence, ‘My hand hath found as a nest the riches of the people; as one gathereth eggs that are left have I gathered all the earth, and there was none that moved the wing, or *opened the mouth*, or peeped.’” 3rd Edition, p. 139.

The sudden transition from this stillness of death, as by an unexpected resurrection unto life, is also strikingly described. Mr. Cuninghame continues the passage just quoted as follows;—“But the deep wisdom of God is manifested in choosing ‘the base things of the world, and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to nought the things that are.—*Suddenly*, in one of the universities of Germany, the voice of an obscure monk was heard, the sound of which rapidly filled Saxony, Germany, and Europe itself, shaking the very foundations of the papal power, and *arousing men from the lethargy of ages*.\* It was in the year 1517, that *the Reformation began* by the preaching of Luther, &c.” The writer of the article *On the Reformation* in the Encyclopædia Britannica is farther quoted as strikingly depicting the previous state of depression and sudden change from it at this time:—“*Every thing was quiet, every heretic exterminated, and the whole Christian world supinely acquiesced* in the enormous absurdities inculcated by the Romish church, WHEN—in 1517 the empire of superstition received its first attack from *Luther*.”

Mr. Elliot points to the dates of the commencement and termination of this period, which have been already alluded to: viz. from the *decrees of the ninth and chief session of the fifth Lateran general Council*, held A. D. 1514, (which, as it were, put the finishing stroke to the life of the witnesses, and sealed them up in death,†) to *the protestation of Luther* in 1517, just

\* He refers to Hume’s Hist. of Eng. c. xxix. observing, that “this infidel, when he reluctantly bears testimony in favour of the cause of truth, is an unexceptionable witness.”

† Mr. Cuninghame (in an article published in the Investigator, vol. iii. p. 281.) objects against this view, that by making the Lateran Council slay the witnesses, he kills them by the *ecclesiastical* power, which is the *second beast* or *False Prophet*; whereas from Rev. xi. 7. it is indisputable that they are slain by the *first* beast, or secular power. Mr. C. considers this a “*fundamental*



three and a half years after, when he first posted his theses against indulgences, &c. on the walls of Wittenberg; and which spread through the whole of Germany in the short space of fifteen days. Thus is the period in question marked, both at its commencement and termination, by distinct and notable acts, and consequences resulting from those acts, corresponding respectively to the symbols of the death and resurrection of the witnesses.

Some other circumstances connected with this Council are noticed which must not be passed over. (1) It was the last *general* council of the holy Roman Empire; for the Protestants declined to attend that summoned some years after at Trent. The French king did not at first acknowledge it, but gave in his adhesion in Dec. 1513. (2) It was held at *Rome*, the principal place of concourse of the Empire, "The *street* of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, &c." (3) "They *of* (or *from*) the people (*ἐκ τῶν λαῶν*) and tongues and nations shall see their dead bodies, &c.: which points, according to Mr. Elliott, to a *council* or *convention of deputies* from the several states of Christendom. That these beheld the dead bodies of the witnesses he considers proved by the fact that the Bohemian brethren were invited to the Council's session, held May 5, 1514, with promise of safe conduct, but—*not one appeared*: "throughout the length and breadth of Christendom they were silenced; they were dead!" It was only left for the Council to guard against their *revival*, by passing a decree in which the inquisitions were stimulated to proceed zealously against all heretics, "and especially *against such as might relapse*, from whom every hope of pardon was withheld."\* (4) It is written—"They that dwell on the earth shall *rejoice* over them, and *make merry*, and *send gifts one to another*, &c.;" and Mr. Elliott further shews that "the assembled princes and prelates separated from the Council with *complacency* and confidence, and *mutual congratulations* on the *peace, unity, and purity*, of the apostolical Church."† But—"Scarcely (says the same histo-

*objection*;" but if rightly considered it is no objection at all. For the ecclesiastical power did not really kill, but only condemned, and handed the victim over to the *secular* power. And this is just what the two-horned beast does—"he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him," and "*causes* that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed." Rev. xiii. 12, 15. It was indeed the united act of the *princes and prelates* assembled. Thus Herod and Pontius Pilate are declared to have killed Christ, as being the secular arm; whilst yet the *Council* is declared to have been his betrayers and murderers. Compare Acts iv. 10. and 27. with chap. vii. 52. Besides this Mr. Elliot does in reality refer the silencing of the witnesses to the effect of the crusades carried on against them previous to the decree of the Lateran Council; the acts of which in that session *attest* their silence, and put the finishing stroke to it.

\* Waddington's History of the Church, p. 661.

† Ibid. p. 663.

rian) had the departing prelates concluded their mutual congratulations, when Luther commenced in the school of Wittenberg his public preaching against the most revolting corruptions of the Church.\*

The *ascension* of the witnesses into heaven (i. e. into "political eminence") was fulfilled, as this writer concludes, in April 1529, "in the very presence and sight of their assembled enemies at the diet of Spires;" when "the princes of Hesse and Saxony, and many other princes and imperial cities of the empire, assumed to themselves the illustrious name of PROTESTANTS, including in it, by its Latin etymology, the very character of witnesses." This last sentence is from Mr. Cuninghame's work, p. 140. The tenth part of the city which then fell, Mr. E. inclines to apply to the now fully organized schism of the *Protestant body*; but if it be preferred to understand it of one of the ten kingdoms, then he points to the case of England.

(2.) Such is the view of this able and intelligent writer;† and if we are bound by any abstract evidence from the structure of the Apocalypse to consider the death of the witnesses as part, it would be difficult to find a better key to the interpretation: certainly none has been offered which so well seems to fit most of the intricate wards of the prophecy. But there are nevertheless some weighty objections in the way of receiving it as a *full* and *complete* accomplishment of Rev. xi.—

First, it does not appear to me to answer fully to the symbols of the prophecy; which objection I shall more fully notice in the next section, when I place before the Reader the elements for *another* interpretation.

Secondly, I am not satisfied with the exposition which makes the words of Rev. xi. 7, "*when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast, &c. shall kill them,*" to require the following paraphrase, which Mr. E. is obliged to give to them: "*When they shall have thus entered on their witnessing, and whilst engaged in still fulfilling it, the beast, &c.*" I do not here dispute the critical evidence adduced by this able writer to prove that the expression *ὅταν τελεσωσι την μαρτυριαν αυτων* will bear such a sense;‡ for, admitting that it *may* bear this sense, my objection

\* Mr. Cuninghame has more recently objected, that Mr. E. kills the Witnesses previous to A. D. 1514,—that all his evidence goes to shew that they were silenced previous to that time;—and that there is nothing in the proceedings of the Council relative to their absence;—whilst the date of the Bull mentioned by Mr. E. is 1511 and not 1514. (Investigator Vol. iii. p. 504.)

† For the whole view of Mr. Elliott, together with the strictures of Mr. Cuninghame on it, and a reply and rejoinder which followed, see the Investigator, vol. iii. pages 185, 281, 440, 504.

‡ Such a sense, or a meaning nearly equivalent to it, is supported by the high authority of Grotius, Mede, Dr. H. More, Daubuz, Bishop Newton, and

would equally remain, being grounded on the general context of the passage, and the analogy of Scripture. The idea of two prophets being interrupted in their career by death, and after lying dead for three and a half days, being raised from that state, and then *resuming their testimony*, and going on with their work, is unanalogous to any thing in scripture, and contrary to all that is suggested to us by the word of God. It is when believers have "finished their course,"—when they have "fought a good fight,"—when they have "done that which their Father hath given them to do," that their hour comes. Perfectly consistent, therefore, is it, when these prophets have witnessed a good confession, and they are now ready to be offered up, that they should be perfected through death; and *have done* with all further testimony, so far as that testimony is to be given in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation.

