

Writings in Theology, Ecclesiology & Musicology

by John Bacchus Dykes

1. Essays and Reviews in *The Ecclesiastic and Theologian*

i.	The Babylon of the Apocalypse (Vols. 12 and 13, 1851-2)	1
ii.	Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse (Vol.15, 1853)	56
iii.	The Apocalypse: Messiah and Antimesias (Vol. 15, 1853)	102
iv.	The Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes (Vol. 16, 1854)	118
v.	Lee on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture (Vol. 16, 1854)	131
vi.	Interpretation of Psalms (Vol. 17, 1855)	143
vii.	The Symmetrical Structure of Holy Scripture (Vol. 18, 1856)	167
viii.	Internal Structure of the Sermon on the Mount (Vol. 18,1856)	184
ix.	Rowland Williams' Rational Godliness (Vol. 18,1856)	198
x.	Lord Arthur Hervey's Sermons (Vol. 18,1856)....	} <i>printed seriatim in the original</i> ...213
xi.	Rowland Williams' pamphlet (Vol. 18,1856)	
xii.	Auberlen on Daniel, and the Apocalypse (Vol. 19, 1857)	226
xiii.	Warnings of the Apocalypse to the Churches (Vol. 19, 1857)	262
xiv.	The Voice of the Last Prophet (Vol. 20, 1858)	277
xv.	Miracles of Antichrist (Vol. 20, 1858)	285
xvi.	Antichrist (Vol. 20, 1858)	301
xvii.	Sermons by Kingsley and Stanley (Vol. 21, 1859)	308
xviii.	Galton's Lectures on the Book of Revelation (Vol. 22,1860)	321
xix.	Curzon's Scriptural Key to the Revelation of S. John (Vol. 22, 1860)	340
xx.	The Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the Scottish Controversy (Vol. 22, 1860)	348
xxi.	Recent Annotators on the Apocalypse (Vol. 23, 1861)	358
xxii.	Inspiration and Interpretation: Burgon and Wordsworth (Vol. 23, 1861)	386
xxiii.	Bishop Colenso's commentary on Epistle to the Romans (Vol. 24,1862)	398

Editorial practice

Numbers in square brackets show page numbers in the original published editions.

Footnotes are from the original editions *except* when they, or sections within them, are preceded by ϕ , in which case they are editorial. Text in curly brackets is likewise editorial.

Idiosyncratic, unorthodox or inconsistent spellings are generally reproduced without recourse to *sic*, except where there might otherwise be scope for ambiguity. Manifest typesetting errors in the original edition have been corrected silently. No attempt has been made to reproduce Greek text: where it occurs in the original it is shown here merely as [Greek]. It is assumed that those for whom spellings, or the original Greek text, are important will consult the original sources.

Identifying Dykes's Papers

With many of Dykes's published papers being either anonymous or pseudonymous, one must look for clues to establish authorship. The following are examples of such clues: none is sufficient on its own but, when aggregated, they tend towards confirmation:

- i. a reference to the paper in Fowler (e.g. some of his contributions to the *Ecclesiastic*);
- ii. a reference, possibly oblique, in a letter or other document (e.g. Baker's reference, in a letter to Dykes, about a well-argued but otherwise unidentified piece on an unnamed subject in an unspecified edition of the *Literary Churchman*);
- iii. a reference within one paper to another (e.g. 'as we said in our review in Vol...'), although the pronouns may be the editor's voice rather than the author's;
- iv. a catalogue attribution (albeit one in which the authority for the attribution is not shown—e.g. Durham University Library's copy of a critique of a book by Bishop Colenso);
- v. a consistent theological position (Anglo-Catholic; ritualist; Biblical literalist);
- vi. the reiteration of arguments or propositions (e.g. consubstantiation; parallelism; numerical symmetry; the nature and identity of the Beast, the false prophet and Antichrist);
- vii. the overall literary style of the piece and the way arguments are constructed and deployed (e.g. a liking for litotes; damnation by faint praise; a preference for the rhetorical rapier over the bludgeon; *ad rem* rather than *ad hominem* criticisms);
- viii. the topic (e.g. hymnody and the music of the church from the earliest days; the Psalms; the Apocalypse; and the place of ritual in the liturgy, in respect of all of which Dykes had an impressive grasp and an obvious interest);
- ix. the repeated appearance of idiosyncratic words or phrases, none of which may be unusual in itself (e.g. 'nay'; 'I must hasten on'; 'captious critic'; 'verily and indeed'; 'unutterable'; 'ever and anon'; 'so to say'; 'beside our purpose'; 'Not so.'; teachableness/teachably; *terminus a quo*); the repeated quoting of a particular author (e.g. the Jesuit Cornelius à Lapide); or frequent recourse to the original Greek.

These and other analytical tools give me the highest confidence that every paper in this Appendix was written by Dykes. They do not, of course, give me any confidence at all that I have identified everything Dykes ever wrote for publication. (Some contenders approach, but do not quite surmount, the evidential bar, such as the review entitled 'Dr Rowland Williams and the Bishop of S. David's', *Ecclesiastic* Vol. 22 p. 480, 'Kingsley's Inaugural Lecture', *Ecclesiastic* Vol. 23 p. 222, and 'Thrupp on the Song of Songs', *Ecclesiastic* Vol. 25 p. 341)

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vols. 12 and 13 (Joseph Masters: London, 1851-1852)

[227] **THE BABYLON OF THE APOCALYPSE**

1. *Lectures on the Apocalypse; Critical, Expository, and Practical. Delivered before the University of Cambridge; being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1848.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster; formerly Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Public Orator of the University. Second edition. London: Rivingtons.
2. *The Apocalypse, or Book of Revelation; the Original Greek Text, with MSS. Collations; An English Translation and Harmony with Notes; and an Appendix to the Hulsean Lectures for 1848, on the Apocalypse.* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., &c. &c. London: Rivingtons.

High position, ecclesiastical and academical, honourably attained; practical energy and generosity of character; a blameless and consistent life; deep acquaintance with the learning of ages past, with the ability and courage to apply its stores to the present, and grapple fearlessly with the great questions of the day: these are the gifts which challenge, and justly challenge, our attention to the works and opinions put forth by any living divine of the English Church. And such claims to a respectful hearing few, we suppose, would deny to the author of the works before us. We have indeed seen in a Roman Catholic pamphlet, now acknowledged by Mr. Gordon of the Oratory, an insinuation that one of Dr Wordsworth's books is replete with falsified quotations. Such a charge ought never to have been made, or else should have been substantiated by particular examples. So far as we are able to form a judgment, no accusation is less likely to be founded in fact. The citations in Dr Wordsworth's volumes seem to us to be candidly chosen and exceedingly correct.

[228]

For his labours in the preparation of these volumes, the abundant learning and illustration brought to bear on the mysterious book which closes the second canon, we would fain, as students of theology, tender the expression of sincere thankfulness.

The lectures have, however, enjoyed another advantage which English Clergy, as a body, are perhaps disposed to underrate. Not merely have they been addressed to the metropolitan audience of our ancient and regal abbey, and previously to the more intellectual assemblage gathered together in Great S. Mary's, Cambridge, but they have been listened to with the attention naturally and fairly gained but the fine and manly delivery of the speaker. We have heard from one of his academic auditory, of the thrill which ran through the whole assembly, when the preacher, commenting on that portion of the Revelation which describes the first resurrection, after the truly majestic description of the greatness of the baptismal gifts, and the need of holding them fast and going onward from the new birth unto the new life, gazed on those before and around him with a moment's pause, and then re-pronounced with emphatic tone the divine words of the apostolic seer: "*This is the first resurrection.*"¹

From pages which contain so much to call for praise and gratitude, so much that we cordially accept, and trust to see accepted by others, it may seem invidious to select for criticism those parts with which we utterly disagree. But any delicacy, which we might be disposed to feel upon this score, is effectually dispelled by the consideration that the subject on which we are compelled to differ from Dr Wordsworth, is that which he himself considers the most important, either in itself or under present circumstances. It is he

¹ Lect. ii. pp. 553—8.

himself who has singled out for an especial degree of attention those portions of his lectures and annotations which concern the questions: "Is Papal Rome the Babylon of the Apocalypse?" Is the Pope of Rome the Son of Perdition, the Man of Sin, the Antichrist of Holy Writ? He has actually republished so much of his lectures as bears upon these points in the shape of an Essay, bearing the former of these queries for its title.

Dr Wordsworth's answers to these inquiries may be briefly stated as follows:

I. The Pope is *not the* Antichrist of Scripture. Antichrist is only mentioned *nominatim* by S. John in his epistle: and S. John therein refers, "I am persuaded," says our author, "to an *infidel power*."

II. The Pope *is* "that man of sin, the son or perdition" (2 Thess. ii. 3); and so may be called *an* Antichrist.

III. Papal Rome *is* the Babylon of the Apocalypse.

We proceed to remark upon each of these statements. The two latter will, however, be found virtually to coalesce into one.

[229]

I. Now the first of these assertions, *so far as it goes*, we receive with thankfulness and gladness. It does indeed tend to embarrass, to a certain extent, the course of the argument on our side, and to a far greater extent, as we must think, the argument of Dr Wordsworth himself. But still, coming from such a quarter, it is a great admission and a great gain. It shows that the ancient interpretation of the prophecies concerning Antichrist, is not only revived, but making way. The ancient interpretation we may, in a rough and general manner, sketch as follows:

That the Antichrist will come in the latter days, an infidel, blasphemous, and persecuting *person*.¹ That he will deny the FATHER and the SON.² That he will forbid men to worship any but himself alone, and this on the severest penalties.³ That he may very probably appear in Rome, of which Babylon was a type.⁴ That he will support, by a display of false and lying miracles,⁵ his suppression of all religious worship, and persecution of the saints of the Most High, who will, of course, instinctively agree in recognising his dread presence,⁶ and oppose him by the might of prayer and the majesty of martyr suffering. That he may possibly favour Judaism, perhaps spring from the idolatrous tribe of Dan, perhaps be himself a baptized apostate. That as the Man CHRIST JESUS was foretold not only by prophecy, but by types; so likewise the man Antichrist. That as the shadows of the Messiah, the centre of all holiness, fall infinitely short of the reality, even so do the forerunners of Antichrist, the prince of wickedness, fall far behind him in all evil, malice,

¹ 1 S. John ii. 22. [φ 'Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son.']

² S. Justin Martyr, in loc. cit. infra.

³ Rev. xiii. 8. [φ 'And all that dwell upon the earth shall worship him, whose names are not written in the book of life of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.'] S. Chrys. cit. inf.

⁴ See the authorities adduced by Dr. Wordsworth, Lect. xi.

⁵ Rev. xiii. 13, 14. [φ 'And he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, And deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the beast; saying to them that dwell on the earth, that they should make an image to the beast, which had the wound by a sword, and did live.']

⁶ S. Matt. xxiv. 24. [φ 'For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.']

and hatred of God and His kingdom. And though it be easier, alas! for man to approximate to incarnate fiendishness of spirit, than to incarnate holiness, the perfect Man, who us also GOD blessed for evermore; yet as types of CHRIST have grievously sinned, so may types of Antichrist have repented and sought GOD, or at least have possessed many good qualities, calculated to win the admiration and even the love of their fellow men. Such have been in different degrees and ways Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus Epiphanes, Simon Magus, Nero, Julian the Apostate, Arius, and in later ages Mahommed. More modern generations may perhaps have seen at least one other shadow of him “who shall come in his own name.”¹

We have not space to follow out the history of these men. A few brief extracts, with references to other sources of information, must suffice. Of the great king of Assyria, in his hour of pride, we read as follows:

“He cast down their frontiers, and cut down their groves, for he[230] had decreed to destroy all the gods of the land, *that all nations should worship Nabuchodonosor only, and that all tongues and tribes should call upon him as god.*” Judith iii. 8.

In another book of the Apocrypha (of the right use of which Dr Wordsworth has spoken so admirably in his Lectures on the Canon) we are informed of the atrocious conduct of Antiochus:

“He returned...and went up against Israel and Jerusalem with a great multitude, and *entered proudly into the sanctuary* and took away the golden altar, and the candlestick of light, and all the vessels thereof...The city was made an habitation of strangers,...her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness...For the king had sent letters by messengers unto Judæa, and the land of Jerusalem, and the cities of Juda, that they should follow the strange laws of the land; *And forbid burnt offerings and sacrifice, and drink offerings in the temple;* and that they should profane the Sabbath and festival days; *and pollute the sanctuary* and holy people...And wheresoever was found with any the book of the Testament, or if any consented to the law, the king’s commandment was, *that they should be put to death*...Now the five-and-twentieth day of the month *they did sacrifice upon the idol altar, which was upon the altar of GOD.* Howbeit many in Israel chose rather to die. And there was very great wrath upon Israel.” I Maccabees i.

We have been compelled, for brevity’s sake, to weaken the force of this striking narrative. The reader, who is not well acquainted with it, will do well to peruse the entire chapter, paying especial attention to the circumstance that the *external* irruption of Antiochus was preceded by *internal* apostacy (verses 11—5) and comparing this with the prediction of the Apostle concerning the advent of the man of sin (2 Thess. ii. 3) to be preceded in like manner by a falling away.

Of Simon Magus (Acts viii. 18—23) it is enough to observe, that he was regarded by the early Church as the very originator and type of heresy, and a claimant of homage due to GOD alone. “*A multis,*” writes S. Irenæus, “*quasi Deus glorificatus est.* He even taught,” adds the same Father, that “it was himself who appeared as the Son among the Jews, descended into Samaria as the Father and came upon the Gentiles (*in reliquis Gentibus*) as

¹ Lord Bacon (Adv. of Learning) [ϕ ‘Of the Proficiency and Advancement of Learning, Divine and Human’, (Oxford University, 1605)] seems to follow the patristic appropriation of this text (S. John v. 43) [ϕ ‘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.’] to Antichrist, whom the unconverted Jews may be expected to receive.

the Holy Ghost. That he was the most sublime virtue, that is to say, the Father who is above all things.”¹

Such was the terror inspired by the life and deeds of Nero, that men would not believe that he was really dead, or expected him to rise again. This we learn alike from the testimony of the heathen biographer, and its re-assertion by a great doctor of the Church.² [231] Amidst his atrocities he had been a despiser of all religions whatsoever. *Religionum usquequaque contemptor*, says Suetonius.

Arius had been the author of that dire heresy which troubled GOD’S Israel for centuries. He is said to have composed songs to spread it and increase its popularity; and his theological work, the *Thaleia*, is believed to have been composed in the style, and particularly the metre, of an impure heathen poet, Sotades of Thrace.³ The faithful few, for such at times they were, looked with awe on the apostacy, and cried that Antichrist must be looked for, that this falling from truth was his forerunner.⁴ His shadow came accordingly in Julian.

Julian, educated in Arianism, fell away to the Pagan creed of his forefathers and attempted to bring it into life again. It is a marked and singular circumstance, that he is the hero of that great Antichristian genius, the historian of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.

The great success of the false prophet, Mohammed, was preceded by the rise of Nestorian and Monophysite heresies in that very region where the creed of the Crescent was implanted.

Of any later types of Antichrist for the present we forbear to speak.

But such as these, only uniting in himself their varied attributes of evil, like the king of Babylon in his early pride, like Antiochus in wrath and blasphemy, like Simon Magus in perversions of the truth, like Nero in inhuman cruelty, like Julian in ability and craft, like Arius in subtlety of speech, like Mohammed in the falsehood of his revelations, like all these, and worse in wickedness than any, was expected of old to be the awful *contra-type* of CHRIST. “The man of the apostasy,” says S. Justin, “he that speaketh great things against the Most High, will dare unlawful things upon the earth against us Christians.”⁵ “There will be a time of affliction,” writes S. Cyril, “such as never happened since there was a nation upon earth till that time. Thanks to GOD, who limits the greatness of the affliction to a few days; for the elect’s sake, those days shall be cut short. Antichrist shall only reign three years and a half. Blessed surely shall he be who shall then be a martyr for CHRIST. I consider that the martyrs at that season shall be greater than all martyrs. Prepare thyself, therefore, O man! thou hearest the signs of Antichrist; nor remind only thyself of them, [232] but communicate them liberally to all around thee. For ‘the mystery of iniquity doth

¹ S. Iren. Lib. I. Cap. 20. app. Hammond in 2 Thess. ii.

² Suetonius (in vita Neronis, ad fin). Proferrent edicta, *quasi viventis et brevi magno inimicorum malo reversuri*. (Cf. Tacitus.—Histo. ii. 8 Vario super exitū ejus rumore, eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque.)—S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, (xx. 19,) Neronem *cujus jam facta velut Antichristi videbantur*. Unde nonnulli ipsum *resurrecturum* et futurum *Antichristum* suspicantur.

³ Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog., &c. *Art.* Arius. Cf. Newman’s Arians.

⁴ [Greek] S. Cyril. Catech. 15. Cited in “Tracts for the Times,” No. 83. We are greatly indebted to this tract; but it may be well to observe that Dr. S.R. Maitland’s revival of the ancient interpretation preceded it by nearly ten years.

⁵ [Greek] Dial. cum Tryph. § 110 (Ed. Otto) This is to be immediately before the second Advent of our Lord, according to Justin.

already work.’ I fear the wars of the nations, I fear the divisions among Christians; I fear the hatred among brethren. Enough, but GOD forbid that it should be fulfilled in our day. However, let us be prepared.”¹

“He, receiving as it were,” says S. Irenæus, “all the power (*virtutem*) of Satan, will come, not as a just king, nor as a lawful one, ruling in subjection to GOD; but impious, unjust, lawless, as an apostate, as a robber and a murderer, re-enacting (*recapitulans*) in himself the apostasy of Satan.”²

“So blessed will Antichrist appear to men,” writes S. Augustine, “that he will be thought by them to be GOD.”³ And throughout the writings of that Father we find applications of the prophecies of David, Daniel, S. Paul, and S. John, to the career of the Church’s direst human foe. Of David, because the Psalmist’s descriptions of the wicked culminate in the son of perdition, as do all his portraitures of holiness in the REDEEMER. Of the rest, in points already named, and likewise, it may be added, with reference to the power of working miracles. (S. Mark xiii. 22; Rev. xiii. 13—15.)

“He (i.e. S. Paul in 2 Thess. ii. 4) here discourses,” says S. Chrysostom, “concerning Antichrist, and unfolds mighty mysteries. And he calls him the man of sin. For he will work, and induce others to work, infinite woes. But he terms him the son of perdition, because that he himself will be destroyed. ([Greek]). But who is this? Is it Satan? Not so; but a certain man imbued with all the working of Satan. And the man, he says, will be revealed; who exalteth himself above all that is called GOD or worshipped! For he will not lead men into idolatry, but will be a sort of antigod ([Greek]) and will overthrow all gods and will bid men worship himself instead of GOD.”⁴

As in CHRIST,” says Aquinas, (and we may surely quote one, from whom Dr Wordsworth has drawn so copiously) “as in CHRIST dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead, so in Antichrist all the fulness of iniquity; not indeed that his manhood can be taken by Satan into unity of person, as the Manhood of CHRIST by the Son of GOD; but because Satan will by suggestion infuse into him his own iniquity in a more eminent degree than into any beside (*eminentius...quàm omnibus aliis*). And in this way *all* other bad men who have gone before, are in some sense a type of Antichrist (*quasi quædam figura Antichristi*); according to that passage of the Thessalonians, ‘The mystery of iniquity doth already work.’”...”But as the foreknown reprobate and unbelievers, *and even Anti-[233]christ*, are not deprived of the inward aid of natural reason; so likewise are they not deprived of the external aid divinely vouchsafed to the entire human race, to wit, the guardianship of angels; by which albeit they are not so assisted, that they should win eternal life: yet are they thus far aided, that they are kept back from *some* evils, by which they might injure themselves and others. For even the very demons are restrained by the good angels from doing all the injury they would. And in like manner Antichrist will not injure to the extent of his desires. (*Et similiter Antichristus non tantum nocebit, quantum vellet.*)”⁵

“It is this,” writes Mr. Trench, (speaking of that instinct in man which leads him to look upwards and which *should* bring him to CHRIST), “this craving of men passionately to

¹ S. Cyr. Catech. xv. 16, 17. Cited in Tract 83, p. 48.

² S. Iren. Lib. V. Cap. 25.

³ In Psalmum ix. 22.

⁴ S. Chrys. tom. iv. p. 232. Ed. Savile.

⁵ S. Thom. Aquin. Sum. Theol. Pars III. Qu. viii. Art. 8. Pars I. Qu. cxiii. Art. 4. ad. 3.

devote themselves to some one, which makes an Antichrist possible, which will make him so terrible when he appears,—men by a just judgment of GOD being permitted to dedicate all which they ought to have dedicated to CHRIST, to His opposite, to him who comes in his own name—because they refused to give it, because they refused to give themselves to Him, who came in the name of His FATHER. It will then be fearfully seen that there can be an enthusiasm of hell, no less than an enthusiasm of heaven.”¹

Dear reader (for we would fain be on good terms with you, if possible, even though you should chance to differ from us utterly), it is quite impracticable for us, within the limits of so few pages, to bestow any toil on the development and recommendation of that view of prophecy, which we believe to be founded in truth, as well to point out the difficulties and dangers of what we consider an erroneous interpretation. Our cause would doubtless gain much in every way, (for nothing more forcibly repels one view than the prepossession of the mind by another,) but its advocate, *spatiis exclusus iniquis*, must for the present forego that species of advantage. Yet suffer us for one moment to dwell upon the character of this primitive *exegesis* of Judaic and evangelic prophecy.

Assuredly it does not claim, in the detail, any thing more than high degree of probability. The meanings wrought out by it from the mine of Holy Scripture, are pious and reverent opinions, not articles of faith to be believed for necessity of salvation. But the value of *probabilities*, the uses of even uncertain warnings, where they accord with the general voice of the Christian Church, and give no encouragement to private fancies; where they are “in harmony with the main tenor of Christian teaching,” where they serve to increase faith, love, devotion, and reverence for GOD’S Holy Word: this value and these uses have been pointed out with much force and beauty by the author of the volumes under re-[234]view.² And may we not fairly demand such admissions in favour of these primitive options? Do they not enlarge our sense of the probable meanings of many words of the Prophets, Daniel,³ and S. Paul, and S. John, and of Him, the Prophet of Prophets, who is also our High Priest and King? Without prompting men towards the desire of being wise above what is written, do they not supply keys to the openings of many wards, do they not throw a ray of light upon very much that is going on around us, and tend to cherish that mixture of holy fear and holy hope, that “heart to love and dread,” which is so peculiarly evangelic, for which from childhood we have learnt to pray? Surely these interpretations are something better than mere whims and fancies. They are winning in their aspect, large in their range, majestic in their simplicity. Borne upon the wings of all the Churches alike in the east and in the west, asserted and re-asserted, with scarcely a dissentient voice, for more than a thousand years after the birth of CHRIST,—the very differences in minor topics only strengthening the main points of agreement—they have formed the theme of meditation for saints and doctors, and fed the minds of the humblest of the flock. And now, when the world seems verging towards decay, and the lengthening shadows move and tremble; now, amidst the fall and disappearance of ancient thrones, and the feebleness in many lands “of the powers that be;” now, after a transient slumber, the thoughts of the wise of ancient days are in course of being awakened and finding a home in many a heart. And if they be, as we incline to believe, the truth of GOD, they will make their way, they will find their own. By many indeed they may be derided and contemned, by many more neglected and passed by. But thou, O Christian student, throw them not thus heedlessly

¹ Hulsean Lecture for A.D. 1846. Lect. ii.