Thirdly, I can still less reconcile with the congruity of the symbols the notion of two prophets continuing to prophesy *in sackcloth* after they are translated to the heavens. What Mr. Cuninghame says, and what Mr. E. coincides in, viz. that they *sympathise* with those members who still continue to testify on earth in circumstances of depression, may be true in itself; for it is true of CHRIST, who is touched with the sense of the infirmities of his people. But surely it were absurd to speak of Christ as being still in a state of humiliation and depression, which clothing of sackcloth indicates. When he ascended up on high, he entered into his glory, sitting down at the right hand of the majesty of God. It was a *triumph*; and a triumph and sackcloth appear quite incongruous.\*

---

other competent scholars, with many others who have followed them; but there are not wanting eminent names on the other side of the question. Mr. E. himself admits that there can be no doubt that the *natural and legitimate* rendering of the Greek phrase is that which is given in our translation; and Mr. Faber, whose competency to judge cannot be disputed, not being able to receive this version, submitted it, he says, to "a gentleman (Mr. Tate) who is deservedly acknowledged to be one of the first Greek scholars of the age:" whose reply is as follows:—"The laws of grammar *inevitably forbid* that *οταν τελευτασι* should be rendered, *when they shall be about to finish*:" the phrase *can only mean* "when they shall have finished." It is true indeed, that the aorists subjunctive, constructed with *οταν*, bear a future sense, but then it is the future *past* (*shall have*) not the future *perfect*, (*shall be about*.) No instance can be produced from any Greek author, in which an aorist subjunctive constructed with *οταν* ever bears the sense of the future perfect." I am aware that this does not fully meet the sense given by Mr. Elliott, excepting as Mr. Tate insists that the phrase *can only mean*, "when they shall have finished." At the same time, what Mr. Faber insinuates in regard to Mede (vol. iii. p. 77) that he would not have sought to deviate from the authorized translation *but to serve a turn*, is not just in his case: for though he notices that it *may* be rendered "when they shall be about to *finish their testimony*," he does not adopt it.

\* Mr. Scott deems the two things so incongruous that he says: "Now if the witnesses were slain at any of the times which different expositors fix upon, it inevitably follows that they prophesied one, two, or three hundred days in

Fourthly, the beast who kills the witnesses is "the beast that ascendeth (το αναβατινον) out of the bottomless pit." I have endeavoured to shew in the last chapter, (p. 286, 288.) that this is the beast under his *last aspect*, after he has *risen again* as it were from the dead. This perfectly agrees with Rev. xvii. 8,—“The beast that thou sawest was, and is not, and shall ascend (μελει αναβαινω) out of the bottomless pit.” I believe the *time* intended to be indicated as *present*, in reference to the action and circumstances of that vision, is *not the time when the apostle sees the vision, but the time of THE JUDGMENT OF THE GREAT WHORE*, which is the title or subject-matter of the vision, as expressed in verse 1. It cannot refer to the time of the apostle, for how could it then be said that the beast “*was and is not?*” It is equally plain to me, that the phrase *was, and is not, and shall ascend*, has reference to three independent and successive periods of time, viz. the period when the beast *was*, or did exist,—the interregnum, or period when he *is not*,—and the period when he *shall ascend out of the pit*, and finally terminate his career. It is exceedingly important to ascertain in which of these three periods the witnesses are killed: the expression in chap. xi. 7—“the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit,” evinces it to be under the *last* period; which expression is altogether anticipatory, since no beast at all has been mentioned previous to this verse. Persuaded, then, that the beast had not reascended from the pit at the time limited by Mr. Elliott for the death of the witnesses, I hesitate to concur in his view, unless it may be regarded in the light of a *primary* fulfilment, which is yet to be succeeded by a more precise and complete one. For indeed some have thought it not improbable (as has been shewn at page 251\*) that all the times which have been mystically fulfilled, will likewise have a literal accomplishment:

4. In regard to any *future* fulfilment of the death of the witnesses, I must now, in conclusion, recall the reader's attention to the terms of the prophecy, which I have just hinted I do not consider to have been fulfilled; and endeavour to point out the principles on which an expositor ought to proceed in the interpretation of that prophecy.

First, there is an obvious reference in the prophecy to Zechariah iv. 14, inasmuch as we are told “These are the two

---

sackcloth less than the predicted period: except any will say that they prophesied in sackcloth *after* their resurrection and ascension into heaven.”

\* So in Brown's Bible on Rev. xi. he says—“Whatever murder of Christ's witnesses may have been effected during the whole reign of Antichrist, or whatever particular persecutions of about three and a half years' continuance have taken place, I suppose the general slaughter here intended is *future*.”





and gives light to his Church, which is *his own body*. That he is the person eminently intended, and in this character, is evident from chap. vi. 11—14, where the prophet is directed to take silver and gold and make *two crowns*, one for the priest and one for the prince, and to set them upon the head of *Joshua*, and to speak unto him and say, "Behold the man whose name is **THE BRANCH**, and *He* shall grow up out of his place and *shall build the temple of the Lord*, even *He* shall build the temple of the Lord; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a *priest upon his throne*: and the counsel of peace shall be *between them BOTH*: and the *crowns* shall be for a *memorial* in the temple of the Lord." It is remarkable that *Joshua the priest* is selected as the one on whom *both* crowns are placed, and through him it is promised that the *Branch* shall build; and yet it was *Zerubbabel*, the prince who, in chap. iv. 6—10, was to be the builder of the house; not, indeed, by his might or power, but "by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." V. 6. The apparent reason, therefore, for placing both crowns on *one* only of these two is, that it may be understood that *both together* were a type of *Jesus*, who unites in his person the two offices of *priest* and *king*; and though *Joshua* is thus crowned and addressed as the type, yet *Zerubbabel* is not excluded, for it is declared that the counsel of peace shall be between them *both*. In the same manner, though they are *two* olive branches viewed in their separate characters, yet they are a type of *one* branch only, who is transcendently called **THE BRANCH**.

The formal notion, therefore, presented to us, of the witnesses, (and without a distinct reference to which no interpretation of Rev. xi. appears complete,) is that of the *priest and prince*, as types of our great *Melchizedec*. These are to be viewed as endowed with power by him to sustain rule and govern in his Church, as his representatives, "until he come whose right it is." *Included*, however, in this notion, and distinctly brought before us by other types, are the whole Church of Christ, who are his *temple*, (1 Cor. iii. 16—17), who are a *royal priesthood*, (see the whole of 1 Pet. ii. 4—9,) and who are hereafter to be manifested in glory, as those who are made *kings and priests* unto God." (Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6.) This notion, therefore, embraces all the chief features which have been mentioned as brought forward by different expositors. It includes the spiritual worshippers of God, who in every age have looked to Christ as their priest and king: it includes the notion of the priesthood and standing ministry of the Gospel, (in which view the holy Scriptures, or Old and New Testaments as some call them, are virtually comprehend-



ed:) it includes the notion of the *Jewish* and *Gentile Churches*, as more expressly typified by the reference to the *olive-tree* in Romans xi.: only they must be considered as churches or polities, which consist of an intimate union of the civil and ecclesiastical powers,—or *church and state* in the best sense of the term.\* And *they* are beyond question the truest witnesses for Christ, who “fear God and honour the king.”†

That the union of the *prince* with the priesthood, as a witness for God, is justifiable, may be farther confirmed by the way in which princes are spoken of in other parts of scripture. They are “*the Lord’s anointed*,” and to lift a hand against them in that character, or even to speak evil of them, is considered a grievous offence. (1 Sam. xxiv. 6, 10; xxvi. 9, 16. 2 Sam. i. 14; xix. 21.) Even Cyrus, a Gentile king, apparently unconverted to the true faith, is nevertheless declared to be, in his regal office, the *Lord’s anointed*. (Isa. xlvi. i.) They are also *olive-trees*; for David says, “I am like a *green olive-tree* in the house of God:” (Psal. lii. 8,) which saying, though it may refer ultimately to Messiah, must nevertheless be true, in the first place, of David himself, as the type. As to their *prophe-sying*, this is no more, I apprehend, than their *witnessing*; and Daubuz, quoting Isa. lv. 4: “I have given thee a *witness* to the people, a leader and commander to the people,” the latter clause of the sentence being explanatory of the former, observes that a witness has *regal* power; and that “a witness of God is a deputy with divine power and authority, an ordinance of God endued with a regal power; which title supposes a resistance to all other human power setting up itself against God’s.” This he confirms by St. Paul’s words, Rom. xiii. 5, 6.‡ Besides this, however, it is worthy of remark, that all

\* Only one *candlestick* is seen in Zech. iv., whilst there are two *olive-trees*: for there existed then only the Jewish church; but that church was pre-eminently a *national* church, protected, fostered, and upheld by the *prince*, when that prince was one who feared God. Hence therefore the Jewish church alone required the *two olive-trees* to symbolize it fully. In Rev. i. ii. and iii. we have the type of the Gentile church, set forth first by the seven candlesticks, and then by seven selected communities of Asia Minor; and hence, apparently, is the reason why, in Rev. xi. two candlesticks are introduced.

† I must not be understood as meaning to justify the abuse of power in princes, corruptions in the priesthood, nor abuses in the established Church. Offences will come, owing to the fallen nature of man, and woe to him by whom the offence cometh. But it does not justify our speaking evil of dignities, or refusing to submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake. As well might children refuse to obey their parents, and servants their masters, unless all be “good and gentle.” The true national witness for God is in Church and State; and though the beast from the pit is made the instrument of vengeance for their abuse of power, yet are his *principles* infidel, and opposed to the majesty of God.

‡ Daubuz is the only commentator I am acquainted with, who directly approximates to the view here taken. We have seen in a former note, (page 317,) that he fixes on Joshua and Zerubbabel, Moses and Aaron, Elijah and

the kings of Israel, previous to the schism which caused the ten tribes to draw off, were prophets. The Psalms witness for *David's* being so; the Canticles, &c. for *Solomon*. And as to the *first* king of Israel, "It became a proverb: *Saul also among the prophets.*" (1 Sam. x. 12; xix. 24.)

The above is not offered as a formal exposition of the whole prophecy, but only as the ground-work or elements for an interpretation: the remaining particulars it will not be difficult to make out, and those already noticed may be followed out to a much greater extent.

The signs of the times tend to confirm this view. I have endeavoured to shew in the former chapter that the last form of Antichrist is to be republican and infidel, and that we have strong indications in the present day of the increasing prevalence of those principles: the obscuration of the symbolical sun and moon, together with the falling of the stars, amounts to the same thing as the death of the witnesses. When they shall be killed, their enemies will rejoice, "because these two prophets *tormented* them that dwelt on the earth." This is already the loud complaint of infidel and revolutionary men; viz. that kings and priests have been and are the greatest evils to society,—a torment and scourge to men. And especially that power which the state has exercised (answering to the fire proceeding out of the mouth of the witnesses, and devouring their enemies, v. 5,)—a power of inflicting capital punishment for treason, and dealing severely with blasphemy and sacrilege, —is aimed at and railed against by the seditious and levelling spirit of the present day; and nothing has caused greater exultation among men of revolutionary principles, than when a *monarch* has been dethroned or depressed.

It would be easy to point to past events of a character sufficient to make out as good an accomplishment of the *death* of these two witnesses, as any of those already pointed to,\* (un-

Elisha, as types of the witnesses; and of these pairs he says—"One of these stood for the ecclesiastical or religious government, and the other for the civil state." He has a difficulty, however, in proving this in the case of Elijah and Elisha, and rests it on the circumstance that he could not have been *priest or Levite*, from the fact of his being found at the plough, when Elijah chose him for his companion, (1 Kings xix. 19,) for neither priest nor Levite could have land. (p. 503.) He should have said, When Elijah chose him for his *successor*, rather than *companion*; for these two cannot be viewed as pairs, in the same way as the other couples. He observes of Joshua and Zerubbabel, that they are called "*the anointed ones*;" i. e. (he says) "*the supreme governors in Church and State*;" and "that in the case of the two witnesses in Rev. xi. 3, the word *δωρα*, *I will give*, implies power and authority." On their being called *olive-trees*, he says, "Which type plainly signified, that those two heads did maintain the nation of the captive Jews, both as to their *ecclesiastical and civil state*; as the *olive-trees*, which afford oil, do maintain the light in the lamps, the *symbol of government.*"

\* Both church and king were overthrown in England in the time of our

less that of Mr. Elliott be excepted;) but though these things have been permitted by the providence of God, as *specimens* of the coming wrath, I consider they have been of too partial a character to answer to the scope of the prophecy. I expect that the beast from the pit will overthrow *all kings and all churches* within the range of his dominion; previous to which they will be in a state of depression and humiliation corresponding to their prophesying in sackcloth. Already is the war against them covertly begun; of which we have unequivocal demonstrations in our own country; not to mention the fact, that we have already ceased to be, in a national point of view, a *Protestant* country; and that so far as one branch of the legislature is concerned, she is already unchristianized; (I allude to the bills to remove disabilities from Roman Catholics and from Jews;) and the *inconveniency* of maintaining a church establishment, now already complained of, will be experienced in a tenfold degree, should the latter bill ever pass into a law. And it is worthy of note, that that warning in Proverbs xxiv. 21, has a special reference to the spirit and the circumstances of the last days: "Fret not thyself because of *evil doers*, neither be thou envious at the wicked; for there shall be no reward to the evil man; *the candle of the wicked* shall be put out. My son, fear thou *the Lord and the king*; and meddle not with them that are *given to change*; for *their calamity shall rise suddenly, and who knoweth the ruin of them both!*" (Compare Psalm xxxvii.) But—the triumphing of the wicked will be short. In the midst of their rage against the Lord and against *his anointed*, he will laugh them to scorn. Though the powers in league with the beast make war with the Lamb, yet the Lamb shall overcome them; for—HE IS LORD OF LORDS AND KING OF KINGS, and they that are with him are *called, and chosen, and faithful*. Rev. xvii. 14.

#### THE CHRONOLOGICAL PROPHECIES.

1. That which has been the most perplexing, perhaps, of all to the student of prophecy, has been the great discrepancy among interpreters in regard to the *dates* fixed upon for the commencement of those prophecies which are supposed to be of long continuance, the different applications of portions of them, and the consequent want of agreement as regards the time at which they are to be finally accomplished.\* A work

---

Charles I., and both have been overthrown in France in the time of Louis XVI.