² Lect. iv. pp. 122, 123.

³ Consider e.g. Dan. xii. 1 compared with S. Matt. xxiv. 21, 22, and indeed with the entire chapter.

aside. Consider their source from primal fountains, and their gathered might from confluent streams. Consider above all, *how safely they may be acted upon*. For they teach no doctrine that is new and strange, they involve no previously unheard-of duties, but they do add one additional motive to the cultivation of all the higher graces of the Christian character. And motives to what is high and pure are never in this world too many. For take these interpretations at the worst. Suppose that after all we are mistaken in looking for infidel persecution, yet to fall upon our own or on a future generation. Yet how enviable, piously enviable, that frame of mind, which should be *really* prepared, in a strength not its own, to meet and face its terrors. Has the soldier, who has dressed his soul for death, misspent his labour when he finds himself unhurt after the battle? No: “dying so, death is to him advantage; or not dying, the time was blessedly lost, wherein such preparation [235] was gained.”¹

And is it ill for us, is it ill for those to follow us, if men learn to think that there may come even yet a time of tribulation, when wealth should lose its power and influence, and the prizes of this earth their charm, and souls be once more tried as in the furnace? If it come not, where is their loss; and *if it come*, how unspeakable is their gain!

“Time, as holy sages sing,
When earth and sin have waxed old
A direr progeny will bring,
The last foe of the fold.

“Of mortal seed, of woman bred,
The Antichrist, they write, will be
From a soft bosom duly fed,
Rock’d on a loving knee.

“High grace at first to Judas came,—
Who knows but he, the Man of Sin ,
In the baptismal wave and flame
May his dread course² begin?

“O ye who wait with hearts too light,
By font, or cradle, fear in time!
*O let not all your dreams be bright,
Here in earth’s wayward clime.*”³

But we may not longer stop to dwell, with our Christian poet, on the aweing, sobering tenor of these warnings on minds disposed to the idolatry of genius, rank, or power; enslaved to the excitements of the day, or yearning with parental fondness to witness the development in their children of all the precious gifts of mind. We have already occupied an undue portion of our limits, and must now turn reluctantly from the contemplation of what we hold for truth, to views which we as solemnly believe, in our heart and conscience, to be mistaken and untenable.

II. and III. Is the Babylon of the Apocalypse Papal Rome? Is the Pope the man of sin?

¹ King Henry V. Act. iv. sc. 1.

² φ *recte* cause.

³ Lyra Innocentium. [φ Keeble, John *Lyra Innocentium: Thoughts in verse on Christian Children* (John Henry Parker: Oxford, 1846)] Judas’s Infancy. [φ p. 68]

We have already implied that we shall treat these questions conjointly. Practically, they for the most part become one; he who answers the first in the affirmative or in the negative can hardly avoid making a similar reply to the other.

Waving for a moment the peculiar theories of Dr Wordsworth, we may observe that there is a well known interpretation of the Apocalyptic visions and the cognate prophecies contained in Daniel and the Epistles, which greatly differs from that which we have slightly sketched above. That difference is not a mere divergence, but a positive antagonism and contradiction. None, that we ever heard of, have pretended to hold at the same time the primitive [236] view and that more modern one to which we now allude. The leading points of distinction are stated with much clearness and conciseness of language in the following passage of a tract by Dr S.R. Maitland:—

“1. As to the *nature* of the apostacy.

“The early Church conceived of it as an actual departure, not merely from the purity of the Christian faith by professed Christians, but from Christianity itself: a falling away from all profession of Christianity into open and blasphemous and persecuting infidelity.

“The Protestant Church understands by the apostacy the impure Christianity of a corrupt part of the Christian Church, or a hypocritical profession of Christianity by a Church pretending to be Christian.

“2. As to the *duration* of the apostacy.

“The early Church did not expect that the apostacy would take place until a few years before the second advent of our LORD, or that the persecution of the saints arising out of it would last more than three years and a half. Protestant writers in general maintain that the apostacy took place more than a thousand years ago, and that it has existed or will at its termination have existed one thousand two hundred and sixty years.

“3. As to the *leader* or head of the apostacy.

“The early Church expected an individual Antichrist, who should be an infidel blasphemer, giving honour to no GOD, suffering no religious worship to be paid except to himself, and requiring that worship from all men on pain of death.

“Protestant writers suppose a succession of individuals, each in his turn becoming an integral part of an antichrist, composed of the whole series, and that the leader or head of the body has been and is a Christian Bishop, professing to be the Vicar of CHRIST upon earth, and to act for His glory.”

We are not aware that Dr Wordsworth would object to what is here called the Protestant theory as an unfair representation of his own opinion, excepting in the matter of the one thousand two hundred and sixty years, and in the application of the title “*Protestant*,” which it will be found that he impugns, as being calculated to create a false impression.

It has, however, already been pointed out that these lectures distinguish between the antichrist and the son of perdition, between the object, that is, foretold by S. Paul in the second of Thessalonians and S. John in his first Epistle general.

The distinction appears to us to be forced, unnatural, and improbable; opposed moreover to the instinctive sense of the great majority of the students of Holy Writ and to the judgment of the most famous commentators, whether eastern or western, primitive or modern, Roman or Protestant.

Firstly, let the reader strive, if possible, to divest his mind for a moment of all theories whatsoever. Let him look at the expressions of these holy apostles placed side by side, and ask himself [237] whether the similarity would not lead him to conclude that both are speaking of the self-same enemy.

S. Paul.

That man of sin, the son of perdition;
 who opposeth and exalteth himself
above all that is called God. ([Greek])
 The mystery of iniquity doth already
 work ([Greek]).

S. John.

He is antichrist ([Greek]) that denieth *the*
 FATHER.
 As ye have heard that antichrist ([Greek])
 shall come, even now are there many
 antichrists ([Greek]). This is that spirit of
 antichrist ([Greek]) whereof ye have
 heard that it should come; and even now
 already is it in the world ([Greek]).

In our ordinary parallel bibles the seeker is alternately referred from one set of these texts to the other as correspondent. Popular editions of the Greek Testament (e.g., Valpy's) make no doubt of the agreement. Martin Luther, in his famous commentary on the Galatians, never hints at more than *one* power which, in his judgment, fulfils these several conditions. Calvin (on 2 Thess. ii.) makes a special reference to the passage of S. John. Hammond treats them as practically one. The sainted doctors of the early centuries, Justin Martyr, Hippolytus, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, and many more, fearlessly commingle the phrases of these apostolic prophets, believing them to bear upon one and the same subject. *Nulli dubium est*, comments Augustine on the passage of S. Paul, *eum de antichristo ista dixisse*,¹ meaning evidently *the* antichrist. For presently he adds, "men believe it to pertain to the same mystery, of which John the Evangelist speaks in his Epistle," and proceeds to cite these texts. And whatever difficulty of explaining detail may arise from the obscurity of prophecy, there is no ambiguity, says this great father, on certain points, namely, those which we have already touched upon under our first head of inquiry.

Easy it were, we believe, to multiply authorities of very varied times and tempers. But we pause to ask, what authorities does Dr Wordsworth adduce in favour of the separation he proposes? Of course there may be many such, whom we in our ignorance have overlooked. But we are certainly unable to discover them in these [238] volumes. Twice or thrice is the assertion made, but in vain do we look for the usual mass of references. It is an "*I am persuaded*" (pp. 512, 274, 364), a mere *ipse dixi*. If this be all the authority that he can urge (and it looks suspicious, when so learned a man does not mention any other), then we must frankly avow that it does not weigh heavily in our scales. Indefatigable in research, and admirable in skilful combinations of the riches of antiquity, he will hardly, we imagine, be recognised by posterity as one endowed with the genius, the acuteness, and the instincts which are required to form the original commentator upon the inspired volume.

We have said that this distinction between the Antichrist and the man of sin, however untenable in our judgment, is yet thus far gratifying, that it does recognise the possibility of the early interpretations proving *partially* correct and sound. On the other hand, we have admitted, that it may cause us some apparent confusing and embarrassment. And for this reason. If we cite a passage from any author denying the Pope to be Antichrist, Dr Wordsworth and his disciples may rejoin, "And so do we." Yet that author assuming the justice of an identity allowed all but universally, as we conceive, both by Papist and Protestant, may have intended to deny at the same time, that the Pope was the son of perdition. Where, however, this is not expressed, the applicability of certain quotations in

¹ De Civ. Dei, XX. 19, § 2. Our previous extracts from the fathers will be found on reference to illustrate the point.

our favour may be denied. But we cannot suffer that which we believe a righteous cause to be in any way unfairly thwarted. By the context of passages, and by the general tone of the writers, we shall judge whether their voice is given for or against the opinions which we oppose, and our appeal must in such cases be made to the common sense and candour of the reader.

But if this proposed distinction between objects, respectively indicated by S. Paul and S. John in some degree confuses the array of arguments and witnesses on our side, still greater embarrassment will it ultimately, we think, be discovered to create in the camp and ranks of our opponents in this field. Gladly as ultra-Protestantism will momentarily hail as an ally, a Divine possessed of those gifts of learning and calmness in which its own spirit is most deficient, the warmth of its first welcome is not likely to prove very durable. It will be disappointed and reject him, both for what he holds and proclaims, and likewise for what he shrinks from proclaiming, and therefore also most probably from holding. Deeply as it must rejoice over his answers to the questions we are now about to discuss, it will dislike his Sacramental teaching, his declared reverence for the voice of the universal Church, his desire to accept in some modified form, the primitive teaching concerning the nature of *the* Antichrist. Its disciples may possibly oppose what he has written on the subject of the Millennium: they will certainly regard him as a defaulter upon the question of the [239] Apostacy foretold in the first Epistle of S. Paul to Timothy (iv. 1—3). If they patronise these volumes for a season, we predict that they will rapidly return to their old favourites, Keith or Newton, Bishop Hurd or Mr. Elliot. Sad to them must seem the havoc which Dr Wordsworth makes among their old authorities. Do they desire to regard Mede as a great name recorded in their favour? This latest commentator might be ranged by his side, but then he utterly rejects the theory of numbers, upon which Mede's scheme is entirely founded. Do they rest their cause upon Bishop Newton? Dr Wordsworth follows that writer in many respects, but then he drops the application of those Pauline prophecies just referred to, in which Newton coincides with Mede.

And we, who differ from both these schemes, the *numeric* one of Mede and the later one now before us, how can we be expected to attach any great importance to a list of authorities, of which the citers only accept exactly so much as may suit their purpose? If Dr Wordsworth be inclined to recognise in part the outlines drawn by primitive Fathers, why may not we step onward and accept them (as to substance) altogether. If he may take upon himself to deny that S. John in his Epistle prophesied of the Bishop of Rome, perhaps we may be found in as good company, when we deny that S. Paul so prophesied. If he must subtract from the fabric raised by Mede, both the scheme of numbers, and the theory of the apostacy, where is recklessness, if we attempt to remove the shattered remnants of the building? In fact, one half of the witnesses who Dr Wordsworth summons, will be found, if examined, to *prove too much*; and his admirers must not be surprised, if this be considered, in the eyes of many, as a close approximation to proving nothing at all.

Before however we proceed to enter more fully upon these topics, it may be well to see if there be any common ground of agreement, from which, as a starting point, we may commence afresh. Such ground does, we trust, exist between us and most of those who think otherwise on these points, and will not therefore fail us in the case of Dr Wordsworth.

Our opponents would, we presume, frankly admit thus much concerning the sense affixed by them to the son of perdition and the mystic Babylon: that it is an *opinion* and not a *doctrine*, not an article of belief, which, when once propounded, men reject at peril of their

salvation. Even Chillingworth,¹ *protestantium protestantissimus*, declares that these are open questions.

It will be indeed urged by some, that in accepting Holy Scripture as the infallible Word of God, we do of necessity accept, by implication, the propositions which they lay down. But this is a manifest *petitio principii*, the very question at issue being whether [240] these statements *are* really the teaching of the Scripture. On this point we cannot do better than borrow the clear and nervous language of Dr Wordsworth. The italics, we may observe, are of *his* choosing.

“We would remind you...of what us too often forgotten, that a *wrong* interpretation of Scripture is *not* Scripture; and that it is *only* the *true meaning* of the *Bible* which can properly be called the Bible; and that they cannot be said to be really zealous for the perfection and sufficiency of Holy Writ, who would impose upon you their own notions of Scripture as Scripture. They do, in fact, substitute human imaginations for the Divine Word; and so they make Scripture to be very *insufficient* and imperfect; and when they speak of Scripture as sufficient and perfect, they are not contending for the sufficiency and perfectness of Scripture, but for the sufficiency and perfectness of their own wit....Remember that Scripture *as a whole*, is your *rule of faith*, and receive nothing as the sense of any particular passage which is at variance with this rule...Remember also that Almighty GOD has not only given us Scripture as our rule, but He has also vouchsafed to us a guide for its application; namely, the Christian Church. In the words of our twentieth Article, ‘the Church *hath authority in controversies of faith*.’.... By doing so [i.e. neglecting these rules]...you would be giving up the fundamental principle of Christianity. Scripture, as interpreted by the Universal Church would cease to be your rule of faith; and when this foundation is gone, the whole fabric falls. {“}—pp. 45, 46.

Earnestly desiring to bear in mind these important cautions, we may now advance to the statement of what appear to us some few of the leading difficulties in the way of receiving the interpretations maintained in these volumes. In so doing, we assume throughout the Catholicity of the English Church and the rectitude of her position: we assume too that the rejection of Dr Wordsworth’s conclusions, *if they be erroneous*, can in no wise injure the reality of her solemn claims on our allegiance. Indeed, to imagine for one moment that any cause can be a gainer by the *prestige* of an admixture of error, is virtually an abandonment of that cause as hopeless and untenable.

1. It is then a real difficulty, which does not affect the primitive belief upon these subjects, but which does strike at the very root of the theory before us, that we are invited to regard the object of these prophecies not as a person, but as *a series of persons*. Personality, as is well known to all who have studied the controversy with Pantheistic tendencies, is a leading feature of the Christian religion.² That religion teaches its disciples

¹ Works (Lond. 1742) p. 20, quoted by Todd on the Apocalypse. Preface, p. xxiii. note.

² We may perhaps be excused for referring to one of our early articles, headed “Socianism and Pantheism.” *Ecclesiastic*, vol. i. p. 164.

[φ This footnote, with its reference to ‘one of our early articles’, raises briefly the possibility that the author was Dykes himself, but this appears highly unlikely. First, the date of that earlier volume—the first half of 1846—means that the article would have been written during Dykes’s final months as an undergraduate when, one imagines, he would have been preoccupied with his final exams, with little leisure to research and write long articles for publication. Second, it reveals a range and depth of knowledge which would be surprising in someone so close to the beginning of his vocation as a theologian. Third, although it is possible (probable, even) that Dykes’s style would have matured in the interim, this rather bombastic article (an adjective never remotely necessary in any consideration of Dykes the man) has none of the linguistic polish evident in his later works. Fourth, Fowler makes no mention of the article, either in the footnote to page 56, where he lists Dykes’s contributions ‘so far as
{cont.}

to believe in a personal Triune JEHOVAH, a personal Creator, a personal Redeemer, a personal Sanctifier, in whom all abstractions, such as power, wisdom, [241] holiness, find their true and sole realization. It tells us of personal messengers encircling the throne of grace, and succouring weak and sinful humanity; and of personal enemies, the evil spirits; each band being headed by personal leaders, S. Michael and his adversary, Satan. A person, the first Adam, is the head of the earthly race, created man; a person, the Second Adam, the LORD from heaven, is the head of the spiritual race, regenerate man. The son of Perdition (S. John xvii. 12,) in the days of CHRIST'S sojourn upon earth, is an *individual person*, Judas Escariot. How natural then, how consonant to all experience and analogy is the expectation of the early Church that a personal enemy, an anti-Messias, was to be expected ere the days of trial ceased. Believing, with the great majority of Christians of our own day, that the little horn of Daniel, the man of sin of S. Paul, the Antichrist of S. John, referred to one and the same object, they considered that the very title [Greek] must signify one who did not *in any way* acknowledge CHRIST as his superior, but set himself up as an antagonist. And let any possessor of a Greek Lexicon look carefully over the list of words compounded with [Greek], how few will he find which can be even tortured into the ultra-Protestant notion of an *Antichrist*. Doubtless in Holy Scripture, a king may sometimes stand for the kingdom which he rules (as is frequent even in ordinary conversation), and a neuter or feminine noun¹ may indicate a system or community. But does there exist, from the first page of the sacred volume to the last, a single instance of *a man* being placed to represent *a continuous series of men*? We may be extremely prejudiced, but we certainly have not yet seen in the works of those whose opinions we are controverting, anything that looks to us like legitimate proof of such a usage. The common appeal to the case of the "High Priest," in the epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 7, 25) is irrelevant. The term there signifies the man who held the office at any given period (the [Greek] of classical Greek)² and not, as Newton would maintain, "the series and order of high priests."³ The other examples given by the same commentator are assumptions, being self-chosen interpretations of the very passage in dispute.

[242]

2. The object of the Divine wrath and condemnation in the Apocalypse is distinguished by the title Babylon. Now in the predictions uttered under the elder dispensation, this city is regarded as a pre-eminent type and figure of "the world," as the enemy of CHRIST: an interpretation urged with much force and clearness, though perhaps somewhat too exclusively,⁴ in one of the most justly valued and most uncontroversial sermons of Dr Arnold, his two sermons on the Interpretation of Prophecy. Viewed in the description of

they can be ascertained', nor in the account of his Cambridge years. There is the further point that, if the earlier piece was indeed from Dykes's pen, there is an unexplained gap of nearly six years between his first and second articles. It is more likely, therefore, that the reference to 'our' early article is editorial.]

¹ Neuter, for it may be regarded as *a thing*, as indeed may all *irrational* objects, of whatever gender: feminine, for it constantly involves the idea of maternity. Thus *e.g.* the Church, like the Mother of the LORD, is at once *et Virgo et Mater*. (2 Cor. xi. 2. Gal. iv. 26.)

² *Æsch. Prom. Vinct.* 937. (Ed. Dind.)

³ The difference may be thus exemplified. When we read in Blackstone, "The king is the fountain of honour," we understand him to signify, not this or that person, but the Sovereign of England, as such, the abstract Monarch. Just so, if it may be said with reverence, does the Apostle here speak of [Greek], the abstract high priest. But if an orator predicted that a king would arise in England, who should attempt to gain the power of the purse, who would suppose him to mean, "a series and order of kings!" In neither case is the phrase correct, yet still less so with reference to the future, than to the past.

⁴ *i.e.* with too much neglect of the local and literal, and too exclusive attention to the spiritual sense.

uninspired historians, as Herodotus, or in the vivid pictures mingled with the denunciations of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it rises before us with an earthly grandeur peculiarly its own, the representative of all that is mightiest in human power and magnificent in this world's glory, for its own permitted season, the very centre and soul of heathendom. Proud, sinful, self-reliant, acknowledging no law but its own will, it persecutes and yet receives within its walls the justly-chastened Church of GOD. But to the humbled and penitent, among the true, though weak and erring, servants of JEHOVAH is made known the coming doom of that great and guilty city. Direct and marked is the interference of the special providence of the Most High. The days are numbered. A century and a half before his coming, the conqueror is foretold; foretold too by name, a privilege accorded to none but himself, with the solitary exception of Josiah. Behold him at the gates of Babylon, the most remarkable among heather types of the true CHRIST, marching onward, while his enemies are engaged in the most idolatrous and blasphemous orgies. What shall stay his triumphant progress? The rolling waters of Euphrates? He, by whom kings reign, hath said to that deep, "be dry, and I will dry up thy rivers." The invader's plans are prospered and that river bed is laid bare and naked. Shall it be the two-leaved gates, the gates of brass with bars of iron? It is written aforetime, that no power on earth shall avail to close them; that they shall be broken in pieces and cut in sunder. Cyrus, the anointed, the avenger of GOD'S people and restorer of Jerusalem, is guided forward, not *wholly* unconscious, it would seem, of his sublime and hallowed mission.¹ The hand-writing is traced upon the wall: Babylon falls, and never more again lifts up her head to queen it over the nations of GOD'S earth.

Now, all who have ever read the mysterious book, which is at present mainly under our consideration, will agree that *in some way* [243] this scene of the fall of Babylon is to be reproduced on a yet more tremendous scale. All will agree that the future Victor must be looked for, not in the person of *an* anointed earthly king, but of *the* anointed, CHRIST, Messiah, "whose kingdom shall have no end."

But concerning that which is to be destroyed, whether it be the world, acknowledging the rule of the prince of darkness, or some Pagan city, which is to prove the antitype of ancient Babylon, or some other corrupt community of men, on this point is re-opened the voice of discussion and controversy. We may herein have some dim ideas of our own upon the *positive* interpretation of the visions erst beheld in Patmos; but we forbear to enter upon them fully, at least in this stage of the argument. Our task must for a time assume for the most part a *negative* character. We are trying, in legal phrase, to show cause why we should not accept one particular explanation. "The first duty is to pull down what is unsound; and it is better to let the foundation which GOD has laid lie bare and level with the ground, until, in answer to our prayers and our labours, He shall enable us to build up something solid and substantial, than to heap up hay and stubble in order that we may seem to have done something."² We do not wish to imply, for a moment, our competency even to the humbler and less pleasing work of demolition. It is for us to state our reasons, with others it must rest to judge.

It is then, we aver, a perplexing effort to our mental vision, to be asked to discern the lineaments of the great city which fell before the hand of Cyrus, the portraiture of any

¹ Cf. Isaiah xlv. 27, 28; xiv. 1—4; and especially verse 4, with Herod. I. cap. 204, where he is enumerating the motives impelling Cyrus to conquest, [Greek]. Cf. also Ezra i. 2, and 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, 23. S. Cyril of Alexandria has some very interesting notices of Cyrus. *Cont. Nest.* II. and in the *Glaphyra* on Genesis. They are given in the original by Morris on the Hindus, pp. 93, 94.