\* Some, as Mr. Faber, &c. think that Daniel and the Apocalypse contain periods of time, running on in a regular chronological series from the time of

of the description now before the reader would not be complete, were it to take *no* notice of this matter, but at the same time it would be an endless and futile labour to attempt to give a history of all the varying schemes of those who have fixed upon particular years for the period of the coming of Antichrist, of the second advent of the Lord Jesus, of the expiration of the times of the Gentiles, the destruction of Babylon, the cleansing the sanctuary, or any other of those notable events contained in the prophetic portion of God's word. They are for the most part refuted by the event; and the authors of the respective systems advocated are either fallen into oblivion, or are only referred to on account of the value attached to those intrinsic principles of interpretation which exist in their writings, and which are still useful in respect to certain *particulars* of prophecy, independent of the system which they may have respectively advocated as a whole.\*

Great however as have been the different opinions on these points, they ought not to be allowed to weigh with the discreet and scriptural inquirer, so as to prejudice him against all examination of the systems of former interpreters; still less ought they to lead to the conclusion that these dates are in no wise to be understood. They are inserted in the prophecies by the Author of those prophecies himself; and we cannot reasonably question that they are intended, like all other portions of scripture, to be of service to the Church of God at some particular period of its history; and therefore for any to set their faces upon principle against all attempts to interpret them, would be to encourage the Church of Christ to despise

---

the prophecy, or some previous event supposed to be alluded to, down to the end of time; to which calendar all the events of these prophecies are to be referred and placed in their chronological order or place. But others, as Daubuz, think there is no perpetual line of time or chronological series; but that we find therein only some special events whose duration is specified; and that we must therefore expect to find several *intermediate spaces of time*, which are not determined by any symbol.

\* The reader who has a desire for entering into these discrepancies will find the following formidable array of different dates brought forward by Calmet (a Roman Catholic writer) which have been assigned by different expositors for the rising of Antichrist. Arnaud de Villeneuve 1326. Francis Melet 1530 or 1540, John of Paris 1560, Cardinal de Cusa 1730 or 1734, Peter D'Aille 1789, Jerom Cardan 1800, and John Pico of Mirandolo 1994. Bengel also notices the following years, as being periods which were immediately preceded by a great expectation that the world would come to an end; (but this expectation existed without any adequate cause,) viz. 1288, 1388, 1488, 1588, and 1666. Pref. p. 311. The Rev. S. R. Maitland gives us the following dates which have been fixed upon for the termination of the 1260 years of Dan. vii. viz. 1650, 1655, 1670, 1686, 1694, 1697, 1716, 1736, &c. Reply to Cuninghame, p. 113. And in his "Reply to a Review in the Morning Watch" he adduces various instances from modern writers, who differ from each other in regard to important events which they fix the accomplishment of as follows: 1843, 1866, 1873, 1888, 1917, 1920, 2000.

one of the great beacons which her Lord has given to her. It has been shown, in a former chapter, that they were evidently intended to be scaled up from certain ages and generations of the Church: they are as clearly to be opened and understood in the generation for which they are written. Whether that is yet "a generation to come," or they have been already opened, or are now opening, may admit of question; though I am decidedly of opinion, notwithstanding the diversity of expositions, that the Lord has been opening them to the Church ever since the era of the Protestant Reformation,—since which period it is that the minds of Christians have been more intensely turned upon prophecy, and these different interpretations have appeared. This is no more than what might have been expected from human nature, and the character of the events to which the prophecies are supposed to relate. The Reformation necessarily opened men's eyes in a great measure to the past; and it was accompanied and succeeded by events of no ordinary character, bearing upon the future destinies of the Church. This is still more remarkably the case in respect to the French Revolution; and when therefore we consider the proneness of mankind to magnify the importance of the times in which they themselves live, and of believers more especially to anticipate that crisis of events which they are desiring, it is no wonder if they have *misplaced* circumstances which, after all, may prove decidedly to belong to the great chain of incidents ultimately to be embraced in a sound and proper interpretation. The nature of the case would farther lead one to expect, in regard to events extending over a large period of history, some of the more important of which are crowded into the latter times of it, that whilst some interpreters might be led too eagerly to adopt an event as predicted in the word of God, or to misplace one really predicted, in order to make it comply with an erroneous chronological system; other interpreters would more carefully compare and examine events with the prophecy, and by the principles of a judicious criticism be led to reject some events, and more correctly to define the features of others, and to fix them to their right places. In this undertaking it is evident that the more modern interpreters must have a decided advantage; inasmuch as they not only avail themselves of the criticisms and discoveries of their earlier brethren, but are likewise warned by their errors, and are materially assisted by that greater developement of events which the lapse of time is continually producing.

One farther argument, in reference to the discrepancy in the periods assigned, may be noticed in this place, viz. that there

exists much difference of opinion in regard to a period which all learned men agree has long since been *fulfilled*. I allude to the prophecy of the *Seventy Weeks*, which was to be dated from the going forth of a certain decree to rebuild Jerusalem. But, as has been already noticed, (p. 320,) there were four decrees; and those who lived during the time whilst the 490 years were running out, could not *a priori* be certain *which* of the four commandments issued by the kings of Persia it was to be dated from, though they might justly have assumed that it must be from one of them; and any difference of opinion, therefore, arising from all four periods having been fixed upon, would be no sufficient reason for discarding every one of the hypotheses built thereon, as if all must be equally erroneous. The two first decrees by Cyrus and Darius appeared the most likely to be the real ones: but the first passed away *forty-six* years before Christ, and the latter *twenty-eight* years before, and yet he appeared not. It was between the period of the expiration of the second and *third* edicts that his birth took place; and it now appears, that it is from the *third*, issued in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, that it was really to be calculated, and not from that of the *twentieth* year of Artaxerxes; so that even during the *life* of our Saviour, the period was not elucidated with absolute exactness. Yea, it is not without difficulty even now; as may be seen by the various attempts (noticed by Dr. Prideaux) for reconciling the expiration of this period with the circumstances of the death of Christ.\*

If then this perplexity occur in a prophecy which *all* admit to have been fulfilled, how much more ought we patiently to wait the result of the hypotheses concerning periods not yet fully accomplished. Even writers of *history* are not fully agreed as to the dates of some important events. Take the *Protestant Reformation* for example, which has been variously dated from the time of Wickliffe, Luther, Henry VIII, the Smalealdie League, Edward VI, &c. But were it to be advanced as an argument drawn from this discrepancey, that no Reformation had actually taken place at all, we should at once reject the argument as absurd.