² Dr. S.R. Maitland, *Second Inquiry*, p. 148.

society of men which acknowledges the true Cyrus, the one Shepherd¹ of the spiritual flock. We *can* see in Babylon the world by whose waters the humbled penitents sit down, and hang their harps upon the willows, weeping over the remembrance of Zion and for the sins which have led them away captive. We *can* see (as we may afterward attempt to explain)² the *city* of Rome, as the embodiment in her turn of the world's spirit, once Pagan, and perchance for a season to be Pagan again, ere her last and complete destruction. But we repeat it, (we hope in the fear of GOD, we hope with the desire to palliate nothing that is evil in any place or in any system) we *cannot* behold the utterly hardened and impenitent Babylon in any Christian Church whatever. Most striking are the contrasts between the bride and the harlot, the beast and the lamb, adduced in the pages of these lectures:³ but to us they look like the antithesis between the purified Church (Eph. v. 27), and the unrepentant world, between CHRIST and the deceiver, the Antichrist. We recognise indeed in the Revelation the image of the Universal [244] Church, but we cannot perceive, after messages to "the seven" have been once delivered, any more reference to one single local Church, Antioch or Alexandria, Carthage or Constantinople, Rome or Canterbury. No, wherever men will admit the duties of prayer to GOD, and penitence for sin, both to be accepted through the one Mediator and atoning Justifier; wherever they will bow the knee to CHRIST, as over all supreme, the Incarnate LORD, their manifested GOD; there indeed may they commingle with their homage much that is displeasing to Him, or there may they omit much which He requires at their hands; but while there can yet be found amongst them any salt of holiness, the tears that well-nigh re-baptize the mourner with water from the once pierced side, the love that is permitted to win forgiveness of the sins "which are many," then, whatever else they may combine to form, such surely cannot be portrayed in the MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS OF THE EARTH.

They may indeed be individually or collectively mingled in spirit with the heathen around them and learn their works—idleness like that of Sodom, haughtiness taught by Moab, enmity in place of brotherly love copied from Edom, trust in merchandise like that of Tyre, and trust in self-wise counsel like the princes of Egypt; they may be, alas! too often willingly, captive to those sins which do at length immure men in the walls of the golden city, the glory of the Chaldees' excellency; but her sworn citizens and subjects *they are not*. They may be even dwellers in Samaria; they are *not* denizens of the mystic BABYLON.

3. It is urged however that these interpretations *must* be true, because they afford a key, which opens to us a very difficult and complicated lock; and that without any force or straining of its mechanism. Certainly a very strong presumption in their favour, provided only that it be founded in fact. Let us examine this a little: for to us this assertion does not appear to be thus securely based, indeed so much to the contrary as to involve some of our chiefest difficulties.

To take an example. In Rev. xvii. 10, we read: "And there are seven kings." We are not professing to explain what these kings are. To be told that each represented a kingdom would not surprise us, even though the powers referred to should not be strictly monarchical. But it would, we think, startle any one not prepossessed by a theory, to find them interpreted to mean *seven successive forms of government in one and the same place*. Yet such, wonderful to relate, is the popular Protestant exposition adopted by Newton,

¹ "That saith of Cyrus, he is My shepherd." Isaiah xliv. 28.

² Cf. upon this psalm, the striking commentary of S. Austin.

³ *Vide* especially Note, p. 380, 381.

Scott, and even Mede. They suppose the kings to be the different kinds of rule in Rome, kings, consuls, dictators, &c.; till they have made up (each in their own way) the number seven. It is now some twenty years since Dr Maitland pointed out that these forms were in no sense properly successive; that the merest [245] tyro in the study of ancient Roman history, who was not defending an hypothesis, must acknowledge that the line runs somewhat in this way: kings, consuls, interrex, dictator, consuls again, decemviri, consuls, military tribunes, prodicator, triumvirate, perpetual dictator, emperor. Reader! you are gravely asked by learned and good men to believe that these multitudinous, ever shifting forms were designated by an inspired Apostle as—*seven kings!*—seven kings too, (observe) of which “five,” says S. John, “are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come.” Stern indeed are the exigencies of theory; to what will they not reduce even the ablest of their defenders?

Scarcely could we believe our eyes when we came upon the page in Dr Wordsworth’s lectures, which repeats this truly wondrous specimen of *exegesis*. Yet there it is, at p. 272, and with an argument, we think a successful argument, to prove that the Roman power is termed a king by the prophet Daniel (vii. 17, 23). That piece of vantage ground, such as it is, we certainly do not care to struggle for.

But we are advocates for a cause, and so is our coryphæus, Dr Maitland. Is it possible to call in a bystander? This will be rather anticipating the examination of witnesses on which we propose to enter, DEO VOLENTE, in our ensuing number. Nevertheless, there is one at hand, not, we hope, a wholly unfit judge.

Mr. R.W. Evans, known as the author of the *Rectory of Valehead* and the *Bishopric of Souls*, is not a Roman Catholic nor a Rationalist. In the year of grace 1847, (i.e. one full year before the delivery of these lectures), he published a volume entitled, “The Ministry of the Body.” It obtained some notice, though less probably than its importance deserved; but it doubtless influenced many of its readers, and suggested to one, Dr Goulburn, (now presiding at Rugby) the germs of his interesting Brampton Lectures. It was understood to be greatly admired by Dr Hook, who publicly and in print praised its author, (and, if we remember rightly, with special reference to this book) as a true Anglican, who kept perfectly clear of Romanising. Now herein Mr. Evans touches upon this point in the following words:

“There is the *verbal juggle* which confounds government with form of government, and makes a distinguishing mark of the Roman empire seven constitutions, some of which are comparatively trifling, and almost momentary modifications of the original.”—p. 227

Surely, to interpret thus, is not to open a lock lawfully, but to pick it, and that in an unworkmanlike and clumsy manner.

4. But Dr Wordsworth, who puts out of court the Roman Catholics as prejudiced in this matter, seems to regard all his own chief allies as quite unprejudiced. Is such indeed the case? Is [246] there no possibility of their weapons being turned against themselves? We once more turn to Mr. Evans.

“Let us suppose a papist to take up the exposition of Rev. xvii. with the same bias against protestantism as such interpreters have shown against Popery, and to lay it down that England was the Beast. He might say, with as much plausibility as they make out most of their story, that her maritime situation and source of her power are most appropriately prefigured by his rising out of the sea. That the number seven has ever most marvellously prevailed in her government. Thus there was the Heptarchy, and since the Conquest she has had seven

dynasties, (i.) Norman, (ii.) Plantagenet, (iii.) Lancasterian, (iv.) Yorkish, (v.) Tudor, (vi.) Stuart, (vii.) Hanoverian. That red has always been the military colour of England.¹ That the woman is the Church of England which was the creature of a woman Elizabeth, herself the daughter of a harlot, who cruelly persecuted the Catholics. Her fine dress, her cap, her blasphemies, represent her wealth, her commerce, and the heresies both of herself and her sectaries. That in her sex there is also no doubt an illusion to the remarkable peculiarity of succession to the English throne. The Plantagenets, the Tudors, the Stuarts, the Hanoverians *all* succeeding through the female line, and a fresh dynasty coming on after the same rule; that the ten horns are England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, all formerly independent kingdoms, and her possessions in the Mediterranean, in North America, in the West Indies, in Australia, in South Africa, in the East Indies. *How easily are such adaptations manufactured, and how readily can we expose our folly, when we are so audacious and unwise as to assume a prerogative of the HOLY SPIRIT of GOD!* And yet such shadowy pictures have been vindicated for truth with as much tenacity *as if they were points of doctrine and articles of faith*; and men have even borne contradiction in the latter more patiently than in the former. *Thus prophecy is degraded to the condition of a handmade to party*, and factious watchwords are supplied from its oracles; *this it must come into discredit, and sink into neglect.*”—*Evans, Ministry of the Body*, pp. 228—230.

These are only some specimens of our difficulties. Next month, if all be well, we trust to consider a few more, as also the nature of the evidence in favour of these theories, the kind and degree of acceptance which they have found in England, and the legitimate consequences of that acceptance, when realized and carried into practice. {*End of instalment*}

[320]

We resume, according to promise, our investigation of this subject, left uncompleted in our last month's number, commencing with the statement of a few more of those difficulties which stand in the way of our acceptance of the modern interpretations. In so doing we shall not confine ourselves entirely to the teachings of Dr Wordsworth, taking care however not to impute to him any opinions of which he is not a supporter, however much they may have been advocated by those allies, who are for the most part in every way his inferiors. With a view to clearness we shall re-commence the numbering of our different points of objection, although some may have a close affinity with each other and with those which have been already stated.

1. It is all but universally admitted that the fourth kingdom described by the prophet Daniel in his seventh chapter is the Roman empire. It is a matter of less certainty, but still an opinion resting on very high and general patristic authority, not lightly to be set aside, that the existence of this fourth monarchy is the object referred to by S. Paul in the mysterious words addressed to the Thessalonians: “And now ye know what withholdeth ([Greek]) that he [the man of sin] might be revealed in his time.”² Assuming, however, as an [321] entire certainty this opinion (which S. Austin treats as problematical³), our

¹ It might here have been added: That the royal liveries in England are scarlet; that the royal arms are largely “trick'd out with gules;” that the same colour is most popular with our aged females among the poor in villages, and with country gentlemen in a national field-sport; and that not only is red the hue selected for the hoods of our *Doctors in Divinity*, but that their very robes, as displayed on feast-days as at Great S. Mary's, Cambridge, and the correspondent Church in the sister University, literally glow with red.

² 2 Thess. ii. 6, Cf. verse 7.

³ Ego prorsus quid dixerit, me fateor ignorare. *Suspiciones tamen hominum*, quas vel audire vel legere potui, non tacebo. *Quidam putant* hoc de imperio dictum fuisse Romano. It is scarcely therefore correct to appeal to this passage of the *De Civitate* (xx. 19) as if it spoke decidedly, as is done by Dr. Wordsworth in his note at page 344, and again by implication at page 520.

opponents proceed to take for granted likewise that this fourth great empire is past and gone. “And surely this is universally recognised as an undoubted fact,” cries a murmur of voices round us. We answer, so far is it from being such an unquestioned fact, that the most profound historical student of our time, Sir Francis Palgrave, asserts the direct contrary in his most recent publication,¹ a testimony the more unimpeachable because evidently given without the slightest reference to any theological disputes. Of course, those who believe that the son of perdition is already manifested, are ready to assume, without much examination, that the Roman empire (if that were the detaining power) has disappeared, and that the vision of the prophet Daniel is already realised. For *their* theory such a belief is necessary. To us it appears a matter of serious doubt whether, but for that theory, they would have ever concluded that there had yet arisen the fulfilment of the following description:—

“The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, *which shall be diverse from all kingdoms*, and shall devour the whole earth and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise, and another shall arise *after them*.”²

The inspired writer of these words is remarkable, as has been justly observed, for the extreme definiteness of his predictions. Accordingly it was the ancient notion that in this passage were foretold *ten actual kings*, “who should appear at the end of the world and last but a short time, Antichrist coming upon them.”³ This is of course like other comments, a pious opinion only; but it is, to say the least in its favour, by no means improbable and not in any way inconsistent with the sacred text.

We should like to see any modern theory of which it is possible thus to speak. Have we seen ten well defined kings or kingdoms springing out of imperial Rome? Certainly, rejoin our adversaries, and they proceed to count the ten with the same ease with which Mr. Evans (in the passage cited in our last number) exhibits the *ten* parts of the empire of Great Britain. Here, for instance, is the most lately published list, that of Dr Wordsworth in these lectures,—

“Italy, Switzerland, Germany, Poland, Hungary, France, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, and our own England.”—p. 369.

[322]

Now we surely ought to have been informed at what period it was that the ancient Roman empire was thus in a state of division into *ten* European kingdoms, *and no more*. It would appear from Dr Wordsworth that this division lasted a long time. For these countries, he continues, “for many centuries were subject to the Papacy.” Granting this last assertion for argument’s sake, we naturally demand in what possible manner, which commends itself to common sense, the power of the Papacy can be said to fulfil the condition of the text that it should arise *after* the ten kings? Is such the opinion of unbiased historians, who are not writing with a view to prop the pillars of this tottering fabric? We take up the first that comes to hand, Mr. Macaulay, a witness to fact, who possesses a claim to be heard, in that, most unhappily, he appears to care but little either for Rome or her antagonists, saying in an intellectual point of view.

¹ History of Normandy and England, Vol. I.

² Daniel vii. 23, 23.

³ Tracts for the Times, No. 83, p. 31.

“The proudest royal houses are but of yesterday when compared with the line of the supreme Pontiffs. The line we trace back in an unbroken series, from the Pope who crowned Napoleon in the nineteenth century to the Pope who crowned Pepin in the eighth; and far beyond the time of Pepin the august dynasty extends, till it is lost in the twilight of fable. The republic of Venice came next in antiquity. But the republic of Venice was modern, when compared with the Papacy.”¹

To this however it is replied that the Papacy, properly so termed, did not commence until the title of universal Bishop was claimed by the Roman prelate, that is to say in A.D. 606, when Pope Boniface III. obtained that title from Phocas, the Emperor of the East. We are not disposed to quarrel with the distinction of times and titles, for it is one of real importance, but our old question still recurs. By what conceivable method are we to understand that this claimant of an universal episcopate arose *after the ten kingdoms* enumerated by Dr Wordsworth? If the reader will again cast his eye upon the list he will find that the second name is that of Switzerland. *Switzerland!* A republic never heard of, even by name, until the commencement of the fourteenth century; unheard of, because not in existence, before the days of William Tell and the battle of Morgarten. And Belgium too: a province of old Flanders, at one time part of the dukedom of Burgundy, at another subject to Spain, then ceded to the House of Hapsburg, at a later date acquired by France, and never, we believe, until the revolution of 1830, a clearly independent power.

But why continue the examination? Is it not evident, without further detail, that these interpreters count ten upon their fingers and then stop, because it is convenient? They mention the comparatively young republic of Switzerland, and ignore the truly ancient republic on the lagunes of the Adriatic: they tell us of the [323] united Cantons, but not of that powerful Duchy of which they once formed so prominent a part: they remind us that there has been an independent kingdom of Hungary, and leave us to discover that there was once likewise a reigning Sovereign of Bohemia; we are on no account to forget the separate government of Portugal, but must preserve a studied silence concerning the kings who governed Sicily and Naples. Of course some such plan must be adopted, or what becomes of the number *ten*?

Really we do wish to be calm and to reason soberly; and it is therefore with regret that we find the necessary process of our argument leading us to inquiry into such catalogues as this. We regret to find one who has been Public Orator in a great University, and fellow of its noblest College, and is now a Canon of our regal Abbey, lending the sanction of a justly honoured name to such extraordinary treatment of plain facts; to a scheme of geography, history and chronology which would not be for one moment tolerated among the pupil-teachers in our National Schools.²

2. In tracing the course of these schemes of interpretation, we read much concerning Christians in subjection to Rome and much likewise of Christians who are Protestant, taking the latter term in its largest and most popular acceptation. One might almost

¹ Essay on Ranke's History, *ad init.*

² The writer has only just discovered *after finishing the above section*, that the same argument has met with the like treatment at the hands of Bossuet. (Variations, Lib. XIII. § 35.)—The catalogue furnished by Bossuet's opponent is as follows: 1, Germany. 2, Hungary. 3, Poland. 4, Sweden. 5, France. 6, England. 7, Spain. 8, Portugal. 9, Italy. 10, Scotland. To us this list appears neither better nor worse than that of Dr. Wordsworth. But for any supporters of these views who may be dissatisfied, we cannot doubt but that a new one can be supplied upon the shortest notice. Bossuet suggests Castile, Arragon, Leon, and Navarre; which may doubtless prove of service to any future commentator, having vacancies in his system, which need to be filled up.

imagine, from the books upon the subject, that this was what logicians call an exhaustive division of Christian communities. Now that men should reason as if such notions were correct, creates a fresh difficulty in our minds towards the reception of their teaching, and always leads us to suspect that there has been an oversight on their part or some embarrassment which they shrink from facing.

For if we turn our eyes toward Eastern climes or upon Greece or the mighty Empire of the Czar, we find a Church embracing the spiritual charge of forty, fifty, or even seventy millions of souls, according to the conflicting statements of those who desire to decrease or augment our ideas of her sway and influence. Its children are believers in the One GOD, revealed to us of Triune Personality, and hope to be saved by the merits of the One great sacrifice. The threefold order of Ministry; the Apostolical Succession; the possession of Sees, whose very names breath the spirit of antiquity, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, seats of Sainted Bishops of old, the Cyrils, Athanasius, Chrysostom; these and other notes too numerous to recount, attest the unbroken majesty [324] of her claims. These claims, we need scarcely say, have been again and again acknowledged by the great Doctors of the Church in England, and by that Church itself, from the sixth down to the nineteenth century.

But directly men are engaged upon the controversy, it becomes apparent that this vast and venerable Communion is likely to interfere with the harmony and simplicity of certain systems of theology. Its witness does not wholly make for Rome, far from it: still it cannot be entirely claimed for England, much less for continental Protestantism. In common parlance, its testimony "cuts both ways." Its children practise Invocation of Saints, and make addresses to the holy Angels. On the other hand they receive the same canon of Holy Scripture as the English Church with, we think, the single addition of the book of Baruch; they do not accept Roman teaching with respect to the intermediate state, and the claims of Rome to a Supremacy over the whole Church they utterly deny and reject: a rejection of which the latest instance may be seen in the Encyclical Epistle of its Bishops in reply to the address of Pio Nono.¹

If then we are informed concerning any theological work that is of a strongly *pro*-Roman or extremely *contra*-Roman tendency, we hold that there is a strong probability that the very existence of the Greek Church will be practically all but ignored. Thus for instance in the farfamed "Essay on Development," a closely printed volume of 450 pages, purporting to embrace a survey of the "Holy Church throughout the world," there was devoted to this deep and interesting subject exactly the sum of *two lines and a half!*

"Doctrine without its correspondent principle remains barren, if not lifeless, of which the Greek Church seems and instance."²

Voila tout! Well might a late gifted opponent, Mr. W. Archer Butler, observe in his reply: "the reader will admire the easy flexibility of the theory; the lion prostrates his strongest antagonist with a casual sweep of the tail."³ Dr Wordsworth, however, if less unkind towards the Oriental Churches, is scarcely less brief. He observes very justly, that even the scourge of Mohammedanism was overruled to the good of the sincere and zealous dwelling in the climes where it arose. "Besides," he adds, "it united Christians together." To which last remark is appended the following note.

¹ See "Christian Remembrancer," of July last, Art. VII.

² Newman on Development, p. 72

³ "Letters on the Development," p. 195, note.

“This is specially true of Christians in Greece and Asia Minor, in with a spirit of religion had been kept alive by Turkish persecution.”—p. 12.

Such is the only notice of those portions of the Catholic Church we have been able to discover in these Lectures!

[325]

But the sober student of church history, who is not bound by the stern necessities of an unprimitive theory of development, or the no less rigid exigencies of an unprimitive theory of Apocalyptic interpretation, will surely pause ere he thus consign to apparent oblivion and neglect all interest concerning the fates and fortunes of so many millions of his Christian brethren. When the great family of the human race is passing in review before his mind’s eye, he will ever dwell with quickened emotion upon those “who are of the household of faith;” and if the noble sentiment of the ancient dramatist, which spake of universal sympathy with all that relates to man, be more than ever full of life and meaning, yet with a still deeper feeling can he parody its words, and say, “*Christianus sum: Christiani nihil à me alienum puto.*” Such a reader will find in the works of travellers many evidences of sloth and ignorance and superstition among the Christians of Greece and of the East; but he will remember that sloth and ignorance are not confined to Oriental churchmen; and that while freedom from superstition is a blessing ever to be cherished, there is need to be aware lest there arise in its stead a want of the reverence really due to holy things and a deficiency in our sense of the supernatural. He will trace even amidst the earthly brilliancy of such volumes as “*Eothen*” many testimonies to deep earnestness and single heartedness, yet existent among Eastern brotherhoods; much more will he find sources of thankfulness for evidence of Divine grace amidst those races, in pages beaming with purer rays, such as those of the “*Wayfaring Sketches*,”¹ and a recent *libretto* entitled “*Eastern Churches*.”² Nor will he, whatever he find at present to condemn in these communions, forget their long train of glories in the past. He will not put lightly from him the remembrance, that that vast continent of Russia owes its conversion from pagan darkness to the knowledge of CHRIST, entirely to the labours of the Eastern Church, since its severance from communion with the West. He will not forget that our Spiritual Mother in this land owes much (it is a deepening conviction among antiquaries) to the missionary zeal of Asia, very probably to the Church of Ephesus: he will not forget in lands, where the light is now, alas! quenched and buried, how there once stood the seven golden candlesticks to whom the seer of Patmos uttered voices sent from the Eternal GOD and the seven spirits before His throne and from “the first begotten of the dead.” No; while time lasts must those memories abide; though

“Moslem prayers profane
At morn and eve come sounding: yet unscar’d
The Holy Shades remain:”

[326]

And if, by GOD’S mercy in CHRIST, we be forgiven and permitted to sit on the right hand on that dread day, the *Dies iræ*, *Dies illa*, we surely trust, among the great multitude which no man can number, to meet myriads, to whom that Oriental Church has been, under the Great Shepherd of the sheep, the appointed instrument of salvation.

And when, therefore, in any controversial writing professing to survey the fortunes of all who name the name of CHRIST, we discover an almost entire silence concerning such a

¹ *Wayfaring Sketches among the Greeks, Turks, &c.*

² By the author of “*The sure hope of reconciliation.*” London: Darlings.

church, we naturally demand some clear explanation of the circumstance. Dr Newman has since attempted to supply by a lecture the *lacuna* of his essay, to our mind with small success. But our opponents in Apocalyptic interpretation do not for the most part even attempt to supply the want of which we complain. Mr Elliott indeed gives an Eastern line of Witnesses, which somehow passes into *Aquitain!* [*Aquitain* for *Eastern* Witnesses!] and Bishop Newton seems to see the Greek Church, in the third part of men killed by the breath of the horses mentioned in Revelation ix. 18. Such interpretations we will leave to work their full effect upon the reader's mind.

But our difficulty which we here seek to have resolved is this. The Greek Church—is it, or is it not, a portion of the domains of the Mystic Babylon? Its children—are they, or are they not, among the followers of the man of sin? If these questions be answered in the affirmative, are we to understand that the only churches not Babylonized are those of England, Germany, and Geneva? If they be answered in the negative, where, we ask, is the even-handed justice which considers *cultus* of saints a mark of the son of perdition in Rome and does not recognize as such in Greece?

These queries Dr Wordsworth gives us no opportunity of solving. Meanwhile, until they meet with some definite reply consistent with the facts and orthodoxy, we cannot but regard the theory which constantly evades and never meets their pressure, as a building which is unsound at its very base.

3. Our next difficulty is one in which, as in the last named, we have been anticipated by Dr Maitland. Indeed so exhaustive is his catalogue of the defects of the modern scheme that it is hard, as we have discovered by experience, to mention a point of this nature upon which he has not touched. In the present instance, (although the topic itself is one which must have occurred to many, besides ourselves, previously to any acquaintance with his learned labours,) we shall freely make use of the illustration which he has thrown around it.¹

The best proof, it is allowed on all hands, of the fulfilment of a [327] prophecy is the general conviction of the Church at large that it *has* been fulfilled.

This is generally the case, as is justly observed by Maitland, with the prophecies “relating to the first advent of our LORD, to the dispersion of the Jews, to the ruin of Babylon, Nineveh, and Tyre. There is in the Christian Church a full and hearty conviction, that these prophecies have been fulfilled by certain facts respecting which Christians are generally agreed.”² Nor is this assertion denied by Dr Wordsworth himself. (The italics are again his own):

“It is indeed true that prophecy *is* best interpreted by its fulfilment; and *if* it *cannot* be proved to the satisfaction of candid, intelligent, and attentive inquirers, that these prophecies *have* been partly fulfilled in the Church of Rome, then assuredly there is a very strong presumption that they have *not* been so fulfilled.”—p. 328.

The lecture proceeds, very naturally and fairly, to represent some parties as no “competent judges of the fulfilment of prophecy.”

“Many persons pay little attention to the history of past ages and their own. They do not consider, and will not *discern the signs of the times*. Many are not qualified, by capacity or

¹ Second Inquiry, pp. 88—101.

² In loc. cit. supra, p. 88.

attainments, to appreciate evidence. Many, again, are blinded by passion, prejudice, or self-interest.”—Ibid.

We shall have occasion again to call attention to these very important admissions. At present we will only remark, that the fulfilment of these prophecies is probably denied by nearly three-fourths of the Christian world, and that if we were to examine the episcopal communities which are orthodox on the mysteries of the HOLY TRINITY and the Incarnation, we should find it difficult to discover *one* which was perfectly unanimous upon the point. “But you are forgetting,” rejoin our adversaries. “It is a principle of justice, acknowledged every where, that the accused must not be accepted as judges in their own cause. What English court will allow the prisoner to step into the jury-box? And who therefore can take into account the opinions of Roman Catholics upon this matter?”

And is in not, we ask in turn, an equally well recognized rule, that the accuser must not mount the judicial seat? When was there an English prosecutor permitted to turn juryman? You must, in common fairness, equally reckon in or equally exclude both. Will it be for one instant maintained that “passion, prejudice, and self-interest” have been confined to one side of the controversy? And the “candid, intelligent, and attentive in-[328]quirers” ranged on one side only of the opposing forces? We hope, ere we conclude, to supply our readers with some materials for giving answer to these queries.

4. In close connexion with the preceding difficulty, and hardly to be separated from it, stands another, which we must now consider. It is this. In what way any Christian community can be, at one and the same time, both a true Church and the mystic Babylon, which is described as a very synagogue of Satan? A problem, we will grant, not wholly insoluble in the abstract; yet not, we must think, yet clearly worked out by our opponents in the particular case before us.

Ultra-Protestantism makes short work with it. Its disciples cut the knot by simply denying Rome to be a Church at all: a proceeding which, by implication, acknowledges the existence of a difficulty, while it denies its pressure on the extremes of the anti-Roman camp.

But such a solution, we need scarcely say, is not calculated to satisfy the theology of Dr Wordsworth. Not merely in these Lectures, but in publications of five or six years standing, has he warned his readers against the danger and the inherent falsity of such statements.¹ Laud, Bramhall, Hooker, Casaubon, and Sanderson, are summoned to aid him in repelling them: Sanderson declaring that “they who, amongst other false principles, maintain that the Church of Rome is no true Church,” are “great promoters of the Roman interest among us and betrayers of the Protestant cause;” and Casaubon (as cited by Dr Puller), that “The denying the Church of Rome the *being* of a Church, hath been a great hindrance of Reformation.”²

This account of the matter then being laid aside as utterly un-Anglican, some other must be found by those who hold that Papal Rome is Babylon and yet a Church. For an explanation of the principles on which these tenets may be held conjointly, Dr Wordsworth refers his readers to the opening of the third book of “Hooker’s Ecclesiastical Polity.” Gladly do we herein follow his recommendation, and only regret that we have not space for some lengthy quotations from that striking chapter. The following is the point which

¹ Theophilus Anglicanus, Part II. Chap. v. pp. 194, 195. (Fourth Edit.)

² Quoted in Theoph. Angl. *ad loc. citat.*

Hooker labours to prove. It is “possible that *the self-same men* should belong to the synagogue of Satan and to the Church of JESUS CHRIST.”¹ A proposition by no means unfamiliar to the student of Augustine, by whom it is affirmed, not once not twice; supported by reason and experience, and sanctioned by numberless examples (drawn from Holy Scripture) of Israelites, who were in external covenant with GOD, and yet withal disciples of false prophets and workers of the abominations of the Gentiles. [329] Such men S. Austin would agree with Hooker in assigning to the pale of the Church visible, but not of the Church mystical.

But here comes in an important principle, which is too closely interwoven with the case to be forgotten without grievous peril. The entire narrative of Scripture discloses to us that *none of the worshippers of Baal, nor the listeners to pretended prophets, were permitted so to act unconsciously.* Even the best men may partake of the errors of their age and country. Cruelty, intolerance, superstition, irreverence, a firm maintenance of groundless opinions, prolongation of existing schism, these and other sins have ere now been permitted to defile the white robes of many a one who was yet earnestly striving to serve GOD in spirit and in truth, according to the light which he possessed. But in what marvellous manner are we to understand that men, re-born in CHRIST, and eminent for personal holiness, have been, unknowingly and unwittingly, not merely infected with the errors of their age, but actually servants of the son of perdition, sworn citizens and soldiers of the mystic Babylon? that saints have been delivered into the hands of the blasphemous power of the Little Horn, and yet remained wholly ignorant of what had happened to them?

That this lot befell numbers for entire centuries, is the monstrous conclusion (for such we must term it, despite the many excellent men, who may have *theoretically* adopted it) to which we are inevitably brought by the scheme of interpretation now before us.

We do pray the thoughtful reader to look this matter steadily in the face. Throughout this article we may seem to be adducing every thing that can be alleged in favour of Rome. This is far from being our real intention, as we fully trust in time to show. We maintain, that the most perfect loyalty to this our English Church, and maintenance of her protestations against all distinctively Roman doctrine and practice, does not involve the acceptance, nay, rather necessitates the rejection, of the particular views we are opposing.

Does the study of Hooker, does the perusal of Dr Wordsworth’s Lectures, does the reverent pondering over the Inspired Volume in any way militate against the proposition we have just now ventured to lay down? The maxim of Hooker embodies the principle contended for by S. Augustine against the Donatists, and asserted in the Twenty-sixth Article of our own Church. Of course we heartily accept it. It *is* a sad and fearful truth, that there are here gathered into the heavenly net those whom the angels at the last end of the world must utterly reject for evermore. But these—will they have been strivers after personal holiness, men living in the fear of God?

An illustration or two will best elucidate our meaning.

In the 11th century, there presided over the diocese of Canter-[330]bury the celebrated Archbishop Anselm. That the tone of his theology is mediæval we cannot but admit. That he was a conscious supporter of Papal authority against William II. and Henry I. is equally undeniable, despite the compliment paid to him and his See by Urban II., in terming him *alterius orbis Papa.*² But his character has received a tribute even from Milner; and his

¹ Bk. III. Cap. i. sec. 8.

² At the Council of Bari, in Apulia, A.D. 1097.

most recent biographer, a German Protestant, Professor Hasse, has seen that his struggle was *essentially* one of the Church against the State. Now in the meditations of S. Anselm (a book scarcely containing a single page to which English Churchmen can object) we find the following prayer. (He is dwelling on his favourite subject, the *humanity* of his GOD and SAVIOUR):

“Be it, that Thou mayest extend to my lips the sponge upon the reed, and apply to my taste the sharpness of the vinegar. Be it, that through Thy Scriptures Thou mayest enable my reason to taste and see, how all this flourishing world is an empty sponge, and all the lust thereof more bitter than vinegar. So, FATHER, be it wrought in me, that that golden cup of Babylon, that maketh drunken all the earth, may not seduce me with its empty splendour, nor inebriate me with its false sweetness; like those who put darkness for light and light for darkness, bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.”

Let scholars read it yet once again in the more touching form of its original dress:

“Libet ut et spongiam per arundinem ori meo porrigas, et aceti amaritudinem gustui meo adhibeas. Libet, ut per Scripturas tuas rationi meae conferas gustare et videre, quomodo florens hic mundus tanquam spongia inanis est, et omnis concupiscentia ejus aceto amarior. Ita, Pater, in me fiat, ut calix iste Babylonis aureus inebrians omnem terram, nec inani me splendore seducat, nec falsâ dulcedine inebriet; quemadmodum eos, qui tenebras lucem, et lucem tenebras, amarum dulce, et dulce amarum arbitrantur.”¹

And then be the question put, whether it does not vibrate strangely on the ear, to be told that this saintly penitent was, after all, so *utterly* self-deceived: that while he was contending against the fiend-like wrath of William Rufus, he was only subserving the cause of a worse tyrant, “the man of sin, the son of perdition:” that while he was imploring the crucified REDEEMER to save him from the spiritual Babylon, he was all the time an unconscious inhabitant of that accursed seat of abominations.

[331]

We declare very solemnly, that we see no choice between holding this or else giving up the theory in question.

Take one or two cases of a like kind. Dr Wordsworth seems to enforce his applications of Holy Scripture most strongly against *conscious* and *post-Reformation* adherents of the Roman system.² This must especially affect controversialists, who cannot urge the plea of ignorance or lack of intention. And yet can we doubt that some of our chief opponents in the profound questions which divide the Churches, have been as sincere in their convictions, as anxious for the glory of GOD and the good of souls, as the champions of our own spiritual mother in this land.

First in *their* ranks, by the admission alike of friend and foe, stands the name of Cardinal Bellarmine. Is he unworthy to be matched in these respects with his opponent, our saintly Bishop Andrews?

Mosheim had lauded “his candour and plain dealing.” Bishop Marsh in his “Comparative View of the Churches of England and Rome,” bestowed on him precisely the same praise; and even one so alien from Bellarmine’s views as the late excellent Mr. Bickersteth has employed concerning him (in his book on Popery) the most charitable and hopeful

¹ S. Anselmi Meditationes, Meditatio ix.; S. Ans. Op. P. 220 E. (Ed. Gerberon, *S. Maur.*) pp. 124, 125 (Ed. Buse). This last edition is a recent one (published at Cologne) of the Meditations only. It may be obtained through our foreign booksellers, for the sum of two shillings. Readers of children’s books will find some very pleasing notices of Anselm in a story called *The Birthday*. (Masters.)

² Pp. 300, 301.

language, with reference to his “pious practical works” and his ultimate trust in CHRIST alone. Hard it must prove to be called upon to consider such an one, as a life-long labourer on behalf of a blaspheming ruler, “who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called GOD or worshipped.”

Turn we to their greatest *practical* controversialist, the man who more than any other arrested the tide of continental Protestantism, the world-famed founder of the society which boasts “to bear no human name.” The following has been written concerning him by the most eminent of our living *non-conformist literati*:

“It was a principle with him—and who must not approve it?—on every arduous occasion to exert his natural ability of mind and body with all possible energy, as if no divine aid or guidance were to be looked for; and then, having done so, and while thus employed, to seek that aid and guidance with a simple fervour, and an absolute reliance, as if human faculties of intelligence and power were wholly inapplicable to the work in hand. Fervent he was—fervently devout; and our Protestant notions would lead us into a very perilous kind of uncharitableness, if they forbade our thinking of Ignatius Loyola as *an eminently good and Christian man.*”—*Isaac Taylor. Loyola and Jesuitism*, Pp. 145, 182

Are the characters and teachings of the chief continental reformers so wholly unexceptionable, that members of our Church must regard *them* with entire approval and admiration, and look upon this man who resisted them as a servant of the *man of sin*? [332] The interpretations, now being examined, seem to enforce on us, if not the first, at least the second of these two conclusions.

We proceed to give an account from the pen of another decided Protestant, of the last moments of a friend and follower of Loyola, who became one of the members of his order; that order to which (in company with Dominicans and Franciscans) Dr Wordsworth applies some Apocalyptic prophecies of peculiar awfulness. The person referred to is the great Eastern missionary Xavier.

“But his earthly toils and projects were now to cease for ever. The angel of death appeared with a summons, for which, since death first entered our world, no man was ever more triumphantly prepared. It found him on board the vessel on the point of departure for Siam. At his own request he was removed to the shore, that he might meet his end with greater composure. Stretched on the naked beach, with the cold blasts of a Chinese winter aggravating his pains, he contended alone with the agonies of the fever which wasted his vital power. It was an agony and a solitude for which the happiest of the sons of men might well have exchanged the dearest society and the purest joys of life. It was an agony in which his still uplifted crucifix reminded him of a far more awful woe endured for his deliverance. It was a solitude thronged by blessed ministers of peace and consolation, visible in all their bright and lovely aspects to the now unclouded eye of faith; and audible to the dying martyr through the yielding bars of his mortal prison house, in strains of exulting joy till then unheard and unimagined. Tears burst from his fading eyes, tears of an emotion too big for utterance. In the cold collapse of death his features were for a few brief moments irradiated as with the first beams of approaching glory. He raised himself on his crucifix; and exclaiming, *In te, Domine, speravi non confundar in eternum!* he bowed his head and died.”—*Sir J. Stephen’s Essays*, vol. i. pp. 237, 8.

Well indeed may the same writer call S. Francis Xavier “the canonised saint, not of Rome only, but of universal Christendom.”

Now, according to the interpretation of these Lectures (p. 279), the Papacy, acting by the preaching orders, is personified in the *second* Beast of Revelation xiii. (11—18). Moreover, all wilful and conscious adherents of the Papal power are worshippers of the former Beast (Rev. xiii. 1—8). To such Dr Wordsworth does not hesitate to apply by word of mouth and again in full print (p. 296) the following terrific denunciation:—“*If any man*

worship the Beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of GOD, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of His indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy Angels, and in the presence of the Lamb.”—(Rev. xiv. 9, 10).

Without doubt his theory demands this application and must fall, unless it can be made. But how many of those who profess to accept the theory, are in reality prepared to make it? How [333] many, remembering what words are, and where they must be accounted for, (S. Matt. xii. 36, 37), are prepared to maintain, in the silence of their closets before Him who seeth in secret, or in the open before GOD, and men, and angels, that they do in their inmost conscience believe this prophecy to relate to that great multitude of their fellow creatures who are in communion with the Church of Rome? Let each ask of his own circle—*How many?*

There are some who may feel inclined to speak in this wise. “If I profess such a belief, I am not thinking of men like Anselm, Francis Xavier, or Bellarmine. No. I can respect their memory and that of many such besides. I have studied my Thomas à Kempis for years; some translations from Fenelon are my delight; I am fond of the sermons of the great Christian orators of France; I can even read with pleasure, and I trust with profit, such books as Scupoli’s *Spiritual Combat* and many parts of Avrillon. If you hear me apply the Apocalypse to Papal Rome, you may be sure that I am not thinking of these, but of men like Cæsar Borgia or the Cardinal Dubois.”

Remarks of this kind (and they are not uncommon) may speak well for the kindliness of those who utter them, but sure as pieces of reasoning they are the arguments of children and not of men. What should *we* say to a Roman Catholic, who denounced us as a body of unhallowed heretics, and when met by instances of saintliness, like those of a Wilson or a Ken, replied that he did not refer to men of such a stamp, but was alluding to an Archdeacon Blackburne or a Bishop Hoadly?

5. Last in our present list of *general* difficulties must come a question, which ought not to be lightly pondered by any who even *profess* to reflect on these mysterious subjects. How do they reconcile their interpretation of these prophecies with another weighty prophecy uttered by Him, by whose Spirit all true prophets spake, that prophecy, which was given in the form of a promise, that He who sent forth His Apostles and their successors would be with them “all the days ([Greek]) even unto the end of the world?”

That heresies should arise and corruptions abound, that few Churches should be exempt from special evils, even as few Christians from special besetting sins, we learn not only from the holy Gospels and the Apostolic Epistles, but most strikingly also from the opening chapters of the marvellous book now mainly under consideration. Of all the Apocalyptic Churches Smyrna and Philadelphia are alone found blameless; two only out of seven, and this while an Apostle was yet living!

But far different is the image presented to us by the modern scheme of prophetic interpretation. We are called upon to believe not only in the *corruption* of Churches, but in their almost entire abandonment of those ends, for which they were instituted by their Divine Founder. We are to believe that a community of Chris-[334]tians, “whose faith was spoken of throughout the world, whose obedience came abroad unto all men,” not merely lost its first love, but became very early in the seventh century the Mystic Babylon. We are to believe that, even now, one half of the Church of CHRIST (especially in Europe and South America) is under the dominion of an Antichrist, and that this dominion has lasted, despite our LORD’S gracious promises, for more than twelve centuries! Moreover, that this Babylonian rule has at one time been more complete and comprehensive than at present,

embracing, before the separation of the East, the Holy Church *per orbem terrarum*, with the exception of a few obscure sects, who are assumed to have kept the Gospel intact and pure. Of these sects we will only say at present that the attempts to defend them from the charges of Manichæan or Donatistic heresy are daily waxing feebler, and in a fair way to be resigned as hopeless by every reasonable investigator of history.¹ Disguise it as men may, these theories demand a virtual acceptance of the belief, that at one time there has been an APOSTACY on the part of Christendom throughout its length and breadth. Possibly some of our readers can follow Mede in practically believing this, without any consciousness of violation to the sacredness of their faith. Yet let members of the English Church, before they commit themselves to a position involving such tremendous consequences, ponder well and reverently the following words of their greatest Doctor, when engaged upon this very question:—

“Mirum mihi quidem hoc vel primâ facie videtur. An unquam de Apostasiâ Ecclesiæ Apostoli loquuti sunt? An de eâ Sanctum Spiritum ita locutum putabant, *contra quam* nuperrimè Christus ipse dixerat *ne portas quidem inferni unquam prævalituras?* An de eâ S. Paulus, hoc præsertim loco, intelligi potest, qui priori capite, ipsam appellat, [Greek]²—Pearson, Concio IV. (in 1 Tim. iv. 1. Tom. II. p. 44. Ed. Churton.)

Forasmuch, then, as these interpretations seem to us to require canons of criticism, which are not applied to any other portion of holy Scripture; forasmuch as they set aside the pious, edifying, and Catholic views of ancient Christendom; forasmuch as they [335] make into the type of a Church an image ever understood of old to represent the Church's enemy, the world, and the chief embodiments of the world's spirit; forasmuch as they involve the most forced complications of historic facts, which on kindred principles of arrangement may be easily retorted on the accusers; forasmuch as they assume, for certain, positions open to exceeding doubt; forasmuch as they do all but ignore the acts and very existence of the oriental Churches; forasmuch as they suppose that prophecies were fulfilled before the very eyes of holy men, who were yet permitted by a GOD of Mercy to remain ignorant that they had sold themselves to the worship of His blasphemous foe, the BEAST; forasmuch as they invite men to regard the sins (and little but the sins) of Rome, and to pass almost in silence over those of all sectaries and Protestants in our own or other lands; forasmuch as they coolly refer to millions of our fellow Christians, and to them, *en masse*, maledictions not to be thought on without grief and trembling; forasmuch as they hold up to the gaze of a scornful and unbelieving world the Bride of CHRIST as in time past as spiritual harlot; for these, and countless reasons more, we proclaim within that humble sphere where our feeble voice may possibly be heard and listened to, that we do utterly refuse and abjure these modern theories; that for the sake of truth and love and of GOD'S Church everywhere on earth, but most especially for the sake of this His Church in

¹ Hallam is *most decided* on this point as respects the Albigenses. (Middle Ages, Chap. IX., Part II.) “I have been,” he says, “the more disposed to state explicitly the real Manicheism of the Albigenses; especially as Protestant writers, considering all the enemies of Rome as their friends, have been apt to place the opinions of these sectaries *in a very false light*.”—Cd. Palgrave's *Merchant and Friar, versus fin*. But what candid mind ever supposed that such a man as S. Bernard would wilfully lie about matters which he must have known? See his Sermons on the Canticles LV. and LVI.

² “To me in truth this notion appears even *primâ facie* marvellous. Did the Apostles ever speak of an apostacy of the Church? Did they think that the HOLY SPIRIT had thus spoken concerning her, *against whom* (CHRIST Himself had just said) *the gates of hell should not prevail?* Can S. Paul, especially in this passage, be understood concerning her, he who in the preceding chapter calls her *the pillar and ground of the truth?*”

England, we do pray that these notions may fade away, and perish as though they had never been.

We have thought it better to lay down our leading *principles* of objection than to attempt the wearisome task of following the steps of any writer through a series of arguments in detail. It is not that we have any craven fear of examining the separate topics even of one so gifted as Dr Wordsworth himself, (while he is defending such a cause,) but that the entire subject hangs so much upon certain general views, that particular points may for the most part be safely left for acceptance or rejection, accordingly as those first principles are acknowledged or denied. A single instance will serve our present purpose. The union of the dragon and the lamb (Rev. xiii. 11) convinces Dr Wordsworth that the power referred to *must be* a corrupted Christianity and not a form of Infidelity. To us, who are content to follow the ancient teachers, this condition appears amply satisfied by their expectation of Antichrist as one who should prove, not merely a tyrant ruling by force of arms, but likewise a subtle deceiver, displaying those miraculous gifts which are usually the prerogative of holiness, and therefore, above all, of the true CHRIST. Thus, e.g., S. Anselm, repeating probably primitive traditions, not only remarks (with Haymo and Aquinas) that the Antichrist will delude men by his preachers, but adds that he himself will have a perfect knowledge of holy Scrip-[336]ture.¹ And if this last idea strike the reader, at first sight, as something strange and startling, let it be remembered, that this great beguiler has been ever looked for as the nearest approximation which can possibly be made by man of the power and craft of Satan himself, and that the knowledge of Scripture possessed by the Evil One is guaranteed to us by the Inspired Records of the wondrous Temptation in the Wilderness.