2. Passing on to the chronological periods themselves, that which is of principal importance is the 1260 years—mentioned by Daniel and St. John, under various forms of expression, no

\* These are of such a character, that a modern writer on prophecy has imagined each week to be a *Jubilee* of years; and that Messiah, instead of being *cut off* at the end of the 69 weeks, cuts off his enemies. See an article by Maramensis, *Inv.* vol. ii. p. 121. Another writer has adopted the expedient of separating the 69 weeks from the one remaining week by a hiatus of upwards of 1800 years!



less than *seven* times.\* This period relates to the manifestation and duration of the Little Horn, which, it has been already shewn (p. 276, &c.) is, by the generality of modern interpreters understood to be *the papacy*. A similar concurrence will be found to exist among the more eminent expositors of the present day, in fixing the period of this rise to the year of our Lord 533.† Mr. Cuninghame, who ably vindicates this date, adopts it for the following reasons. He first lays down as a proposition, *that the commencement of the 1260 years is to be marked by the giving the saints and times and laws (of the church) into the hands of the little horn*, (On the Apoc. 3rd edition, p. 256.) And he next adopts the axiom of Mr. Faber, that the giving the saints into the hands of the papacy must be by some formal act of the secular power of the empire, constituting the pope to be the head of the church. He therefore fixes upon the year 533, in which, in the reign of the emperor Justinian, by an act of the secular government of the empire, the Roman Pontiff was thus acknowledged. The emperor first issued a decree defining his own faith, especially in the article that the virgin Mary was *the mother of God*, (thus publicly avouching the *principles* of demonolatry;) and he required all his subjects to conform to it under penalty to the disobedient, and to their children, of the confiscation of their property. He then submits this edict to the pope, and in the epistle which accompanies it he styles him, *the acknowledged head of all the churches, and all the holy priests of God*, and desires his approbation of what he had done. This was given by the pope in the following year; and consequently we have here, in the view of those interpreters who adopt this date, the civil power usurping the authority of Christ, and issuing blasphemous things against God; and the two-horned beast of Rev. xiii. now rising up out of the earth, (answering also to the little horn of the ten-horned beast in Dan. vii.) is evidently prepared to play into his hands and to cause men to worship the beast. The epistle of the pope in reply bears date March 534; and immediately after this, Justinian, in an edict addressed to the præfect of Africa, *invokes* the virgin Mary, thus giving public

\* It is mentioned as three *times* and a half, 42 *months*, and 1260 *days*, which, calculating by *lunar* time, will all agree. See Dan. vii. 25, and Rev. xi. 2, 3; xii. 6, 14, and xiii. 5. Mr. Habershon notices that three distinct events are mentioned in connection with these three forms of expression; viz. the first having respect to popery as it appears under the actual dominion of the pope himself;—the second to the tyrannical dominions of the ten papal kingdoms;—the third to the depressed condition of the church of Christ.

† The names of Cuninghame, Frere, Irving, Keith, Habershon, and many others have sanctioned this date. Mr. Faber likewise adopted it in the former editions of his Sacred Calendar, but has abandoned it in the last edition, for a reason which will presently be noticed.

evidence that the faith of the head of the empire, to which all his subjects were required to conform, was not only blasphemous but demonolatrous. Finally, all the preceding acts of Justinian for establishing a secular and ecclesiastical supremacy in the church (including also a letter to the patriarch of Constantinople, in which the above titles were likewise given to the pope,) were inserted in the volume of the Civil Law, published by Justinian, which became the basis of the jurisprudence of all the kingdoms of the western empire.\*

At the termination of the 1260 years of the tyranny of the Little Horn the ancient of days sits, and the judgment commences which consumes and destroys him: and 1260 years from A. D. 533 brings us down to the French Revolution 1792-3. From which circumstance, as Mr. Cuninghame decidedly considers this to have been the period when judgment commenced upon the papal power, he adduces it as an argument *a posteriori* for adopting the year 533 as that of the rise of the beast: maintaining that argument backward from the period of the break-up of his power, so manifestly occurring at that time, we are necessarily brought back to the time of Justinian.

There is likewise another event which leads to the same date: the *three times and a half* are with a high degree of probability supposed to be a moiety of *seven* times, which seven times are further supposed to be "the times of the Gentiles," i. e. the times of Gentile domination over Israel. Mr. Cuninghame dates this from B. C. 728, when Israel became tributary to Assyria, and were very soon after led into captivity, and when the Assyria-Babylonian empire likewise began to obtain that universal sovereignty which is ascribed to it in the vision. The bisecting point of the *seven* times, dated from 728 B. C. is A. D. 533.†

\* Mr. Cuninghame, who notices these matters (Crit. Examination of Faber, p. 90.) states also that the previous edicts of Gratian and Valentinian the iii. on which Mr. Faber lays emphasis, are not to be found in that volume; a distinction which he thinks of a very prominent character between the two former edicts and that of Justinian, as to their becoming the settled and ultimate law of the empire.

† It has already been observed that Mr. Faber formerly advocated the view of Mr. Cuninghame, (which Mr. Cuninghame, indeed, in some measure derived from him,) but that in a subsequent edition of his work he has departed from it. He has adopted instead, the period of the ten Gothic kingdoms unanimously recognizing the papal supremacy. The abandonment of the year 533 by Mr. Faber, appears to be in consequence of its being necessary to adapt the 1260 years, with the other parts of his exposition, to a new principle adopted in his scheme; the object of which is evidently to prevent his readers from coming to the conclusion (which was inevitable in his former editions,) that the second advent of Christ is premillennial. But he is singularly inconsistent in maintaining his new views: he considers that the point of time, from which the 1260 years are to be calculated, is the completion of the great demo-

It is important however to observe, in regard to the epistle of Justinian, in which he constitutes the pope the head of the church, that certain passages of it, particularly those which are to the point in hand, are called in question by Comber, in his work on the "Forgeries of the Councils," p. 251, who declares them to be spurious. His reasonings, however, are by no means conclusive. For he argues on the *improbability* of the emperor's having thus constituted the pope head of all the churches (including of course those of the eastern empire;) whereas it appears from other documents, as the Novels of Justinian, (nov. 131, ch. 2.) that he really did consider the pope pre-eminent, however plausible the reasoning of Comber may be in the abstract.\*

3. In reference to the chronological system of Mr. Cuninghame, viewed as a whole, it has been urged against it that he departs from what is supposed (by those who make the objection) to be the obvious order and structure of the Apocalypse in the arrangement of the Seals, Trumpets and Vials. Thus

---

nolatrous apostacy of the Christian church, and *the removal of that porticular impediment which hindered the manifestation of the Man of Sin.* This impediment he considers was "the coercing power of the coercing law of the Roman empire." The first step in the progress of its removal he states was the Emperor Constantine's withdrawing his presence from Rome, and constituting Byzantium the capital of his empire—"by which he gave the Roman bishop *space* for expansion: whilst the ample immunities and privileges which he received from succeeding emperors were plainly no other than a removal of the coercing power, so far as it was exercised by the imperial head." He then shews, that certain of these privileges and immunities were conferred by the edict of Gratian and Valentinian II. A. D. 378; that then followed another edict of Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. A. D. 445; and next he comes down to the identical decree of Justinian, 533, constituting the pope head of all the churches, and directing that all ecclesiastical business should be laid before him; and declares, "*Thus was the coercing power removed, so far as it was exercised by the head of the empire.*" Sac. Cal. vol. i. p. 153, and a Review of Faber in the Investigator, vol. iv. p. 302. He attempts nevertheless to carry the period down to a later date, by showing that all the ten kingdoms of the Western empire did not as yet submit to the Pope's authority. The insufficiency and inconsistency of his reasons for this may be seen in the same Review, and in Mr. Cuninghame's Critical Examination.

It is also now objected by Mr. Faber, that the decree of Justinian in regard to the western Empire, which was the seat of the papacy, had no more authority than a piece of waste paper; forasmuch as that emperor had no power over it at the time of its promulgation. Mr. Habershon however says,—"*The Empire of the West being extinguished, he, as sole remaining emperor of the Roman world—as conqueror (by means of his generals Belisarius and Narses) of the Arian nations of the West, &c.—was undoubtedly the legitimate authority for regulating the ecclesiastical concerns of the whole empire.*" P. 21. And Mr. Faber admits above, when pursuing another point, that Justinian did constitute the pope head of all the churches, and direct that all ecclesiastical business should be laid before him, &c."