Again, we may observe that whole pages of these Lectures consist of antithetical statements, to the effect that the claims of the Roman Church to supremacy, &c., are unrecognised in the Apocalypse, whence it seems half implied that she is Babylon. Of course, as English Churchmen, we have little to do with such hints as these. To Roman Catholics we leave it to answer the first of the two assertions. *We* do not argue against it: *è contrario*, we hold it to be true; but that the second assertion is *in any way* a consequence of the first we are quite unable to perceive.

There are some other points in these Lectures on which we are *perforce* compelled to touch. Could they be left unnoticed with safety it should be done, for it is an invidious labour and may be thought to savour of personality. But although in this, and in other portions of our *critique*, we may seem obnoxious to such a charge, our conduct assuredly does not spring from any personal feeling whatsoever. There are, indeed, arguments and assertions in these Lectures, which we cannot and will not treat with respect, be they employed by whom they may. But we do not forget the Horatian *aliquando bonus dormitat*, and trust that the tone of our strictures may not prove inconsistent with the sincerest respect for the character and abilities of one, in every way, so far above us. Of inaccuracies we say little, for these *will* happen everywhere. Two or three shall be committed to a foot note, not without hope that they may in due time be corrected.² But

¹ Notitiet omnem Scripturam.—(Elucidarii, Lib. III.)

² An inaccurate reference to S. Augustine has already been noticed. It is much more strange to meet with the assertion, (twice made) that the tribe of Ephraim is omitted in the sealing of the 144,000. (Rev. vii.) We had never imagined that there was a doubt but that it was indicated by the tribe of Joseph in verse 8. If not, what *is* meant by that tribe? Again, then “*the Twelve*” are mentioned (p. 262 and note) it is apparently forgotten that their marred organization was ever again perfected. We have heard that, in a recent sermon preached in the Abbey, Dr. W. actually spoke of Judas as one of the Twelve Foundations
{cont.}

there are four topics of larger range which we cannot think it right to pass by without some comment: two of which however must be deferred till the next month.

(a) Firstly, if we were to judge Dr Wordsworth by these Lectures (which we should be sorry to do, for we deem him capable of things in all respects far superior) we should imagine him hardly [337] able to realise any mysteriousness in evil, excepting in the form of a corrupt Church. Such sentiments at least appear to pervade the entire framework of the volume.

Now we must request any, who may feel inclined to adopt this cast of thought, to reflect carefully upon a few leading dogmas; which we have not space to develop in these pages, although intrinsically they would repay the toil of a lengthened consideration. Such, for example, are these following.

That we know positively nothing of the origin of evil. That we are scarcely able to conceive the mode by which an archangel and angels could, in the immediate Presence, tempt themselves and fall. That these fallen angels compassed, even in Paradise, the overthrow of man's innocence. That they are ever about our path, and perhaps, as holy men have believed, learn much of our inmost thoughts by observation of the workings of the countenance or even by some subtler means.¹ That they can suggest to our minds ideas of despair, presumption, and numberless other forms of sin, and this even in our very dreams. That their leader tried, by the allurements of appetite, ambition, and spiritual pride, to seduce the sinless humanity of His Maker, the Incarnate GOD. That, although utterly defeated, he seems to have ventured upon a second and last approach (S. John xiv. 30). That he most probably overreached himself in bringing about the death of the Just One, who thereby despoiled him of his proprietary right² over man's life. (Heb. ii. 14, 15). That original sin is transmitted even to the children of regenerate Christians. That souls are permitted to be called into existence (and, therefore, to an eternity of weal or woe) at the dictate of earthly passion; even when that passion is unsanctified by GOD'S hallowed ordinance of marriage.

He who has well meditated these, and the thousand other kindred themes connected with them, will readily arrive at the conclusion, that as for the salvation of men there has been wrought a "mystery of godliness," even so (without necessary reference to corrupted Churches) may we justly speak of a "mystery of iniquity."

Now if any reader has firmly grasped this conviction, as an abiding and indwelling thought, we may venture to predict that a large portion of the substratum, upon which these lectures are reared, will sink down and crumble away under its influence.

(b) In the second place, we must endeavour to call attention to the apparent non-recognition, on the part of the lecturer, of the depth, power, subtlety, and extension of the infidelity of the nineteenth century. We say emphatically of the nineteenth century, [338] because the age has its own new inventions, as in the world of science, so likewise in that

of the New Jerusalem (Rev. xxi. 14); and idea admirably adapted to suit his theories, but utterly irreconcilable with the plain narrative of Holy Writ, in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. [ϕ Dykes subsequently wrote a sermon on the subject of Judas' replacement: 'The Two Places (S. Matthias)' (Acts i. 25), published in FOWLE, E. (ed.) *Plain Preaching for a Year Vol.3* (Skeffington: London, 1873). See App. C Part 2 p. 50.]

¹ Cf. the striking lines in the *Lyra Innocentium*, which commence,
"The powers of ill have mysteries of their own," &c.

² Vide Dr. Mill on the Temptation, and the note on this subject at the end of these Five Lenten Sermons.

of unbelief. The coarse deism, if not atheism, of Chubb, Toland, Tindal, and their brethren of a past generation, has disappeared. The suppers of the Baron Holbach, where men could, as a joke, appoint *un avocat the Dieu*, are no longer fashionable; though their likeness is, we fear, reproduced on a more fearful scale among the votaries of London cider-cellar. A wicked woman is not openly adored as the Goddess of Reason, in the consecrated aisles of *Notre Dame*. No, all *that* is too coarse, too repulsive for the would-be literal thinkers of the day. Far different is their line of thought and action. General terms of love for all men; a professed zeal for the second table of the Decalogue, with a quiet but studious oblivion of the first; a condescending admiration of Christianity, with a secret fear and hatred of its most solemn claims; a vague acceptance of its promises without its threats, its accents of joy without its notes of fear, its moral code without its sacramental teaching; a sublime patronage of its Divine Founder, as *un assez grand genie pour son temps*, or an idealised *mythus* of abstract humanity: these are the echoes from the shores of North America, Germany, and France, which are being reproduced with marvellous skill, learning, and even genius among all classes in this realm of England.

We must not suffer ourselves to be betrayed into a long digression upon this vast and fertile subject. Those who desire to study it will find means without much difficulty. But if, after a careful survey¹ of its phases, he meet with such a sentence as this, "Infidelity proclaims itself," he will surely fancy that the writer must be referring to the unbelief in other ages than our own. "Infidelity proclaims itself!" Is it possible to imagine a more incorrect account of the insidious unbelief which is working its way amongst us; which, when attacked, denies that it *is* unbelief and claims the title of a most pure, beneficent, and spiritual religion, exactly adapted to man's needs in the present state of the world's progress? Yet such a declaration he will light upon at page 366 of these Hulsean Lectures; and if his sentiments at all coincide with ours, it will give a shock to his confidence in the entire system of interpretation which can, in such an age as ours, adopt and sanction it. That this, and many similar statements of Dr Wordsworth, are required by the necessities of his scheme, we do not doubt: that they will bear the slightest examination at the hands of candid and impartial observers we do most profoundly doubt.

[339]

We are here compelled, by sheer lack of space, to make a somewhat abrupt termination of this second instalment of our article. Like many more valuable productions, it has run to a greater length than was anticipated: a circumstance demanding an apology on our part to that large class of readers, who take but little interest in the subject. Those who *are* interested, will, we trust, make allowance for our prolixity, when they consider the size and

¹ The revelations of Alton Locke upon this head, have not, we think, been combated. Much information may be gleaned from articles in the *Revue des deux Mondes* during this present year; especially those on German literature, and American poetry, and above all the high-toned and masterly critique of M. Nicholas' *Etudes Philosophiques* by M. Albert de Broglie in February last.—M. Veuillot (reviewed by us last year) must not be omitted, despite his many faults. How significant is the recent purchase of the Westminster Review by Mr. Chapman!

[φ Once again, a reference to an earlier review 'by us' offers the possibility that Dykes may have been the author of that article, too. Certainly the prose style of the review at issue is closer to Dykes's than was the case referred to previously (p. 11). And the use in both articles of certain words which do not feature in everyday conversation is a further, slight, indication that the reviews might have a common author. On the other hand, the reference in the earlier article (Vol. 10. pp. 218) to the author's having 'once held converse with [Gustave Xavier] de Ravignan' (1795—1858), a Jesuit priest who is not known to have travelled to England before 1851, and with whom Dykes is not recorded in Fowler as having held any converse, written or in person, relegates the likelihood of Dykes's authorship of the previous article to the category of 'possible but improbable'.]

importance of the volumes criticised: an importance arising from the learning and ingenuity with which certain *theses* are defended, as well as from the character and position of their defender. And if these disquisitions must still be considered by very many as lying wholly *in nubibus*, and not descending to the sphere of practical utility, we will yet request their kind attention to matter which we have still to bring before them, or at least ask them to pardon our occupation of so large a space, on the plea that there are others who believe that particular parts of these inquiries touch very closely upon the fundamentals of the faith.

[398]

We had intended to commence this portion of our *critique* with an examination of Dr Wordsworth's authorities. But, before attempting this task, we must complete that division of our argument which was left unfinished in the last month's number, that the subject might not engross an undue proportion of its pages. Two topics out of four which seemed to call for especial observation, were disposed of. We proceed to those which remain.

(c) The third point to be noticed is the exceedingly hard measure dealt out by our author, to the Monastic Orders, who are supposed, (as has been said) in conjunction with the Papacy, to be the second Beast of the Apocalypse. Doubtless, in this particular, we English of the present generation were, for the most part, nurtured in a school of prejudice, as unwise, as it was narrow-minded and uncharitable. But a re-action has taken place, a re-action so deep as to penetrate our most valuable books of history, so extensive as to influence the publications even of the Religious Tract Society.¹ The value of these Orders in feudal times, their kindness as landlords, their successful subdual of the soil, their sanctuaries against the lawlessness of lay barons, their services to literature, *especially in the preservation of the manuscripts of Holy Scripture*; these and innumerable other benefits arising from their institutions have been brought before our notice in the most varied forms and by writers of the most widely different schools of thought. Nor has it been passed by that, whatever they at last became, they were at first in an eminent degree *reformers of many practical abuses*.² and if reforms are to be condemned, because, after a season, they lose vigour, what shall be said of those reforms headed by Luther in Germany and by Calvin at Geneva?

That re-action has certainly, like most others, been in many quarters somewhat excessive. *We* at least can have no wish to see the faults into which these bodies fell, unduly extenuated, much less concealed from view. Had they preserved their first warmth and earnestness, Tintern and Rievaulx would even now perhaps have been preserved from the hand of the spoiler. But as little can we desire to cherish the miserably false and partial statements [399] which were in vogue before the commencement of the re-action to which we have alluded.

When some future Hallam or Sismondi shall indite a history of the literature of this century, he will doubtless have occasion to chronicle this remarkable alteration of tone with reference to the monasteries of the middle ages. He will allude perhaps to the intention of Southey to have written a history of those Orders; he may find room for reference to Thierry, Comte and others of that class, whose admiration, however well

¹ See "The Dawn of Civilization" and "The Middle Ages" on their list of small books.

² See Sir J. Stephen's *Francis of Assisi* versus fin.; and likewise his "Founders of Jesuitism." *Essays in Eccl. Biog. Vol. I.*

deserved, yet springs from questionable grounds; he will make more favourable mention of some delightful volumes of Neander (despite occasional Germanisms), as his life of S. Bernard and "Light in Dark Places;" he will remind his readers of Maitland's "Dark Ages," and possibly of Sir J. Stephen's brilliant sketches of Franciscans, Jesuits and Benedictines; and assuredly he will not forget that a great English poet, the laureate Wordsworth, has dedicated to the praises of the monks some of the most graceful as well as truthful of his sonnets. But the foremost place will undoubtedly be assigned to that distinguished Protestant writer, the philosophic statesman who for many years so largely swayed the destinies of France. The lectures of M. Guizot first brought forward the mediæval church as a mighty instrument of civilization, as the chief witness and protectress against feudal violence and barbarism; not, as used to be said, its nurse and parent. And nowhere are the beneficial effects of the monasteries more fully recognized or more vividly portrayed.

But our literary historian will be compelled to admit that there were books, which not only attempted to check any excesses of recoil arising from the past fury of anti-monastic writers, but which actually reproduced certain theories of the 16th and 17th centuries, holding up these Orders to the deepest reprobation of mankind. He may instance, as a proof of his assertion, certain lectures of another Wordsworth, not the sweet singer of Rydal Mount, wherein the preaching orders are said to combine with the papacy to form the second beast of the Apocalypse.—p. 279.

Deep indeed, upon this hypothesis, must be the guilt and responsibility of writers like Dr Maitland and M. Guizot. They have been employed in representing these Orders as originally instituted with a view to the glory of GOD, and as composed of men who, with whatever alloys arising from corruptions in the Church, from the spirit of their age or from personal defects, were yet benefactors to the human race, the channels of many rich gifts of heavenly love and mercy to their fellow creatures: whereas according to the Dr Wordsworth, these societies deserve nothing less than the anathema of every Christian man.

(d) An important topic yet remains, namely that of religious persecution. Its bearing upon the matter in hand will be seen presently.

[400]

The history of persecution appears to admit of a brief summary; so far at least as regards the most marked and leading features of the case. Punishment for religious error was seemingly permitted under the Patriarchal dispensation. (Job xxxi. 26—28.) It was sanctioned, even to the death, by the law of Moses. (Deut. xiii. 6—11.) It was acted upon by the sons of Levi and by Phinehas, in whose persons zeal obtained a blessing from on high. The children of Judah re-awoke that spirit during their temporary reformation in the reign of Asa. (2 Chron. xv. 12, 13.) Nebuchadnezzar, in an hour of repentance, makes a like decree, unblamed of the "greatly beloved" prophet who records it. (Daniel iii. 29.)

But a holier dispensation came. The dread lightnings called down by Elias upon the messengers of a wicked king were no longer to be a pattern for imitation by the servants of GOD. There might indeed arise peculiar cases; an Elymas to be struck with blindness for a season; a wretched pair, who conspired to "tempt the Spirit of the LORD," to perish by a swift and sudden destruction. But these were acts of Apostles, who enjoyed the gift of discerning the spirits, and cannot therefore be alleged as infringements of the general spirit of the Gospel precepts, nor examples to be followed by the Church at large.

For the first three centuries the Christians were a persecuted body. But when Constantine had mounted the once despised Cross upon the imperial diadem, state penalties against heathen idolatry were soon enforced by the sovereign power. A few years later Arian heresy is rife and wins the ear and convictions of Constantius. To the Arians is attributed,

we believe with justice, the first invocation of the civil arm against their brethren; and the Ecclesiastical historian, Socrates, who mentions this novel plan, mentions it only that he may condemn it.

Nevertheless it spread and was before long adopted by the Catholics. Even S. Augustine deemed it lawful against the Donatist heretics; following, if we mistake not, in this matter the example of Cyprian.

Grievous injustice it were to the memory of holy men to attribute such conduct to wanton cruelty or pride or what the world calls priestcraft. They argued themselves into a course of conduct. We are not disposed to defend their conduct or their arguments; but it was held and acted upon by all sides and possessed a kind of plausibility adapted to the spirit of their times. If an heresiarch became the spiritual murderer of a myriad souls, why, they reasoned, should *he* be spared while the assassin of a single subject could not escape the sword of Cæsar? His early removal would save the eternal ruin of numbers and avenge the insulted majesty of a greater than Cæsar. "Also the king said to me," writes the Sire de Joinville, "that no man, unless he be a great clerk or perfect theologian; ought to dispute with the Jews. But a layman,[401] when he hears the faith gainsaid, ought to lift up his sword and make a thrust with all his might." And who was the sovereign who thus addressed his seneschal? Was it a Nero under the guise of a Christian? Was it a wicked ruler, thinking to make amends for his own bad life by ruthless severity against the enemies of the Cross? Not so; far otherwise. It was Louis the Ninth, S. Louis of France. "The noblest and holiest of monarchs," as he is emphatically termed by Dr Arnold. "Perhaps," says Hallam, "the most eminent pattern of unswerving probity and Christian strictness of conscience, that ever held the sceptre in any country." Large words, yet not one whit too large, as will be admitted by any who have ever studied the original records of his reign.¹

A darker period was to arrive. What had been sincere, however mistaken and unchastened zeal, became mixed up with the lust of gold and power. European politics grew more complex, and statecraft but too often made a cat's paw of the Church, and hid the most selfish ends under a pretended desire of extirpating heresy. Without attempting here to disentangle that most subtle web, it is enough to say that the system reached a climax in the Spanish Inquisition under Torquemada, in the Netherlands under the Duke of Alva, in France, in that most awful deed, the massacre of S. Bartholomew.

With Rome, gigantic alike in her virtues and her crimes, must rest, we think, the *maximum* of guilt in the whole of this terrific system. But it is idle, it is worse than idle, it is weak and wicked to shut our eyes to the fact that the system was adopted by all sides, alike in theory and in practice. Ziska, the Bohemian reformer, rooted out by fire and sword the wretched Beghards or Beguini. Huss, so shamefully betrayed and burnt at Constance, had persecuted the Nominalists to the utmost of his power, because he was himself a Realist. Calvin put to death Servetus, and Melancthon perfectly approved of it. Edward VI., at the instigation of Cranmer and Ridley, burnt Joan Bocher for Arianism; and Fuller, the Church

¹ *Vie de S. Louis, par Jehan, Sire de Joinville*, not long since translated and published in a cheap form. Compare "Guizot's Hist. de la Civilisation en France," "Velly, Histoire de France," "Hallam's Middle Ages," vol. i., and Keble in the "Christian Year:"

"Where shall the holy Cross find rest?
On a crowned monarch's mailed breast;
Like some bright angel o'er the darkling scene,
Through court and camp he holds his heavenward course serene."

historian, writing a century after, declares that she was justly put to death. The large mind of Lord Bacon did not rise superior to this belief. Elizabeth made it death to deny her supremacy *twice*. Upon this count there suffered seven lay gentlemen and five Roman Catholic Clergy. Between the years 1585 and 1603, there perished in this land one hundred and twenty of [402] the secular Roman priesthood. How Henry VIII. ended the lives of the Carthusian monks with the most dreadful tortures we do not include in this list; for Henry stands by himself, alone, uncared for, indefensible. But we must remark that the Huguenots in France made the fiercest retaliation, lauded the murderer of the famous Duc de Guise, and often slaughtered their prisoners in cold blood; that Calvinist princes persecuted Lutherans, and Lutheran princes Calvinists.

These are a few facts out of many. Those who do not choose to believe them on our authority, may be referred to Hallam, Smyth, and Robertson; writers whose bias, so far as they are biased, is most assuredly not Romeward. Meanwhile, let us beg of them to read carefully a few short extracts from these historians. The following is the language of the late Cantabrigian Professor.

“It is generally supposed that it was only the bloody Queen Mary and Bishop Bonner who put people to death on account of their religious opinions; that the Protestants were incapable of such enormities. *This is not so, and Protestants should know it.* There were put to death more than one hundred and sixty of the Roman Catholic communion in the time of Elizabeth; sixteen or seventeen in the time of James I.; and more than twenty by the Presbyterians and Republicans.”¹

“On the whole, more than one hundred and sixty persons were put to death in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, for being priests, or for acting as priests; for harbouring priests, for converting, or being converted; lastly, for denying the supremacy.

“The offences of each party may be compared, and the atrocities of the one may be more tremendous than the cruelties of the other—they certainly were. The guilt, however, of putting to death their fellow-creatures must be shared by both.”²

And thus speaks Dr Robertson, whom Smyth quotes:

“Luther, Calvin, Cranmer, Knox, the founders of the reformed church in their respective countries, inflicted, as far as they had power and opportunity, the same punishments which were denounced against their own disciples by the Church of Rome, upon such as called in question any article of their creed. To their followers, and perhaps their opponents, it would have appeared a symptom of diffidence in the goodness of their cause, or an acknowledgment that it was not well founded, if they had not, employed in its defence all those means which it was supposed truth had a right to employ.”³

Lastly, thus writes Hallam concerning the Elizabethan statutes.

“It is much to be regretted that any writers worthy of respect should either, through undue prejudice against an adverse religion, or through [403] timid acquiescence in whatever has been enacted, have offered for this odious code the false pretext of political necessity. *That necessity, I am persuaded, can never be made out.*”⁴

¹ Smyth’s Lectures on Modern History, Vol. I., Note ii. p. 266, *et seq.*

² *Ibid.* p. 271.

³ Robertson, ap. Smyth, Vol. i. p. 242

⁴ Hallam’s Const. History, Chap. III.

It is not well, then, for either Anglican or Gallican, foreign Protestant or Ultra-montane, to talk grandly on this theme of persecution, as if any party could display clean hands. We did not think it well in the Comte de Montalembert to call our Irish churchmen “inheritors of unrepented, inexpiated sins,” as if they had never known what it was to suffer for *their* religion. We did not think it well in Mr. H. W. Wilberforce to point his argument not merely by an account of the death of poor Swallowell, but by a narrative of all the sickening details of his sufferings; as if the case could not but too easily be paralleled. (Mr. Pugin’s pamphlet ought to convey him a stern rebuke upon this head.) We do not think it well in Dr Newman to speak of the sword and the halter being employed against the Roman teaching; and then to refer to the employers of precisely similar means on *his* side, as “holy men and zealous,” who “would have interfered with a high hand;” *a high hand* being, we presume, an euphemism for the fires of Smithfield. We do not think it well in M. Veuillot to wish to revive in the 19th century the spirit of the 15th. We cannot admire the French historians, who attempt to palliate or defend the deeds of that fearful night of S. Bartholomew. Far better for them to exclaim with their countryman and co-religionist, De Thou,

“Excidat illa dies ævo, ne postera credant
 Sæcula—*nos certè taceamus* et obruta multâ
 Nocte tegi propriæ patiamur crimina gentis!”

But that which we think culpable in our opponents, we cannot learn to approve in our friends. We cannot admire books which proclaim loudly the tremendous acts of Rome in the way of punishment for religious opinions, and leave it to the reader to discover that the principle of persecution was long acknowledged over the whole of Europe.