\* The whole reasoning of Comber may be seen in Mr. Biekersteth's "Practical Guide," or in the Investigator, vol. iv. A searching reply to it may likewise be found in the preface to Mr. Cuninghame's last published work—"The Fulness of the Times," &c. to which works the reader who desires to investigate this matter is referred.

the writer of the series of interesting and able Essays on Prophecy in the Christian Guardian for 1830, which already have been adverted to, says—"We shrink from all interpretations which tell us that although St. John, according to the ordinary meaning of his language, represents the opening of the seventh seal to be the signal for the sounding of the seven trumpets,—yet that in fact these trumpets began to sound many centuries before the opening of the seventh, or even of the sixth seal." (p. 369.) Certainly the view which appears, at first sight, to present itself to the reader of the Apocalypse is, that the seventh seal contains the seven trumpets, which do not begin to sound until the seventh seal is opened; and that the seventh trumpet, in like manner, contains the seven vials, which are none of them poured out until the seventh trumpet has sounded. This principle is followed by Mede, Newton, Whiston, Faber and others, excepting that in the diagrams to some of the later editions of Mede he makes six of the vials to be poured out during the sounding of the sixth trumpet, and the seventh vial only at the sounding of the seventh. Mr. Cuninghame, however, makes the series of the trumpets begin, (so far as the *chronological* order of them is concerned,) and four of them to have sounded, between the opening of the second and third seals; and he fixes the opening of the sixth seal and the sounding of the seventh trumpet to A. D. 1792. Mr. Frere also deviates from the principle just adverted to, and makes the Seals and Trumpets run nearly in two parallel streams; the first seal and trumpet beginning in the fourth century, and the last beginning each of them in 1792, at which time also he dates the effusion of the first vial. Weighty reasons are adduced by both these writers for deviating from what appears to be the obvious construction; which reasons ought not to be discarded without due consideration. At the same time the order contended for by the writer in the Christian Guardian appears the most natural and free from complexity, and he consequently proposes to read the entire Apocalypse "consecutively as one harmonious whole, and as a connected and well-arranged narrative, only broken by one or two episodes, which are introduced for the most necessary purposes." He accordingly advances an interpretation of the book conformable with this proposition, for the particulars of which I must refer to that volume of the periodical before named.

4. One other circumstance affecting the arrangement and interpretation of the chronological prophecies remains to be noticed, and that of considerable importance. It is contained in the dissertation of Mr. Habershon on the "Prophetic Scriptures." His principal proceeding is, to examine into the

peculiarities of those chronological periods mentioned in the Old Testament, which are avowedly fulfilled. In the first of those which he examines, viz. the sojourning of the children of Israel and their affliction in Egypt,—he discovers the following particulars: viz. first, that two durations are assigned to it;\* secondly, that their commencement is at separate periods; but, thirdly, that they have one common termination; fourthly, that the exact time of their commencement could not have been known with certainty until after the deliverance from Egypt; and lastly, that the period of commencement was in neither instance from the time when the prophecy was given. The Babylonish captivity of seventy years is also shown to have been a *twofold* period, viz. from the captivity of Judah in Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar to the decree of Cyrus, B. C. 606 to 536; and from the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar to the decree of Darius Hystaspes, B. C. 588 to 518.† There are other chronological periods noticed in the work, with their respective peculiarities; but the two just instanced are the most important, and afford a sufficient specimen of the whole. It will be evident to the judicious student of the word of God, that what we find to be the character of the fulfilled periods of God's word may, by a just analogy, be transferred to the unfulfilled; and that if, as regards the last of the instances above cited, in an event which is unquestionably a type of the Church's spiritual deliverance from Babylon, there were clearly two commencements and two terminations of the predicted period of captivity, there can be no hesitation in applying the above principles to its *antitype*, viz. to that more remarkable deliverance of the same people which is yet to take place from their last and heaviest captivity. Indeed it may be that *all* the unfulfilled periods will be found to partake more or less of the peculiarities of those which are fulfilled; and if this be the case, then Mr. Habershon will have been led to furnish the church with a principle of interpretation by which many of the conflicting dates and epochs adduced by different expositors may after all be reconciled; and it will be found, (as with many other truths of divine revelation, when they come to be understood,) that what appears now to be perplexed and contradictory, only requires the right clue to be found, in order to digest and arrange them in their proper places.‡

\* In Gen. xv. 12—14, and Acts vii. 6, 7, it is declared to be 400 years; in Exodus and Gal. iii. 17, it is declared to be 430 years. The former period is dated from B. C. 1921, and the latter B. C. 1891, and both terminate B. C. 1491.

† The reconciliation of these two periods may be seen in Prideaux's Connections, Vol. i. p. 254.

‡ Whiston has long since conjectured that the 1290 and 1335 years mentioned in Daniel xii. have a different commencement from the 1260 years, and

5. In conclusion, it must not be forgotten that there are *two* methods by which it has pleased God to make known to his Church, when he purposes to accomplish a prophecy. The one is by assigning an *event* as the epoch from which a certain period of time is to be reckoned, (as in the instances just considered,) which time is to elapse before that which is more especially the subject of promise is to come to pass. The other is by a delineation of certain *characteristics*,—moral, political, and otherwise,—which shall signalize the time, when the thing foretold is about to be accomplished. These characteristics are abundantly scattered throughout the old and New Testaments: and as they are within the observation and comprehension of every individual, learned or unlearned, who can but read the word of God, or hearken when it is read; so doubtless all will be rebuked who do not give heed to the signs of the times, and are not by them led to trim their lamps and gird up their loins, and be found in the posture of watchfulness for their Lord. The limits of the present volume do not permit my entering upon the direct exposition of any of those prophecies which bear directly on the characteristics of our Lord's advent being at hand.\* All I can say in this place is, that I am most firmly persuaded that we are living in that awful period designated in Scripture as *the last time*, and *the last days*. Every succeeding year serves to increase the evidence on this head, and to give clearness and precision and intensity to those signs which already have been noticed by commentators. Even worldly men are so affected by some of the signs of our times, as to feel seriously persuaded that some tremendous crisis is at hand. It therefore more especially behoves the professing people of God to be upon the watchtower, and to observe what is passing around them, and be prepared for the future, that that day may not overtake them as a thief in the night.

The *signs* of the times, though they will not inform us of the day and the hour, and perhaps not of the year, of our

---

therefore are independent periods; and also that there are two independent periods of 1260 years. But his conjectures are not rested on any scriptural basis. Mr. Faber also makes, in the last edition of his work, the 1290 years and the 1335 years to be distinct periods; but instead of their following each other by successive intervals, as they apparently do in the Scriptures, he dates the 1290 years from A. D. 70, the 1260 years from A. D. 604, and the 1335 years from 1864, and to terminate A. D. 3199! Mr. Habershon has at least the credit of scriptural analogy for what he advances; though, how far he makes a correct use of it, in his application of the subject to the unfulfilled prophecies, is another question. His work, however, will be found in many respects well worthy of perusal, and is among the best modern treatises on prophecy.

\* The Reader who is desirous of information on these points will find several of them noticed in the "Essays of Abdiel," page 121—144.



Lord's advent, will nevertheless afford an unequivocal demonstration that it is *at hand*. Not that I would be thought to undervalue the chronological marks: they are perhaps the *most* valuable notices when correctly understood, and will doubtless serve to fix the period with greater precision, though perhaps not with the exactness which some expect. The more prophecy is studied *as a whole*, with the rest of Scripture, the more will it serve to confirm the faith and animate the hope of the believer. Each fresh discovery of its meaning, each fresh or more complete accomplishment of its promises, yea even the rectification of formerly-indulged errors, will tend greatly to encourage and establish him. I have adverted with disapprobation more than once in the course of this volume to the work of an able writer on the subject; I am happy however in being able to illustrate my last remark by a quotation from his work which I admire and approve:—

“Time, which wears out and destroys almost every thing else, only contributes to stamp the value and to augment the influence of the benefits of Prophecy. Like wine, it improves by age, and acquires with it not merely ripeness and maturity, but also excellence and strength. It is therefore from this circumstance alone possessed of amazing powers: it is a motion continually accelerated: it is a weight perpetually descending, and therefore constantly increasing its force and impulse as it descends.” (Whitley's Scheme of Prophecy, p. 52.)

## A P P E N D I X .

### I.

IN reference to Note 1, on page 227, respecting the meaning of the term *Babylon* in 1 Peter v. 13, (which the Reader is requested to turn to, and again peruse,) I have since received an interesting communication from the Rev. R. Rabett, in reply to some queries which I forwarded to him respecting his assertion, that Babylon was *destroyed* many ages before the Apocalypse was given, and which reply I have his permission to make use of.

“My reasons for affirming, that the *literal* ‘*Babylon the Great,*’ on the Euphrates, was destroyed many ages before St. John wrote his Revelation, are founded upon the inspired testimony of Daniel concerning Belshazzar, the king of Babylon, in his interpretation of the hand-writing upon the plaister of the wall of the king’s palace. “And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. *This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and FINISHED IT....PERES; thy kingdom is DIVIDED, and GIVEN to the Medes and Persians....In that night was Belshazzar, the king of the Chaldeans, slain; and Darius, the Median, took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old.*”....“Daniel prospered in the *Reign of Darius,* (the Median,) and in the *Reign of Cyrus,* the Persian.” Thus were the words of this, and a collateral prophecy of Jeremiah, fulfilled in respect of the downfall of Babylon the Great. Jeremiah foretels the *suddenness* of the *event* in these words.\* “Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul; be not cut off in her iniquity; for *this is the Time* of the Lord’s vengeance; he will render unto her a recompense ....Babylon is SUDDENLY FALLEN and DESTROYED; for her judgment reacheth unto heaven, and is lifted up even to the skies. *The Lord hath raised up the spirit of the Medes;* for His device is against Babylon, to DESTROY IT; because it is the vengeance of His temple. Set up the standard upon the wall of Babylon, make the watch strong, set up the watchmen, prepare the ambushes; for the Lord hath both DEVISED and DONE THAT WHICH HE SPAKE against the inhabitants of Babylon. O thou that dwellest upon many waters, abundant in treasures, THINE END IS COME.” So that as Cyrus, the Persian, (whom the Lord called by name, “for Jacob his servant’s sake, and Israel his elect,”) *suddenly* diverted the course

\* Jer. li. 6, 8, 11—18.

of the River Euphrates, even in one night, and marched his troops through the dry bed of the river into the city of Babylon, and took possession of it; so did Darius the Median take away the gates, and pull down the broad walls of Great Babylon, according to the word of the Lord by Jèremlah the Prophet, saying,\* “The broad walls of Babylon shall be UTTERLY broken, and her high gates shall be burned with fire;” and so truly was this prediction fulfilled, that Babylon was *never after that period the seat of supreme government under a Babylonian or Chaldean monarch.* And when Alexander the Great, who was *not a Median* but a Macedonian monarch, purposed to restore the city of Babylon to its pristine state of grandeur and magnificence, that it might once more become the seat of supreme government, *he died;* the Lord so watching over his own sacred word which he had spoken by his servant Isaiah, saying,† “Come down, and sit in the ‘dust, *O virgin daughter of Babylon,* sit on the ground: there is NO THRONE, *O daughter of the Chaldeans....* Sit thou silent, and get thee into darkness, *O daughter of the Chaldeans;* for THOU shalt NO MORE be called, THE LADY OF KINGDOMS.” As the Lord frustrated the attempts of Julian the Apostate for rebuilding the temple of Jerusalem, by causing balls of fire to come up out of the earth, which destroyed the workmen and their work; so the Lord frustrated by death Alexander’s attempts to rebuild Babylon. And as of the former building it was said, “There shall not be left one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down,” and of the latter‡.... “They shall not take a stone for a corner, nor a stone for foundations; but THOU shalt be DESOLATE FOR EVER;” so has it come to pass. In a word; from the time of Cyrus and Darius the term “Great,” (which the title of “*The Lady of kingdoms*” imports,) could never more be *literally* applied to the *city or kingdom of Babylon of the Chaldees,* according to the word of the Lord — “Thou shalt no more be called, The Lady of Kingdoms.” I am aware that the kingdom or province of Babylonia, under the Selucidæ, was continued from Alexander’s time till within about 65 years of the Christian era, after which it became a Roman province: but Strabo and Pliny both concur in testifying that Babylon, in their time, was only a “*great desert,*” and a “*desolate wilderness,*” and the latter historian lived about the time of St. Peter. The name of *Babylon* in 1 Peter v. 13, seems to me to be incoherently placed, because the words, “Church that is,” are in *Italics;* but as the *name* of Babylon is there found, some *local* meaning must be assigned to it. St. John wrote his Revelation “in the ISLE that is called Patmos,” and has only mentioned the name of the *island,* and not any

\* Jer. li. 58.

† Isaiah xlvii. 1, 5.

‡ Jeremiah li. 26.

particular town therein, it being properly a barren island, or without a town of note, and it is possible that, from the desert, desolate, and wilderness-state of Babylon in St. Peter's time, the Apostle might, in his travels through the province, merely append the name of Babylon to his first epistle, in order to identify the part of the world in which he then was with certain believers of his company, fellow-labourers and fellow-travellers; the name of Babylon being put for the whole province, to wit, Babylonia, which would comprehend the ruins of the old city if that were necessary. And as Peter's 1st epistle is addressed, not to any particular church or city or country, but in general terms "to the strangers scattered throughout" the countries of "Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia;" so he might possibly use the name Babylon, (or Babylonia) in the same general sense in which he addressed the united brethren that were resident in those countries which he had specified, as well as "in the world." But after all, I have no objection to Peter's 1st Epistle being subscribed from the literal Babylon, or from Babylon on the Delta, or from Selucia, the modern Babylon, or from the country or province called Babylonia: though in a mystical or spiritual sense I could hardly admit that Rome was meant by Babylon: for Irenæus and Eusebius have both informed us that Linus, Anaclet and Clement were, in succession the three first bishops of Rome, which would exclude both Peter and Paul from such episcopal office in Rome. I think it wisely ordered that we should know much less about Peter's pretended patrimony, seat, chair, &c. than any other of the Apostles, because of the idolatry of Papal Romanists, and that they glory so much in Rome as the residence of Peter, whom they have denominated the prince of the Apostles. For my own part I do not admire the subscription of St. Peter to his first Epistle, though it may be quite correct: there is to me an ambiguity about it; but as I do not wish to plunge into deep waters, which seem to me unfathomable, I must leave the subject as I found it. Yet if you want authorities for the plausibility of such an argument as that "Peter was at Rome" when he subscribed his 1st Epistle, you may see some small ground for it in Dr. Adam Clarke's quotations in his Commentary on the 1st Epistle of Peter v. 13, and also in his Preface to that Epistle, (not that the Doctor himself favours the opinion,) in which is exhibited the four leading opinions of the learned concerning the supposed situation of the Babylon mentioned by Peter; but perhaps you have already seen it.—Cave (as quoted by Dr. Clarke) in his life of St. Peter, says, that Jerome concludes his article of St. Peter, saying, "He was buried at Rome, in the Vatican, near the triumphal way; and is in veneration all over

*the world;*” but I believe this is a *traditional* account, and the best and only one which Romanists possess. I have no objection to the *tradition* that *Peter suffered martyrdom at Rome*; but early history is, I believe, *very silent* upon the subject of *Peter’s apostolical ministrations at Rome*: however, I have nothing better to tell you now.”