And further, it must be said, at the risk of whatever amount of outcry, that a very large proportion of those who perished so awfully at the dictate of the Roman Church can in no proper sense of the word be termed *martyrs*. Many of them “took the swords and perished with the sword;” heroes it may be, but not martyrs. Many, as the Albigenses, were sufferers for what they believed right; but their creed was deadly heresy, and a *martyr* must die on behalf of GOD’S own truth and not for a soul-destroying falsehood. Many likewise in Spain, cruelly and wickedly as they were treated, had yet been guilty of the dire sin of professing [404] to be Christians, and so gaining posts of honour and authority, while in reality they cherished Judaism.¹ Nor can we forget that adherents of that Church have in our own land suffered for conscience’ sake, for a long time and in very trying and varied ways.² And in the present day the Noble Army of Martyrs has been really enlarged and recruited from the bands of French missionaries in Cochin-China. While other nations have made treaties concerning the interests of the tea and opium trade, France alone (to her honour be it said) has constantly introduced clauses *intended* to protect the lives of her propagators of Christianity.

These things ought to be known, and if *we* seem to have dwelt in any degree partially, it can only arise from the re-action forced upon us, as seekers after truth, by what we are compelled to call the one-sided insinuations of other writers. But let those who think us partial in the matter read M. Guizot’s 12th *Leçon* in his *Civilization en Europe*. When good and candid men adopt a strain so different from his, does not this arise from the

¹ See Prescott’s Ferdinand and Isabella; and the admission of a partisan of the Jews, Mr. Disraeli, in the too truthful sketch given in “Coningsby.”

² On this head, the reader will do well to study the striking and candid sermon of Dr. Mill for the 5th of November, A.D. 1848. (Four Sermons before the University of Cambridge. London: Masters.)

pressure of some theory which needs that difference? If Dr Wordsworth adopts it, it must be because he is obliged to consider Rome a persecutress and ignore all like conduct on the part of her adversaries. It is because he must make Papal Rome “the woman drunken with the blood of saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of JESUS,” because he must see her in that image, which to the eye of Victorinus (almost the earliest commentator on the Apocalypse) represented *Pagan* Rome with her ten awful persecutions of the faith.

But such representations, however popular with the many during seasons of excitement, will they bear the test of calmer hours and the research of large-minded students of history, whether civil or ecclesiastical? Let them be welcomed as they may by multitudes, who make no immediate inquiry. There are by-standers who can afford to wait their time, for that they have the deepest confidence in the inborn power of truth.

One more consideration of a rather different character and we shall hasten onward to the question of authorities.

The first two of Dr Wordsworth’s Lectures are devoted to an examination of the doctrine of the Millennium. Against this doctrine he argues with great force and clearness. Without pretending to have examined the question very profoundly, we may yet thoroughly acknowledge the weight and cogency of his reasonings and express our own sympathy with them and willingness to abide by their results. The Lecturer calls upon his audience to reject the theory of the Millennium, because, although it is “propagated [405] with industrious zeal and appears to have laid a strong hold on the public mind,” (p. 44,) although it has enjoyed the countenance of several great and venerable names, yet the balance of reason and authority seems on the whole to lie decidedly against it. The teaching of the Millennarians is pronounced by Dr Wordsworth to be inconsistent with other parts of Holy Writ; to lack the sanction of the Universal Church; to have been adopted by some holy wise men before its consequences had been fairly tested; to have brought discredit upon the study, and to have endangered the reception, of the sacred book from which advocates imagine it to be deducible. These statements, we repeat, are in our humble judgment, forcible and well founded.

But of a truth there is scarcely a single argument adduced by Dr Wordsworth against this popular interpretation of *the thousand years*, which does not appear to us to recoil with fatal force against the interpretation which he supports concerning the Beasts and the Mystic Babylon. Does he aver that the Millennarian teaching has been advocated with zeal and laid strong hold on the public mind? We may, though with some qualification, assert the same of his account of Babylon. Does he admit that the doctrine of the Millennium has received the sanction of some revered and illustrious names? Truth requires us to make a similar admission respecting his explanation of Babylon and the Man of Sin. Does he maintain that, despite these advantages, the former doctrine may be rejected, as having a stronger case against it than can possibly be made out in its favour? We maintain precisely the same position respecting the modern theories on Antichrists and the city of abominations. Does he urge the inconsistency of the common notion of the Millennium with other parts of Holy Writ? We have, both directly and indirectly, attempted the same task with respect to his theory upon the other subject. Does he challenge the advocates of the Millennium to display the warrant of the Universal Church? We demand from the assertors of this volume’s teaching the same august and binding sanction. Does he maintain that the Millennarians have brought discredit on the study of the Apocalypse? We, in company with Mr. Evans and many more must declare the very same conviction respecting these subsequent interpretations. Lastly, does Dr Wordsworth think that Papias, S. Justin Martyr, S. Irenæus, might have changed their opinion on the Millennium, (p. 41,) had their

lives been prolonged to a later age? We think that Hooker, Andrewes, and even Mede would have spoken very differently on the questions here at issue had they been spared to witness the career of continental Protestantism.

We are at last arrived at the question of authority. What and of what kind are the testimonies in favour of this tremendous arraignment of millions of Christians, as servants of the Man of Sin and denizens of the spiritual Babylon?

[406]

With many Dr Wordsworth himself is a sufficient authority. We had prepared some two or three pages intended to explain, why, despite all the excellent gifts of this learned Divine, we demur to so *entire* an acceptance of his opinions. We had therein hinted, how, in looking for a commentator on the writings of *the loved disciple*, we should prefer some one of less controversial habits, one whose volumes displayed more of affection and enthusiasm, dwelt more largely on the cycle of consequences arising from the Holy Incarnation, or gave more instruction concerning the secrets of the inward life. But however much those pages might excuse our non-adoption of Dr Wordsworth's teaching, it is perhaps more charitable to withhold them.

Who then are Dr Wordsworth's witnesses? He appears to admit that he has none to produce from the *first six centuries*. And, (with the exception of some words of S. Gregory the Great) the first name of any weight which he can cite is that of Peter of Blois, a French ecclesiastic of *the twelfth century!* The reader may hence judge of the Primitive character of these opinions.

But the Fathers were not prophets, argues the lecturer, and could not therefore foresee what the Roman Church and her Bishop would in time become. Granted;—but did not the ancient Fathers, one and all, hold an interpretation, which, if accepted, renders that of Dr Wordsworth impossible? We assert, unhesitatingly, that they did; and we challenge contradiction of the assertion.

From all the ages prior to the Reformation, Dr, Wordsworth's vast extent of learning selects the following list of great theologians: Peter of Blois, the Waldenses, Joachim of Calabria, Ubertinus de Casali, Peter Olivi, Marsilius of Padua, Petrarch, Dante. For this list (not, we think, a very overwhelming one) he is mainly indebted to Wolf's "Lectiones Memorabiles." We must add that Vitranga is summoned as an eulogist upon Olivi, and reference made to many other passages of Wolf, besides those employed; as likewise to Signor Rosetti's comparatively recent work, entitled "Spirito Antipapale."

We, on the contrary, take our stand upon these two positions. *Firstly*, that among sober-minded adversaries of the Roman claims, these theories have scarcely ever, if ever, become a *living idea*. And, *secondly*, that wherever they have energised and attained to vigorous life, they have been conjoined with so much of fanaticism, heresy, or violence of conduct, as may well induce all thoughtful Christians to pause, ere they venture to embark in the same vessel.¹

¹ By a *living idea*, we of course, mean one which is not a mere theory of the head, but is inwrought into the very heart and conscience; which is displayed in practice, and moulds other notions into harmony with itself. That an idea should be capable of thus flourishing is indeed no criterion of its abstract truth. It simply goes to prove the existence of power and of capacity for laying hold of *some* leading principles and faculties in the mind of man. But that an idea should lack this innate vigour,—that it should seldom be acted in as true, or, if so acted upon, produce strange contortions both of sentiment and practice; that it should be fitful, variant, arising only in seasons of controversial excitement and sinking into torpidity when they are past: all these signs afford a very strong presumption *against* its reality and truth.

[407]

Let us look at these witnesses a little more closely.

(α) Peter of Blois.¹ Of this divine Dr Wordsworth has not either in his lectures or in his edition of the Apocalypse, quoted so much as one sentence or even syllable. Had he done so, he would willingly have examined his remarks: failing that, we have reason to doubt whether they would repay the trouble of research.

(β) To believe that the Waldenses were *far* superior to the Albigenses (whom we are glad to find Dr Wordsworth quietly ignoring); to respect their constancy and purity of life; to sympathise deeply with their unmerited sufferings is one thing. To accept them as authorities for an English Churchman is another. The few statements we have to make concerning them shall be taken wholly from a book which thoroughly, and in all respects, patronises their cause.² “The Vaudois line,” says the writer, “may generally be known by its opposition to the Papacy, and its reference to *Sylvester, as affording the first manifestation of Antichrist.*” (Proof of this fact is given from Remer, Dachery, and the famous Vaudois document, claiming to be of the twelfth century, the *Noble Lesson.*) In A.D. 1178 Peter Valdo had journeyed to Rome to obtain the sanction of the then Pope, (Alexander III.) to his fraternity, the poor men of Lyons. “Never,” continues our author, “did the founder of a religious community experience a better reception from Prince or Pontiff. The Pope embraced Valdo, and approved of the order, as professors of voluntary poverty; but while he craved them a limited licence, as preachers, he forbade them to exercise it without the especial permission of the regular priesthood.” This injunction was for a time obeyed, but at length the restraint seemed burdensome. Recriminations ensue between various Bishops and the followers of Valdo; they are admonished to be silent, refuse, and are at length excommunicated, and select from themselves their own unordained ministers. However hardly dealt with, it is impossible to regard them thenceforth as anything more than *a sect.*

Now, their reason for selecting Sylvester as the first manifestation of Antichrist is obvious. The Waldenses professed voluntary poverty, and a grant of lands was fabled to have been given to Sylvester by Constantine.

[408]

And yet, considering that Sylvester was elected Bishop of Rome in A.D. 314, this is rather an early period for Dr Wordsworth to see an Antichrist, especially when we remember that he does not thus regard S. Gregory, whose date is A.D. 590. We read that a church was dedicated to GOD in honour of Sylvester, and that this very S. Gregory the Great preached therein; that his name is found in very ancient martyrologies, and his festival kept not only by the Latin, but likewise by the Greek Church.

Moreover, in a certain Calendar, generally considered an authority with devout sons of this our English Church, as being that contained in the Book of Common Prayer, we find among the minor commemorations of holy men; “December 31, Sylvester, Bishop.” In other words, the man whom the Waldenses regarded as the first Antichrist, is honoured by the English Church as a saint of the Most High! Said we not truly at the commencement, that some of Dr Wordsworth’s witnesses would be discovered to prove *far too much*?

¹ Our *belief* is, that this Petrus Blesensis wrote to his friend to come out of Babylon just as a country Rector might with us advise a London friend to come out of the bustle of Babylon to rural quiet. Thus Napoleon spoke of Paris as Babylon, and does not Cowper address London by the same title?

² The Church of CHRIST in the Middle Ages. London: Seeleys, 1845. See pages 303—321, and again p. 484.

(γ) The next supporters of these views may be fitly introduced by an extract from Dr Todd. He is speaking of the earlier portion of the thirteenth century.

“The awful words of prophecy were seized upon as the most effective weapons of political and religious controversy. To the followers of the abbot Joachim, the Fratricelli, the Beguins, and other extravagant sects, who were engaged at that period in an angry warfare with the court of Rome, the fanatical application of the Apocalypse had peculiar charms. They pretended to predict from its visions, *with the help of some new and peculiar revelations of their own, the total abolition of the Christian Church, its worship, its hierarchy, and its endowments*; and in its stead, the substitution of a new dispensation brought about by the agency of the mendicant friars of S. Francis—a dispensation which was to excel in spirituality, the Christian religion, as far as the Gospel of CHRIST had surpassed in excellence the abrogated law of Moses. And the existing hierarchy of the Church, by whom, of course, such doctrines were vehemently discountenanced, were denounced as the Babylon of the Apocalypse, the children of Antichrist, the beast to whom it was given to make war upon the saints, and to whom the dragon gave his power and his seals, seals, and great authority.”¹

A longer account of poor Joachim may be found in a note appended to Dr Todd’s earlier set of Lectures.² He, who shall have studied that account, will be able to appreciate more fully our reasons for profoundly distrusting the authority of this Abbot, as and Interpreter of Holy Writ.

[409]

(δ) The evidence of Peter John Olivi is very similar to that of Joachim, and must stand or fall upon like grounds. Dr Wordsworth, with a candour which never forsakes him, even in controversy, has supplied the students of his valuable edition of the Apocalypse, not merely with Olivi’s comments, but likewise with the criticism upon those comments, made by the eight Papal Divines appointed to examine them.

Notwithstanding this candour, which deserves the highest praise, his demands upon the subject appear to us not a little unreasonable. That there is but too much truth in Olivi’s assertions “concerning the corrupt state of the existing Church,” we learn from very numerous and unquestioned sources of information. But Olivi looked for reformation “by means of the order of that section of the Franciscans (*spirituales* or *perfecti*) to which he himself belonged,” says Dr Wordsworth: a reformation, we must add, which was expected to diminish or even annul the power of Bishops, to exalt that of the Pope, and to do away with the possession of Church property, including, we presume, all deaneries, canonries, and the like. With what consistency we can regard Olivi as *fanatical* in his ideas of Church reform and *sober-minded* in his *exegesis* of the Apocalypse, we are utterly at a loss to understand. Enough for the present to observe, that in Olivi’s judgment the decline of CHRIST’S Church commences “*sub Monachis et Clericis temporales possessiones habentibus*,” and a new and happier state commences, “*à tempore beati viri patris nostri Francisci*.” In Olivi’s Postils the Franciscans stand forth as the best and greatest of reformers; in Dr Wordsworth’s Lectures these same Franciscans combine with the Papacy to form the second Beast foretold in the Apocalypse! Admirable harmony!

(ε) But Olivi’s comments are not to rest merely upon their own merits. Dr Wordsworth would fain endorse them with the authority of a great and respected name, that of the

¹ Lectures on the Apocalypse, Lect. I. pp. 27, 28.

² Todd on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist, Note D. p. 453. sq. —It is only *since* the publication of the two former portions of this article, that the writer has had the opportunity of making use of this book. He mentions this, lest he should seem to have borrowed, without acknowledgement, some materials which were collected by independent research.

Dutch divine, Campegius Vitringa. And Vitringa certainly does assure us that he read Olivi's Interpretations with admiration.

Now the question thus raised is this: not whether Vitringa is justly extolled as the glory of Dutch Protestantism, and as a good and (in many respects) even a great man, and an illustrious commentator upon Isaiah, but whether he is a competent witness on the particular subjects now before us. We venture to assert that, with all his great merits, Vitringa is often far too self-sufficient, somewhat wanting in the sense of the supernatural; and, lastly, upon the point of the respective merits of Rome and Geneva, absolutely wild and fanatical.

An example of the first two faults may be pointed out in his comment upon Isaiah xiv. 12. In that verse the ancient fathers were wont to see a reference to the fall of the ruined Archangel, who has thence obtained the name of Lucifer. Now here is Vitringa's cool dismissal of primitive testimony in this matter:—

[410]

“Veterum lusus et ipsius jam Tertulliani, qui in Luciferi, lapsû hic viderunt lapsum Satanæ, cui populari errore inde adhæsit Luciferi nomen, ipsis relinquendi sunt, non refellendi, cum nihil probabile suadeant.”

“The *triflings* of the ancients, and even of Tertullian himself, who in the fall of Lucifer have here seen the fall of Satan (to whom by vulgar error has thence adhered the name of Lucifer), must be left to their authors, not refuted, since they carry with them no probability.”

Moreover, in his “Anacrisis Apocalypseos,” he interprets the sixth seal (Rev. vi. 12—17) as a prediction of the future abolition of anti-Christianity, Popery, Monachism, and *Episcopacy!* (This “Anacrisis,” we must observe in passing, is pronounced by Dr Wordsworth to be “distinguished alike by solid learning and *Christian moderation.*”)

Once more, in his “Elucidation of the Parables,” Vitringa discovers in the servant, owing the ten thousand talents, the Pope, or line of Popes, who have “maltreated the true servants of GOD, and shall be delivered over to an irreversible doom.” In the parable of the merchant seeking goodly pearls, the pearl of price signifies, according to him, “the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of Calvin, opposed to all the abortive pearls, that is, to all the other reformed Churches.”¹

Upon the whole, those who are dissatisfied with the Sermons of Olivi will not, perhaps, consider his case improved by the introduction of Vitringa as his patron.

(ζ) Of the exact sentiments of Marsilius of Padua, Dr Wordsworth has given us no means of forming an opinion. We have let pass an opportunity of examining them for ourselves, which we cannot just now conveniently recall.

(η) We had well nigh omitted the case of Ubertinus de Casali, whose date is about A.D. 1310. His language is slightly vague, and appears to identify, as completely as did his judges, the Church of Rome with the Church Universal. On the strength of this identification, his examiner declares that like opinions had been held not merely by the Waldenses, but likewise by the Donatists and Manichæans. Dr Wordsworth catches at this admission with delight, italicises the words in which it is made, and calls them “a remarkable confession on the part of these Romish divines, and of the Pope himself, that the identification of the Apocalyptic Babylon with Papal Rome was no *new* opinion in the 14th century”.

¹ Todd on the Apocalypse, p. 71 (note); Dr. Wordsworth, Lect. VI., p. 165; Trench on the Parables, p. 41. (Second Edition).

Now on this assertion we must take the liberty of making two observations.

The first is, that we believe Dr Wordsworth to be in error in imagining that the followers of Donatus, or the Manichæans, *did* stigmatise the Roman Church as Babylon. They did indeed, especially the Donatists, heap upon the *Catholic Church of CHRIST* a collection of the most injurious titles that could possibly be found, but we certainly cannot discover from S. Augustine that they singled out Rome from among the lists of Churches. If indeed the Church of Rome and the Church Catholic be precisely convertible terms, then (but not, we think, otherwise) may it be truly said, that they called the Roman Church the *magma meretrix*. But is Dr Wordsworth prepared to admit this hypothesis? We presume not.

But, secondly, assuming that these Donatists and Manichæans did, like the Waldenses, consider the Roman Church to be Babylon, are *we*, English Churchmen, for the sake of strengthening an article of impeachment against Rome, to make common cause with the partisans of two of the most blasphemous, anti-Christian and soul-destroying heresies, that the world has ever witnessed? With all reverence and solemnity may we say it, GOD forbid!

(*θ*) In the poetry of Petrarch the anti-papal interpreters of S. John will probably find their best support. His cv. sonnet, entitled, *Invettiva contro la Corte d' Avignone*, and the two which follow, do in truth pour a tremendous storm of epithets, such as might have well-nigh satisfied Martin Luther. And Wolf quotes similar passages from his Latin poems and letters, though we have not had the opportunity of testing the accuracy of these citations.

Nevertheless, those who are seeking for what they call *witnesses to truth* before the era of the Reformation, ought not to be surprised if their opponents consider that there exist certain drawbacks to the weight of this "illustrious name."

For in the first place, it is against the Papal court and not against the Roman Church, as such, that Petrarch seems to launch those thunders, which appear so curiously intermingled in his pages with his love poems to the far-famed Laura. And of that threefold qualification which is commonly required to render a man an authority among Christians, namely, eminence of genius, of learning, and of personal sanctity, the last item unhappily, cannot possibly be assigned to Petrarch. Lastly, the reality of his convictions may be judged, when we call to mind that he strenuously persuaded Urban V. to move the court from Avignon to Rome, that on attaining his wish he started, though old and infirm, to pay his homage to that Pope, and was only withheld by a severe illness, which seized him on the road; that in early life he had enrolled himself in the clerical order and received the tonsure; that he died in full communion with the Roman Church, and that his funeral was attended by the Bishop and all the clergy of Arqua, his tomb is shown to the present day.

(*i*) But a claim is laid to a far loftier name, that of the author of the "Divina Commedia." Now, if by this claim be meant, that Dante became an ardent Ghibelline, who, both by word and deed, [412] supported the *temporal* power of the empire against the *temporal* power of the Papacy; if it be meant that he spoke fearlessly against the personal vices of the clergy from Popes and Bishops downwards, and declared that under rulers like Nicholas V. and Boniface VIII. the court at Avignon might become the beast with the seven heads and the ten horns; that he condemned their too much study of the decretals in place of the gospels, and their wrongful and avaricious use of excommunication; all this may easily be gathered from his *De Monarchiâ* and his immortal poem. But if it be insinuated that Dante really believed the Pope, to be by office the man of sin, or the Roman Church a harlot, or even the theology of his own age (as represented by Aquinas) a corrupted system, such insinuations must be pronounced simply ludicrous. Mr. Carlyle is

here at least an unbiased witness, and his view of Dante in these respects¹ is that which every by-stander will accept. We subjoin a sample or two of illustrative passages:

Even when on the point of declaring that the avarice and ambition of pastors like Pope Nicolas III. (whom historians have called the introducer of nepotism) had realized for the time the Evangelist's vision of the mystic Babylon, Dante yet prefaces his address to the man, with terms of respect for the office he had held.

“E se non fosse, *ch' ancor lo mi vieta*
La reverenza delle somme Chiavi,
 Che tu tenesti nella vita lieta,
 Io userei parole ancor piu gravi.”²
Inferno. Canto xix. (100—4).

Again, it is evident that Dante had the most unfavourable impression of the personal character of Boniface VIII. Nevertheless, when he comes to speak of the sad end of that Pontiff, who was seized and insulted by Philip IV. of France at Alagna, in the Roman Campagna, and shortly after died of grief, in what sort of terms does he allude to the event? “I see the *fleur-de-lys* enter Alagna, and in his Vicar CHRIST be taken captive. I see him again derided, I see renewed the vinegar and gall, and himself murdered amongst living robbers.”

“Veggio in Alagna entrar lo fiordaliso,
 E nel Vicario suo Cristo esser catto.
 Veggiolo un' altra volta esser deriso;
 Veggio rinnovellar l' aceto e 'l fele
 E tra vivi ladroni essere anciso.”
Purgatorio. Canto xx. (86—90)

[413]

Is this the poet, whose language Dr Wordsworth would wish men to make their own?

One more passage and we will part with the great Florentine. In the preceding canto of the *Purgatorio*, he meets with Pope Adrian V., who is said before his elevation to the Papal chair to have been worldly and fond of money. Did that elevation, in the view of Dante, at once, transform him into an anti-Christ? Here are the words which the poet puts into his mouth:

“Scias quod ego fui successor Petri
 * * * * *
 La mia conversione, omè! fu tarda;
 Ma, come fatto fui Roman pastore,
 Così scopersi la via bugiarda,
 Vidi che lì non s'acquetava 'l cuore,
 Ne piu salir potiesi in quella vita;
 Per che di questa in me s'accese amore.

¹ Lectures on Heroes and Hero Worship.

² “If reverence of the keys restrain'd me not,
 Which thou in happier times didst hold, I yet
 Severer speech might use.”

*Fino a quel punto misera e partita
Da Dio anima fui, del tutto avara.”¹
Purgatorio. Canto (99—113).*

Before this spirit, still supposed to be uncleansed, the poet hastes to do obeisance and is only checked by an intimation from the departed Bishop, that the annulling of all marriages in the unseen state, (S. Luke xxi. 35) extends to the relationship between pastors and their flocks.

We have only to add, that the opinions we have expressed concerning the sentiments of Dante, have not been formed without careful consideration of the passages referred to by Wolf and Signor Rossetti.

(χ) It remains to offer a few remarks upon the character of these last-named writers. Rossetti may be very briefly dismissed. He may be acute and ingenious in tracing allegories, and eloquent in their exposition; but his idea of discovering anti-papal devices secretly hidden in the arrangement of Dante’s words, can only be regarded as a light and childish fantasy. Mr. Cary is compelled “to avow his disbelief of the secret jargon imputed to our poet [414] in the ‘Spirito Antipapale;’”² and the “Quarterly” reviewers justly said, that such imaginations would be “the ruin of Dante as a poet” giving us only “sundry curious conundrums instead of bursts of inspiration.” As if Dante Alighieri, who for his opinions suffered exile from his much loved Florence, and refused to return, if it involved an admission that the Ghibelline cause was wrong, would have stooped to veil his sentiments in tricks of letters and almost impenetrable enigmas!

But the two bulky folios of Wolf are a much more serious matter, for they are the great storehouse for quotations, and but for their aid, Dr Wordsworth himself, with all his research, would probably have been greatly at a loss for his Ante-Reformation witnesses. Only a few readers of the lectures can be expected to have looked into the “*Lectiones Memorabiles.*” We will therefore give them a specimen of the book, which is not, we trust, unfairly chosen.

In Tom II. pp. 839—841, (this last page being *specially* indicated by Dr Wordsworth,) we find a list of no less than *thirty* testimonies from writers of the highest authority (*maximæ auctoritatis scriptoribus*) all said to confirm the conclusions arrived at in these “Hulsean Lectures.” They are collected by Simon Schardius, assessor of the Imperial Camera. And certainly the secretaries and partisans of the Emperors of Germany do appear to have been this way given; not indeed wholly without provocation, yet perhaps not entirely without a few grains of prejudice. Friend Schardius is rather a lax quoter, not accustomed to mention chapter and verse. E.g., in citing Tertullian, he affords us no means of discovering whether

¹ “Me know first
The successor of Peter,
. “Late, alas!
Was my conversion: but, when I became
Rome’s pastor, I discern’d at once the dream
And cozenage of life; saw that the heart
Rested not there, and yet no prouder height
Lured on the climber; wherefore, of that life
No more enamour’d, in my bosom love
Of purer being kindled. For, *till then*,
I was a soul in misery, alienate
From GOD, and covetous of all earthly things.”

² Note to Canto i., line 45 of Eng. Trans.

he is referring to an ante-Montanist or post-Montanist treatise. Some of his “writers of the highest authority” speak very hypothetically. Thus Arnulph, Bishop of Orleans, is reported to have said that a Bishop of Rome, “*if he be devoid of charity, and puffed up, and exalted, by knowledge only, is an Antichrist.*” A guarded statement, and quite compatible with even Hildebrandic views the office itself; for all men know that an Apostle *may* prove a Judas, the son of perdition. The respect due to some others is certainly new to us. Did our readers ever hear the praises of a Minorite, by name Haybalus, or of Ulric, secretary to Louis of Bavaria, as great theologians? We suppose that they must have been such, for they stand as Nos. xx. and xxiii. in Schardius’s enumeration. But, after all, his first two testimonies will be the *most* convincing, at least to those who choose to accept them. The first is that of the Angel, in Rev. xvii. 18, whose words are expected to form their own interpretation, and to be understood according to the mind of Schardius; i.e. as concerning *Papal* Rome (this being the precise question in dispute). But the second is at least an independent [415] and extraneous witness. It is [we can hardly expect to be believed, but there it stands in the aforesaid Tom. ii. p. 839] the most ancient of all the Sibyls, Arezia or Aretia, *the wife of Noah!* She, records Schardius, declared that “Babylon was an impure city of the Latin land. That Belias (meaning Antichrist thus denoted by her as the author of all evil) will come and display many signs to men. Then in truth will there be casting down of holy men, and an overthrow of the elect and faithful.”¹ A very correct picture of that patristic idea of Antichrist, which *we* have been humbly attempting to advocate: howbeit, a testimony, which we have no thoughts of trying to wrest from Schardius, until we have a little additional evidence for its being the *genuine* utterance of a *genuine* Aretia.

We have now gone through the entire list of Dr Wordsworth’s continental authorities. What must be the intrinsic poverty of those finances, which can drive even *him* to have recourse to such miserably forced loans as these!

But on directing our steps homeward, we come to that which is by far the strongest part of Dr Wordsworth’s case. It *is* true that the weapon wielded by Luther was partially adopted in our land, not only in the first heat and excitement of the Reformation, but also by some wise and holy men of the succeeding age. Some of these lived when, in addition to these deep doctrinal differences which still divide the Churches, there existed a mass of practical outrages upon piety, from the seat of the Roman primate downward. On the other hand, they did not think to augur of the future corruption of continental Protestantism: they did not look for a time when a Scotch Presbyterian traveller should say: “Geneva, the seat and centre of Calvinism, the fountain head from which the pure and living waters of our Scottish Zion flow, the earthly source, the pattern, the Rome of our Presbyterian doctrine and practice, has fallen lower from her own original doctrine and practice than ever Rome fell. Rome has still superstition: Geneva has not even that semblance of religion.”² If then Papal Rome Babylon, by what name ought we to call Geneva?

Whilst Protestantism abroad was declining, the Reformation had wrought for Rome the inestimable blessing of a great *practical* purgation. Mr. Macaulay’s sketch, if somewhat rhetorically stated, has but too much truth in it.

“To the debauchees, the poisoners, the atheists, who had worn the tiara during the generation which preceded the Reformation, had succeeded Popes who, in religious fervour and severe

¹ “Babylonem impuram civitatem Lainiæ terræ. Belias veniet (sic Antichristum vocat, notans eum autorem universi mali esse) et signa multa edet hominibus. Tunc verò sanctorum virorum dejectio, et profligatio electorum atque fidelium.”

² Laing’s notes of a traveller, p. 325.

sanctity of manners, might bear a comparison with Cyprian or Ambrose. The order of [416] Jesuits alone could show many men not inferior in sincerity, constancy, courage, and austerity of life, to the apostles of the Reformation. But while danger had thus called forth in the bosom of the Church of Rome many of the highest qualities of the Reformers, the Reformers had contracted some of the corruptions which had been justly censured in the Church of Rome. They had become lukewarm and worldly. Their great old leaders had been borne to the grave and had left no successors.”¹

Let him who would judge the case equitably, remember these facts. Let him also, we must request, carefully apply to all authorities those two positions which have previously been laid down.

[Vol. 13. p. 44]

The leading English authorities for our opponents are these four, the Homilies, Bishop Andrewes, Hooker, and Joseph Mede.

Of the Homilies we will say but little; for it is a painful theme, (so far as regards the matter here before us,) and might induce *apparent* disrespect of this our Spiritual Mother, the Church in England. Thus much may suffice. The Homilies do nowhere, as Laud said at his trial, define the Pope to be antichrist. Do those who call on us to hold all opinions therein incident-ally expressed think English churchmen *bound* to believe the doctrine of the divine right of kings? How far this last idea be scriptural or not is no part of our present business to inquire. But seeing that it forms the burden of a sextipartite Homily, those who do not conceive themselves on this account tied to it, as to a necessary part of their belief, must not dream of pressing us with the authority of the Homilies.²

The case of the holy Bishop Andrewes is certainly remarkable. King James I. took up the modern theory of Babylon. Bellarmine answered the royal scholar, not, so far as we can judge, with his usual skill; and then Andrewes came to the rescue. But did the idea ever attain to life and become a practical conviction, in the mind of either the monarch or his friend? Historians tell us that James, in order that he might marry his son into one of the great reigning families on the continent, was ready to make very large concessions to Rome, and admit, as so many of our divines would also do, a modified primacy in the Pope. When Santa Clara was trying, as a Roman Catholic, to take a conciliatory view of the English Articles, he supported that view (as Mr. Arthur Baker mentions in his letter to the Bishop of London) from the writings of Bishop Mountague and Bishop Andrewes. And if any living Bishop of our Church, who may profess to agree with Andrewes in his view of the Apocalypse, will at the same time employ the devotions of that great and good man, and will further introduce into his private chapel the ritual adopted by him,³ we may safely predict, that these ideas concerning Babylon will not display much salient energy; and that lookers on, whether Puritan or Papal, will not readily imagine that they form any prominent part of such a Bishop's inmost thoughts.

[45]

Must we bow, then, in this controversy to the judgment of Hooker? Hooker wrought a work on behalf the English Church against Puritanism, such as, humanly speaking, none other could have effected. His deep ponderings on the mystery of the Incarnation, and his

¹ Article on Ranke.

² Cf. Palmer on the Church. Supplement *ad fin.* and Vol. I. Pt. 1. Chap. xi.

³ See the account in Dr. Hook's Ecclesiastical Biography, Art. Andrewes.

exposition or the nature and force of law are for all time. But are there no marks even in *him* of those lowering influences of the time, from which even the best and greatest are seldom free? Must we follow Hooker in the Erastrian teaching of his later portions of the Ecclesi-astical Polity? Can we look back so fondly as he did (Lib. iv. *ad fin.*) to the memory and Church policy of Edward VI.? Are we to join with him in that excessive admiration of the character of Calvin, which Bishop Bull did his best, in after time, to check, and which Mr. Dyer's recent biography will perhaps annihilate for ever? Considering that Hooker's sermons are usually held to be the productions of his earlier and less matured mind; considering that he never terms the Roman Bishop an antichrist or man of sin, we trust that we are offering no disrespect to his memory, if we do not pay great attention to that *single* sentence in *single* sermon, wherein he alludes to Papal Rome as Babylon.

There remain the elaborate works of Mede. His learning, his piety, his high tone upon other questions of theology, have rendered his writings one of those formidable batteries, under cover of which whole regiments of very inferior soldiers may discharge their smaller metal in safety. Dr Wordsworth's books may perhaps prove the same. But Mede, to make his theory coherent, was obliged to see Rome in a well-known text of S. Paul, (I Tim. iv. 1—3) and consider it the great apostacy. It is with deep pain that we have learnt, through the kindness of a friend, that Dr Wordsworth in a recent sermon appears to sanction this notion, from which he has shrunk in the argument of the Hulsean Lectures.

Happily it does not devolve on *us* to rebuke this teaching. It has been done already and by those who had a right to speak. Well may Archdeacon Churton term Mede's "Apostacy of the Latter Times," "a treatise, which while it has found much popular acceptance," has "singularly escaped that critical examination, which many of its positions seem greatly to require."

Next let us hear Bishop Horsley:

"In Mede's scheme of interpretation, every thing depends on the numbers, and nothing is plausible but the supputation. And that plausibility is nothing more than a delusive appearance produced by gratuitous assumptions, by irregular arbitrary applications of the prophetic images, not warranted by the usage of the prophetic style, and in many instances dependent upon facts of doubtful history, and, above all, upon *that unwarrantable, monstrous supposition, that Christian Rome is Antichrist, and all who have at any time opposed her, however wild and fanatical in their opposition, saints.*"¹

Once more yet, we turn to Dr Burton, a man not unworthy, in any respect, to be placed side by side with Mede or Dr Wordsworth.

"I ought perhaps to enter an explanation, why I do not follow the host of commentators who have referred the prophecy in 1 Tim, iv. 1, &c., and in 2 Thess. ii. 1—12 to the errors of the Church of Rome. I can only say, that *after giving the passages every consideration, I cannot see the smallest probability of this being the right interpretation.* We ought perhaps to be very cautious how we trace any illusion to the Church of Rome in the New Testament, when we find the Romanists making use of this very passage, [from Timothy] and turning it against ourselves."²

But why speak we even of a Horsley and a Burton? Mede met with his deserved reproof from a yet weightier hand of his own time. And another member of the University of

¹ Bishop Horsley, Brit. Mag. No. 34. p. 738, quoted by Churton—Memoir of Bishop Pearson, p. 63.

² Burton's Brampton Lectures, note 60, p. 436.

Cambridge saw with eagle glance the entire consequences which Mede's theory, if accepted, must necessitate. He saw that it *must* follow that the *primitive church itself* was apostate and idolatrous; that the promises of CHRIST OUR LORD had failed; that the *ancient* reverence for the mortal remains of martyrs, and the belief in the efficacy of their prayers for us, as they lay beneath the altar, was thus attacked as sinful: that—but we prefer to give the vigorous Latin of *Bishop Pearson*, from the *Concio*, of which we quoted a single paragraph in our previous argument.

“Hæc à me ideo tantùm dicta sunt, ne de promissione JESU CHRISTE, de viris apostolicorum temporum (sine quibus ne sacris quidem Scripturis jam frueremur) reliquisque primitivæ Ecclesiæ heroibus, tam malè sentiamus; ne tam fædam Ecclesiæ apostasiam, tamque idololatricam, prædicemus: Quæ, si vera sit, non tantùm ab imperii Romani dissolutione, sed ab ipsis ferè Ecclesiæ cunabulis, omnes Christianorum conventus infecit atque conspurcavit. Nam, si angelorum sanctorumque, pro nobis humi degentibus, et cum immundorum spirituum catervâ colluctantibus, omnem intercessionem intercludamus; si martyrum pro CHRISTO vitam profundentium nullam omnino apud thronum Dei potentiam agnoscamus; si omnes, qui eorum reliquias venerabantur, rejiciamus, conspuamus, et idololatras vocemus; si hæc omnia ex *‘bestiarum cornibus, ex tempore, et temporibus et dimidio temporis’* scire nor presumamus, *quænam illa unquam fuerit Ecclesia quid nos communionem habere possumus, penitus ignoro.*” . . . “Si autem illa religio, quæ totum ferè mundum sub CHRISTO jugum[47] misit, apostatica et idololatræ fuit; ubi verè Christiana, ubi Catholica, ubi Apostolica unquam apparebit?”¹

We must leave it, as we promised, to the good sense of our readers to judge which side these great men would have taken in the questions at issue between ourselves and Dr Wordsworth. In their days, be it remembered, no one doubted the identity of the man of sin with *the* Antichrist. We must once more beg to remind them of a previous citation from these Hulsean Lectures:

“If it *cannot* be proved to the satisfaction of candid, intelligent and attentive inquirers, that these prophecies have been partly fulfilled in the Church of Rome, *then assuredly there is a very strong presumption that they have not been so fulfilled.*”—p. 328.

Our opponents' case has sunk and broken down in former days: we cannot think it hazardous to predict a like fortune to it in our own. Even Mr. Stanley Faber, though inclined to look for an infidel *power* rather than a *person*,² decisively rejects the ultra-Protestant hypothesis. In our own circle of acquaintance we know of more than one, who, at first carried away by the learning, ingenuity, and high character of Dr Wordsworth, has begun to doubt and waver in his allegiance to these views. At present, we will content ourselves with but one more extract from a writer (not dull, uncandid, or unattentive), who does not appear to have had these interpretations proved to his satisfaction. Thus, in his eloquent and deeply interesting Bampton Lectures, speaks the present Archdeacon of S. Alban's concerning the Church's expectation of the future.

“Here we are met by two main ideas. The first is the prediction of the great falling off and apostacy which is to mark the last times, and which will have reached its crisis and been fully developed in the Man of Sin, when ‘the LORD shall consume him with the Spirit of His mouth, and destroy him with the brightness of His coming.’ The second is, the announcement that ‘this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world *for a witness* to all nations; and then

¹ Concio IV. ad Clerum. Minor Works, Tom. II. p. 55. The reader may see an excellent translation of most of this passage in Dr. Mill's Sermons on the Nature of Christianity. Sermon II. *ad fin.*

² Calendar of Sacred Prophecy; cited by Todd on Antichrist.

shall the end come.’ *That neither of these announcements has met with an adequate fulfilment, whatever foreshadowings have from time to time prefigured them, or however they may have seemed, at intervals, to be very nigh at hand, can hardly be doubted; and so closely are they both connected with the second coming of our LORD, that each of them has at all times attracted the expectant gaze of those who have been looking out for that solemn event.*”¹

[48]

Dr Wordsworth argues, very justly, that the identification Papal Rome with Babylon ought to annul for ever all attempts at amalgamation with any Churches of the Roman obedience. Most certainly it ought, and must, wherever it is *really* believed. But we therefore argue *è converso*, that those, who have made attempts at reconciliation, *could* not have held such a belief. This assures to our side the authority of Archbishop Wake and the famous Lutheran Syncretists, Leibnitz, Calixtus, Cassander and their followers.

There are many other great English divines, and some of them conspicuous as anti-Roman controversialists, from whose works we have never seen one syllable produced, which tends to support the theories of Dr Wordsworth. Such are Bishop Sanderson, Bishop Bull, Barrow, Bishop Jeremy Taylor.² Now that these famous men were either ignorant of these schemes of interpretation, or that, knowing would not have employed them, had they possessed the slightest confidence in their correctness, is utterly inconceivable. They did not indeed, perhaps, argue against them. It must still be owned, that the mass of the holders is *far* beyond the reach of argument. An advocate on our side can only entreat such, with the Roman bard:

“Ne mea dicta, tibi studio dispōsta fideli,
Intellecta prius quàm sint, contemta relinquant.”

While on the other hand, to many more, on our side, the whole system seems too absurd to be patiently dealt with. Many, however, probably kept silence, lest in expressing their disbelief of any charge against Rome, they might be accused, or at least suspected, of Romanising. For whatever Dr Wordsworth may allege (p. 309) about the fear of Stuart kings who were wedded to Roman Catholic princesses, having discouraged and silenced supporters of *his* view, it may safely be rejoined, that for every *one* thus kept at bay, there have been *ten* deterred by the fear of clamours like those of Exeter Hall in our own time. During the last three centuries it has daily become more natural to dread, not the *vultus instantis tyranni*, but the *civium ardor*—alas! too often—*prava jebentium*.³

Yet, of those who think that there *may be something* said in favour of regarding the Roman Church as Babylon, how few are there who do not, on some important point, clash with the positiveness and elaboration of the scheme adopted by Dr Wordsworth.[49] We take a single instance, that of a man, who is often held forth as the *princeps* of our anti-Roman writers, Archbishop Bramhall.

“They [the Protestants] have *defined nothing* concerning Antichrist; howbeit some particular persons have delivered their private opinions with confidence. The name of Antichrist is taken sometimes more largely, sometimes more strictly.”

¹ Grant’s Brampton Lectures, pp. 21, 22.

² Taylor is said, however, to have recommended the study of Bishop Andrewes’ argument. No marvel that he should shrink from *open* espousal of the cause, when his own obligations to foreigners, especially *S. Francis de Sales*, are considered.

³ Grotius and Hammon, for daring to run counter to the popular voice upon this subject, were termed by a French Protestant “the shame and reproach, not only of the Reformation, but also of the Christian name.”

Then, after maintaining that the Pope may be called *an* Antichrist, he continues:

“The name of Antichrist is sometimes used more strictly, and in a more eminent sense for *the* Antichrist; for that ‘man of sin, the son of perdition,’ mentioned in 2 Thess. ii, 3.” [N.B. Dr Wordsworth is *convinced* that the ‘man of sin’ and *the* Antichrist are quite distinct. Bramhall names those marks of the man of sin, which may suit the Pope, and then adds:] “*But it is confessed, likewise, that these marks do all agree to the Turk. So whether the one or the other, or perhaps a third, Protestants determine not; but leave private authors to their own opinions.*”¹

Again, Hales, the friend of Pearson, in a sermon on abuses of hard places of Scripture,² speaks forcibly of the danger of pressing these uncertain expositions; and among living writers, Mr. Palmer has exclaimed:

“GOD forbid that we rest our arguments against the errors of Rome on so *sandy a foundation* as these modern interpretations of the prophecies. We appeal to *facts*: we see and prove the corruptions of the eastern and western Churches; but we are not compelled to exaggerate those errors, nor forced to attribute to all alike, those superstitions which many unquestionably reject. This is one of the great evils of the systems of interpretation to which I allude. *Their tendency is to produce an exaggerated view of errors, an indiscriminate censure unsupported by fact*, in order to justify the awful sentence of damnation denounced by Scripture against those whom they identify with the visible Churches of Christendom.”³

How different is the tone assumed by Dr Wordsworth, as e.g. at page 316 of these Lectures.

To Bishop Horsley and the rest already named must be added the names of Fell, Whitby, Wells, Hammond, and Mr. Greswell, who deny that these Prophecies apply to Rome, as a Church, or to its Bishop. And on the continent there have appeared Grotius, Le Clerc, Wetstein, Rosenmuller,⁴ among Protestants; to whom we believe that we might with justice add, Puffendorf, Neander, Guizot, and many more.

[50]

Bossuet, whose strict honour in the statement of fact is unquestioned alike by his Protestant or Ultramontane adversaries, writes as follows with reference to his own sphere of place and time.

For my own part, thus much is true, that I never in my life have met with any man of good sense among our Protestants, that laid stress on this article: in sincerity, they were ashamed of so great and excess, and more in pain how to excuse the transports of their own people that introduced this prodigy into the world, than we were to impugn it. Their ablest men freed us from this labour. It is well known what the learned Grotius wrote on this subject, and how clearly he has demonstrated that the Pope should not be Antichrist. If the authority of Grotius seem not weighty enough to our Reformed, because truly this learned man, by studying carefully the Scriptures, and reading the ancient ecclesiastical authors, disabused himself by little and little of the errors he was born in, Dr Hammond, that learned Englishman, was not suspected in the part. Nevertheless, he took no less pains than Grotius to destroy the frenzies of Protestants touching the Antichristianism of the Pope.”⁵

¹ Protestants’ Ordinations Defended. Works, Vol. V. pp. 256, 257 (Ed. Angl. Cath. Library).

² Cited by Churton, Memoir of Bp. Pearson, p. lxiii.

³ Palmer, Supplement, pp. xxiii., xxiv.

⁴ Palmer of the Church, Supplement.

⁵ Variations, B. XIII. § 10.