Since the receipt of the above I have met with the following very important admission contained in the Roman Catholic Bishop Walmsley’s exposition of the Apocalypse, published under the name of Sig. Pastorini:—

“This same *Woman* is further said to carry on her forehead the following inscription: *A mystery: Babylon the great, the mother of the fornications, and the abominations of the earth. V. 5.* Here is a *mystery*, or an enigma to be unravelled, viz. *Babylon the great, the fornications, and the abominations of the earth.* The reader, we apprehend, is already prepared in great measure for the solving of this enigma. *Babylon the great*, is the great imperial city of Pagan Rome. And she is the *Woman*, as we have just shewn, who is *the mother of the fornications and abominations of the earth.* This is the explanation of the proposed *mystery.* But to make it more clear, that by *Babylon the great* is here meant idolatrous Rome, we appeal to the angel’s words: *The woman which thou sawest is the great city which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth, (v. 18)* which, as we have before observed, plainly points out the great ancient city of Rome, that domineered over the greatest part of the kingdoms of the then known world. The *woman* therefore is the image of that city, and in the inscription on her forehead she is styled *Babylon the great*: consequently *Babylon the great* is here the same with the city of Rome. In the primitive ages this figurative name of Babylon was frequently given to heathen Rome by the Christians, on account of the resemblance of the characters of those two cities, for their idolatry and for their oppressing—one the Jews; the other the Christians. St. Peter dates his first letter from Babylon (1 Pet. v. 13,) that is, from *Rome*, as St. Jerome and Eusebius tell us. “The appellation of Babylon (said Tertullian) is used by St. John for the city of Rome, because she resembles ancient Babylon, in the extent of her walls; in her haughtiness; on account of her dominion; and in persecuting the saints,” (lib. adv. Jud.) St. Austin also says, “Rome is a second Babylon, and a daughter of the ancient Babylon,” (de Civ. lib. xxii. c. 18.) *Babylon the great* is therefore sufficiently distinguished.” P. 127.

## II.

ON the supposed existence of the *Ten Tribes*, Mr. Wolff’s mention of the black and white Jews of Cochin, (p. 195), from

not being sufficiently explicit, is calculated to lead to erroneous conclusions. He merely gives the traditions of these two classes of Jews, as mentioned by themselves. The white Jews do not claim to have come into India earlier than soon after the destruction of the *second* temple, or about the year 68 of the Christian era. They say the black Jews are merely converts to Judaism from among the Hindoos; which Mr. Wolff thinks probable, as converts are now frequent, and the features and manners of the black Jews are Hindoo. They are little better than slaves to the white Jews. The black Jews, however, say for themselves, that they became converts in the time of Esther, Mordecai and Ahasuerus; and that they were already in India *as Jews*, when the white Jews came. The white Jews deny this. Journal 473—748.

As regards the Jews supposed to be in *China*, (p. 273), the following extract from a Christian missionary in that country, inserted in the Record of July 4, 1836, relates to them:—

“There is also a colony of Jews in China, at *Kae-foong-foo*, of whom Mr. Davis, in his work on the Chinese, gives some interesting particulars. They are said to have reached China as early as 200 years before Christ: the Chinese call them ‘the sect that plucks out the sinew.’ There is a place reserved in their synagogue for its chief, who never enters there except with profound respect. They say that their ancestors came from a kingdom of the west, called the kingdom of Juda, which Joshua conquered after having departed from Egypt and passed the Red Sea and the wilderness: that the number of Jews who migrated from Egypt was about 600,000 men. They say their alphabet has twenty-seven letters, but they commonly make use of only twenty-two, which accords with the declaration of St. Jerome, that the Hebrew has twenty-two letters, of which five are double. When they read the Bible in their synagogue they cover their face with a transparent veil, in memory of Moses, who descended from the mountain with his face covered, and who thus published the Decalogue and the law of God to his people. They read a section every sabbath day. Thus the Jews of China, like the Jews of Europe, read all the law in the course of the year.”

The following is Mr. Cuninghame’s opinion, published in his recent work on “The Fulness of the Times,” Pref. p. xxii.

“We have lately seen in the public papers, frequent mention of the *Tribes of Caucasus*, who have issued a declaration of independence, addressed to all the courts of Europe, and are at war with Russia, and are reported to have repeatedly beaten her armies. They in that document describe themselves as being *four millions* in number, divided into “many tribes, languages and creeds, with various customs, traditions and creeds.”



“The chief chosen by each body during war is implicitly obeyed, and our princes and our elders govern according to the custom of each place with greater authority than in the great states around us.” Now it appears to me *probable*, that Ephraim and a portion of the Ten Tribes may be found among this people. That Ephraim is in some country north of Judea, and a country of mountains, appears to be certain from the language of Jeremiah, *Go and proclaim these words towards the north, and say, Return thou backsliding Israel;—they shall come together out of the land of the north.—Behold I will bring them from the north country.* Jer. iii. 12, 18; xxxi. 8. It is also said, *For there shall be a day that the watchman upon the mount Ephraim shall cry, Arise ye, let us go up to Zion, to the Lord our God.* The land of the north is a description exactly suiting to the countries between the Euxine and the Caspian, which are nearly due north of Judea, but by no means the regions to the east of the Caspian. Moreover, I am led to expect that, in this text, *mount Ephraim* does not mean the mountain of that name in the land of Canaan, which was given to Ephraim, but some mountainous country where Ephraim *now dwells*; for immediately after these words the prophet proceeds to predict their return into the land of their fathers. The region of Caucasus is the immediate vicinity of the ancient *Colchis* or *Colchos* of the Greeks, which seems to be the *חלץ*, properly *Calach*, of 2 Kings xvii. 6. and *חבור* *Chabor* is perhaps the *Iberia* of the Greeks which adjoined *Colchos*. The river *Gozan* may be the *Phasis* which traverses *Colchos*. In some of the modern maps it bears the name of the *Fasz* or *Kioni*. It is rather more than a year since I first communicated these ideas to some of my friends, and since that time the Circassian tribes have been rising in importance in the public mind, and have been repeatedly mentioned in parliament. I shall just add, that what is now stated is offered simply as a *conjecture*, in order to direct the attention of those who are observing the signs of the times to that quarter. From what is said in the declaration of independence of the Circassians, they appear to be Mahomedans; but as they also admit that they are divided into many tribes, languages and creeds, some among them may, as it is said of Ephraim, be joined to their idols. The account given of these tribes in the *Encyclopædia* is, that they are Pagans, but use circumcision. I shall further observe, that it is apparent from Deut. xxxiii. 17, that the military prowess of Ephraim and Manasseh is to act a conspicuous part in the events of the last times; and if there be any truth in the conjecture now offered, I have no doubt but events will soon speak with an unequivocal voice.”