Events have indeed occurred since the time of Bossuet, which have bestowed a momentary *éclat* upon these interpretations, over and above that attraction which *any* definite explanation of prophecy must always possess for a large class of minds, especially among those who have never heard but one view of the question. The conduct of James II. exasperated the mind of the nation into a willingness to believe every charge which could possibly be brought forward against Rome. In that day Englishmen had begun to desire the defeat of the Polish hero John Sobieski, by the Turks, lest a triumph to his arms should lend new strength to the mandates issued from the Vatican. But a dissenter, the celebrated Daniel Defoe, recalled his countrymen to a more natural and worthy state of feeling. He reminded them that the battle about to be fought under the walls of Vienna was against the common foe of all who named the name of CHRIST; and that in such case, no intensity of feeling, however provoked by the acts of a rival communion, ought to make men hush the voice of prayer and sympathy on behalf of the Champion of the Cross. About seventy years since, occurred another season well fitted for the revival of these theories; we mean the time of the Gordon riots, so graphically described by a well-known writer of fiction of the present day.¹ The preface to that tale might have been imagined to foretell the recurrence of a like display,—that long to be remembered winter of A.D. 1850—1, when the storm, originally brought down by Roman Catholics upon themselves, glided so profusely on to the necks of many of the most devoted children of the English Church.

A student of theology may well be recommended to seek the verdict of some calmer hours, and not confine his researches to [51] the statements and reasonings of one side only. Since however, the fear of being charged either with intellectual feebleness or with unsound Churchmanship, appears to frighten some readers from the study of Todd and Maitland, it is worth while mentioning, that a deceased prelate, of remarkable abilities, and very decided anti-Roman, and even anti-Tractarian bias, Bishop Copleston, declared himself so staggered at their arguments, as to withhold his own opinions on the man of sin, which he had been on the point of publishing. It is only due to these writers to reprint some of the remarks of this distinguished scholar, as contained in a letter addressed, in 1841, to his intimate friend, Archbishop Whately.

“I have resumed the publication of two anti-papal sermons, preached at Newport. I had intended to introduce my own views, generally, not critically, of the New Testament prophecies, as to the ‘man of sin’ &c.; but the reading of Todd’s Lectures, and his coadjutor’s writings in the same strain,—Maitland, of Lambeth palace—have made me pause. I should like to know what your opinion is of Todd’s view. He has certainly thrown great light upon the historical view of this question,² and has compelled me to give up the [Greek], to which we have been so long prone, *taking for granted Mede’s theory*, and looking no further back than his expositions for the principles by which to guide our opinions.

“*At first I was prejudiced against both Maitland and Todd, but a diligent perusal has satisfied me that they are both sincere and orthodox Christians, men of remarkably strong intellect, perspicuous writers, accurate and indefatigable in their researches, and acute reasoners.*”³

If Bishop Copleston cannot be claimed as a convert to the views we have been attempting to advocate, it will at least be admitted that he was on the road toward their acceptance.

¹ φ Charles Dickens in *Barnaby Rudge*.

² We have not bound ourselves to the acceptance of all Dr. Todd’s *positive* views, though perfectly agreeing with his *negative* ones; in which last he follows Maitland.

³ Memoir of Bishop Copleston, p. 172.

The thought that such a man, even under such circumstances, was compelled to pause, may perhaps induce some among his numerous admirers to do likewise.

Very observable also is the circumstance that, although these theories have flourished during some seasons of great excitement, they have *thoroughly* failed to lay hold upon the intellect of England. Her great philosopher (claimed, with reason, as the offspring of the Reformation,) Lord Bacon; her chief moralist and first political philosopher of the last century, Samuel Johnson and Edmund Burke, all employ language completely incompatible with these interpretations. And we have pulled down from the shelves of a humble private library a multitude of books with cognate passages: works of historians, as Clarendon, Robertson, Smyth, Hallam, Alison; of men of letters, as Dr Parr; of travellers, as Borrow, Ford, Laing; of writers on art, as Lord Lindsay; of poets, as [52] Crabbe and Wordsworth; of essayists, as Goldsmith, Lord Mahon, Macaulay, Sir J. Stephen; of Anglo-Americans, as Prescott and Washington Irving; or Nonconformists, as Isaac Taylor and Robert Hall; of clerical *literati*, as Dr Arnold, Mr. A. P. Stanley, Mr. Maurice, Mr. Chevenix Trench. Not *one* of these authors, it must be observed, but is quite decidedly anti-Roman in his cast of thought. Of course, it may be objected that secular authors will always adopt the world's tone, and can therefore carry no weight with religious men. Most true; but we are only mentioning these names as witnesses to *facts*; though some of them may have right to a much higher place. Had we named several among them as teachers, the objection referred to would at least come with a bad grace from any, who can venture to make appeal to the fanaticism of a Joachim, the sectarianism of the Waldenses, the somewhat lax morality of a Petrarch. We had thought of printing the passages above referred to in an appendix. As this course seems impracticable, it is only fair to give one or two specimens of what we *do* consider to be a tone incompatible with the conclusions of these lectures.

“Believing, as we may, and, to give any meaning to a large period of Church history, we must, that Papal Rome of the middle ages had a work of GOD to accomplish for the taming of a violent and brutal world, in the midst of which *she often lifted up the only voice which was any where heard in behalf of righteousness and truth*—all which we may believe, with the fullest sense that her dominion was a wicked usurpation, however overruled for good to Christendom, which could then take no higher blessing—believing this, we may freely admire these lines [of Hildebert] which so nobly tell of that true strength of spiritual power, which may be perfected in the utmost weakness of all other power.”—*Rev. R.C. Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry*, p. 163.

“Lastly, he may admit that Popes have been instruments in the hands of the Divine Ruler for bringing light, establishing, and propagating great truths; that their influence has often been exerted to distinguish truth from falsehood, what Mr. Newman would call a faithful development from a corruption; that, in the course of ages it was part of the Divine purpose, that the Latin kingdoms should exercise a very peculiar influence over the destinies of the world, and should, in an especial manner, present the form of a Christendom to the different portions of it; that the position of the Bishop of Rome did help to make the reality of a Christendom more manifest, and that he had a special, most awful, most responsible stewardship entrusted to him, *in the discharge of which, it is mere arrogance, party spirit, and contempt of history, to say he was not often in the main faithful*; a daring intrusion upon GOD'S judgment to assign, in each individual case, the limits of fidelity or infidelity. But all these admissions, so far from approaching one step towards the notion of Mr. Newman, that the true LORD delegated His developing authority, tend, far more than the opinions which I have repudiated, to set that notion utterly at naught.”—*Rev. F.D. Maurice, on Epistle to Hebrews*, preface, p. xli.

[53]

“If these slight notices of the heroes and heroines of Port-Royal (slight, indeed, when compared with the materials from which they have been drawn) should be ascribed by any one to a pen plighted to do suit and service to the cause of Rome, no surmise could be wider of the mark. No

Protestant can read the writings of the Port-Royalists themselves, without gratitude for his deliverance from the superstitions of a Church which calls herself Catholic, and boasts that she is eternal.

“But for every labour under the sun, says the Wise Man, there is a time. There is a time for bearing testimony against the errors of Rome, why not also a time for testifying to the sublime virtues with which those errors have been so often associated? *Are we for ever to admit and never to practise the duties of kindness and mutual forbearance? Does Christianity consist in a vivid perception of the faults, and an obtuse blindness to the merits, of those who differ from us?* Is charity a virtue only when we ourselves are the objects of it? . . . Amidst the shock of contending creeds, and the uproar of anathemas, good men have listened to gentler and more kindly sounds. They may have debated as polemics, but they have felt as Christians. On the universal mind of Christendom is indelibly engraven one image, towards which the eyes of every true disciple of CHRIST are more or less earnestly directed. Whoever has himself caught any resemblance, however faint and imperfect, to that divine and benignant original, has, in his measure, learnt to recognize a brother in every one in whom he can discern the same resemblance.”—*Stephen’s Essays*, vol. i. pp. 516, 17, 18.

But if we look to those, in whom these theories have taken root and shot upwards and borne fruit, the sight is indeed full of sadness and of solemn warning. Certainly, for our own part, if we believed that Rome as a Church was Babylon and its ruler the son of perdition, we should argue against safety in the English communion, which admits the validity of Roman orders; we should shun the countries where Roman rule exists; forsake the buildings wherein Roman rites had once been celebrated; strive to shut our eyes to the work of a Raphael and our ears to the strains of a Haydn; mislike antique stained glass, and in cathedrals be anxious to “break down the carved work thereof with axes and hammers.”

The best proof that such reasonings are not forced and unnatural lies in the fact, that they have often *really* followed from adoption of the premises. How full of meaning is that well-known distich, which begins with a pæan over Rome as Babylon, and concludes with the praises of an arch-heretic.

“Tota jacet *Babylon*: destruxit tecta Lutherus,
Calvinus muros, sed *fundamenta Socinus*.”¹

Martin Luther was the leading promulgator of the theory that the Pope was anti-Christ. Yes! but it seems *certain* that Luther did not believe in the Canonicity of the Apocalypse; a fact recorded by Michaelis and seized with joy by Mr. Francis Newman. Milton sung of “the triple tyrant” and the “Babylonian woe.”² True:[54] but Milton likewise taught the sleep of the soul and ended in thorough Arianism.³ David Georgius (called by his biographer, Osiander, a man of GOD and of holy life) came to the conclusion, that if the doctrine of our LORD and His Apostles had been true and perfect, the Church they founded would have still subsisted; but that since it was manifest that anti-Christ had overthrown it, it lay beyond all doubt that their doctrine was false and imperfect. Ochín, a man of solid judgment and “of greater learning than all Italy put together,” according to Calvin, thus arrived at a similar conclusion. “Considering,” said he, “on the one side, how it was possible that the Church could have been established by CHRIST, and watered with His blood; on the other, how it could be, as we see it, utterly upset by [Roman] Catholicity, I

¹ φ Trans: ‘Babylon [in this context, the Church of Rome] is completely laid low: Luther destroyed the roof, Calvin destroyed the walls and Socinus the foundations.’ Dykes often cites this line.

² φ *On the Late Massacre in Piedmont*

³ See his *De doctrinâ Christianâ*.

have concluded that he who established it could not be the SON of GOD, for His providence has evidently failed.” From these reasonings Ochin renounced Protestantism and became a Jew.¹

But we may view the matter on a larger scale. Lord Clarendon says concerning the Scotch of his day; “a great part of their religion consisted in an entire detestation of Popery, in believing the Pope to be anti-Christ, and perfectly hating the persons of all Papists.”² The English Puritans confidently affirmed, and *acted on*, a like belief. What followed, let the page of history relate. Dr Wordsworth indeed sees in these men mere fanatics, who called many primitive customs anti-Christian, and brought discredit on the cause which he espouses. Their fanaticism we grant, their individual hypocrisy must in many cases be admitted, though the lines between conscious deceit, and self deluding enthusiasm, are often very hard to draw. But these men do nevertheless, in part, extort a portion of that respect which is ever due to a determined carrying out of deep convictions. We regard the Puritans, as men who *acted* where Dr Wordsworth and others only *theorize*. And when their Scotch brethren sought to bring ancient cathedral music into dishonour, by wedding wicked songs to the old chants,³ they seem to us consistent enough as logicians, however indefensible as doers of evil that good may come.

Some may throw their lot with these Puritans, who *practised* what they held. Many others will adopt the course of accepting these interpretations as a *theory*, and belying by their actions the teaching which they *think* they hold. We submit a third course to their choice, acceptance of the primitive belief concerning antichrist, or at the least, rejection of the modern theory. In that acceptance of the one, or rejection of the other, they will be joining with a vast [55] assemblage of the wise and good in every age. With us we claim the voice of the primitive saints and doctors, Irenæus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Lactantius, Augustine, Victorinus; with us we have the brightest names of the middle ages, Venerable Bede, Aquinas, S. Bernard, S. Anselm, Haymo; with us we reckon many of the first among continental intellects, Grotius, Wetstein, Rosenmuller; with us, we believe, stand Puffendorf, Leibnitz, Lessing, Palmer, Chevenix Trench; with us are certainly Bishop Pearson, Hammond, Bishop Horsley, Doctor Burton; with us we have still Grant, Greswell, Stanley Faber, Maitland, Todd, Evans: who are they that presume to reproach us as men who speak without the sanction of authority?

There are many, many topics which we are compelled to leave untouched, although we thus leave in the hands of Dr Wordsworth some positions which seem remarkably assailable. Fain would we have spoken of his scorn of the notion, that Rome may again for a season become Pagan. One might think that he had never heard of that great neighbouring nation, which, only half a century back, openly abolished Christianity, enthroned the goddess of reason, and declared death to be an eternal sleep. One might think that he was utterly ignorant of the fact, that in the very year his Lectures were delivered, Rome did actually fall into the hands of an unbelieving ruler, Giuseppe Mazzini. Fain would we have inquired how it comes to pass that in the France of our own day, where infidelity is still so rife, there is scarcely a work of love and mercy, scarcely a book against unbelief, scarcely a fraternity or a sisterhood, but it emanates from the servants of the “man of sin.” And we had intended to show how thoroughly that *antichristian* power

¹ These last two instances are given by M. Nicholas (*Etudes Philosophiques*. Tom. iii. p. 210,11). His facts we may accept without committing ourselves to all his conclusions.

² Hist. of Rebellion. Book ii. vol. i. p. 165. (Ed. 1807).

³ See Percy’s Ballads. Preface to John Anderson.

was in that country the main stay of *Christianity*, by extracts from a very interesting “Diary in France,” which bears upon the title page the name of “Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of S. Peter’s, Westminster.”

We should further like to have examined whether this country was guilty of a great national sin, when, in March 1799 the English cruisers were appointed to watch, that they might save Pope Pius VI. from the heavy hand of Napoleon Buonaparte. We should have tried to discuss the question, how far it is lawful to trace in that marvellous conqueror the lineaments of a type of him, who is one day “to come in his own name.” We could have again called attention to the manner in which the career of that wondrous and versatile intellect destroys the entire *onus* of improbability, which before time seemed to rest upon the primitive ideas concerning Antichrist.

Lastly, we had meant to draw out *seriatim* the dangerous consequences of these theories, their tendency, to unreality if taken up and not acted on, to uncharitableness, Donatism, and fanaticism, if attempted to be realised in practice. Dr Wordsworth is indeed far above the generality of their advocates. He speaks with a sense [56] of responsibility, sadly wanting in many of his allies; he speaks, as those only can, “who have lived in good conscience before GOD; he is often elevating and sometimes even touching in his appeals. It is no doubt always charity to proclaim truth, of we feel confident in our case. But can that confidence in these interpretations be arrived at without uncharitableness? Does Dr Wordsworth so arrive at them? We cannot say that, in our judgment, he does.

But on one danger only of these theories have we space to dwell, and that is, their Romeward and Romanizing tendency. Yes! we repeat it, paradoxical as it may sound, their Romeward and Romanising tendency.

We speak of what we know. Among Dr Wordsworth’s undergraduate hearers were those, who recoiling from the shock of being told by a great Doctor that they ought, as Christians, to regard Papal Rome as Babylon and the Beast, began for the first time to think badly of their mother’s cause, if she were compelled to have recourse to such weapons. It must be ever thus in the long run. Excess will produce recoil. Men are told, as in these lectures, of tittle but the evils of Rome; they commence in time to look at nothing but her merits. She is denounced as well-nigh wholly an enemy of CHRIST, [Greek]: they become ready to accept her as represent-ative of CHRIST, [Greek]. They are reminded only of “savage and portentous confessions,”(indefensible enough, we know); they turn to an equally one-sided study of such works as those of Scupoli and Horst. They are told loudly of fierce Inquisitors; they will learn to see nothing but meek-eyed sisters of charity. “Do not treat Rome as *no Church*,” says Dr Wordsworth, in his *Theophilus Anglicanus*; “look at the use made of such speeches by Bossuet in his ‘Variations.’” Do not call Rome an antichrist, we add; look at the use made of such names, by Dr Newman, in his “CHRIST upon the Waters.”

We might show from contemporary publications that our view is gaining ground; that men feel how a leaning on such extremes is apt to beget a suspicion that they are at a loss for better supports; and drives back very many who would have listened to more reasonable controversy. But we will be content with one extract from Dr Todd. May it be found to command the attention which it deserves!

“The author of the following pages does not think so ill of the reformation, and is too deeply convinced of the truth of that Protestantism which is professed by the Church of England, to suppose for a moment that its cause can suffer anything by renouncing error or embracing truth. The real question therefore should be, not what interpretation of prophecy is most useful or effective in controversy, but what interpretation is most in accordance with the plain words of

Holy Scripture and most likely to represent exactly the mind of the HOLY GHOST. The [57] Pope-Antichrist argument is, no doubt, an effective weapon with the ignorant or weak-minded who look not beyond the surface and are led away by words rather than by things, and yet even with them the author is persuaded that such arguments have more frequently inflamed unholy passions and nurtured unchristian bigotry, than produced rational conviction grounded on a love of truth; whilst with the learned and sober-minded, the serious student of Holy Scripture and of history, *they have done more to damage the cause of Protestantism than the disputations of twenty Bellarmines.*

“Let us not suppose that the nicknames of Antichrist, or Babylon, or Man of Sin, cast upon our opponents, with rancorous acrimony, in popular invectives, can permanently advance the cause of truth; but let us ever remember, as has been well said by a learned and pious layman of our Church, that, ‘a good cause needs not be patronised by passion, but can sustain itself upon a temperate dispute.’ And in point of fact, does not experience prove that such arts of controversy have more frequently been the means of hardening against the truth the minds of many, who would perhaps have yielded to the legitimate influence of fair and sober reasoning?”¹

The defence of another Communion from charges (however *ultra modum* and untenable those charges be) carries with it its own peculiar dangers. A real desire to be just and candid towards the accused may glide into unfairness towards our own Church; may engender, at least temporarily, that spurious humility, which delights to find in her faults parallel to those of other Churches; which is quick to “speak evil of dignities,” without secret prayer for those whom it condemns.

If we have, in the spirit of opposition and from the pressure of haste, been extreme, or uncandid, or too partial, we sincerely regret it. But we cannot apologise for the temporary pain which is caused to many by the merely being asked to give up early prejudices, so far as they can be shown to be mistaken or unfounded.

“By the common cry, the common mind
Is buoyed aloft; be it not so with us:
Whatsoe’er possible evils lie before,
Let us sincerely own them to ourselves
With all unstinting, unevasive hearts;
Reposing in the consciousness of strength,
Or fervent hope to be endowed with strength
Of all-enduring temper—*daring all truth.*”²

¹ Todd on the Apocalypse. Preface, and again on page 264. We must disclaim any illusion to Dr. Wordsworth in making this citation. It is the *general* question which we have in view.

² φ Taylor, Sir H. *Isaac Commenus*, Scene V Act III.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol 15 (Joseph Masters: London, 1853)

[350] WILLIAMS AND HENGSTENBERG ON THE APOCALYPSE.

1. *The Apocalypse, with Notes and Reflections.* By the Rev. ISAAC WILLIAMS B.D.,¹ late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. London: Francis and John Rivington, 1852.
2. *The Revelation of S. John expounded for those who search the Scriptures.* By E. W. HENGSTENBERG,² Doctor and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the original by the Rev. PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, author of "Typology of Scripture," &c. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and P. Clark, 1851—2.

There are few among our readers, we apprehend, who have made the Revelation of S. John in any degree a subject of study, who will not feel the force and truth of these words of S. Jerome, "Apocalypsis Joannis tot habet Sacramenta quot verba. Parum dixi pro merito voluminis. Laus omnis inferior est: in verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiæ." And it is the existence of these "multiplices intelligentiæ" which, while it doubtless enables the humble, unlettered Christian who reads this sacred book merely for practical edification to reap therefrom a rich harvest of spiritual supplies suited to his individual

¹ φ From Jacskon, S.M (ed.) *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* Vol. 12 (Funk and Wagnalls: New York, 1909) p. 368 we learn (here précised): WILLIAMS, ISAAC: poet and harmonist; b. 12 Dec. 1802; d. 1 May 1865. Harrow and Trinity College, Oxford (B.A., 1826; M.A., 1831; fellow, 1831; B.D., 1839); deacon, 1829; curate of Windrush-cum-Sherborne; priest 1832, philosophy lecturer at Trinity College, 1832, and dean of the college, 1833; rhetoric lecturer, 1834-40; vice-president, 1840-42. Curate to Newman at St. Mary's, Oxford, and later had charge of the church at Littlemore. Curate to Keble at Bisley, 1842-48; and at Stinchcombe, 1848-65. Associated with Newman and Keble in *Lyra Apostolica* and *Tracts for the Times*, writing Tracts 80, 86, and 87. His works embrace commentaries on the Psalms, the Gospels, and the Apocalypse; and *The Cathedral, or the Catholic and the Apostolic Church of England*. In Verse (Oxford, 1838); *A Harmony of the Four Evangelists* (London, 1850); *A Short Memoir of R. A. Suckling, with Correspondence and Sermons* (1852); and many sermons, individual and in series. A writer of hymns, but none of them had great currency.

² φ From Jacskon, *op.cit.* Vol. 5 pp. 224-225 we learn (again précised) : HENGSTENBERG, ERNST WILHELM: German Protestant exegete; b. the son of a Lutheran clergyman 20 Oct 1802; d. 28 May 1869. In 1819 he entered the University of Bonn, studying OT exegesis and church history, classical philology, Aristotelian philosophy and Arabic. The results of his philosophical studies were embodied in a German translation of the metaphysics of Aristotle, and from his Arabic studies he obtained his doctorate.

He took his baccalaureate in theology in 1825, his thesis embodying a defence of the truth of Protestantism and a criticism of rationalism, especially on OT problems. As head of the seminar of OT studies his activity and his reputation increased, albeit that the vigour of his orthodoxy earned him the dislike of the authorities. In 1827 he became editor of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, a medium through which he was to exercise a wider and deeper influence on the religious life of his age than through his strictly academic labours.

Hengstenberg entered on a task that he was to carry on, despite discouragement, for forty-two years, earning for himself opposition and enmity, ridicule and slander, open and secret denunciation. "The opinion of the world during the last forty years has associated with Hengstenberg's name all that it finds condemnatory in the revival of a former faith—Pietism, a dead orthodoxy, obscurantism, fanaticism, Jesuitism, sympathy with every influence for retrogression" (Kahnis). However, *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* remained steadfast in the pursuit of its great mission—the combating of rationalism. It was not content to assail rationalism as an abstract system, but attacked its tendencies in whatever individual form it manifested itself. Its quarrel was with all who assailed or denied the divinity of Christ, exalted matter and the flesh, or paid undue worship to human reason. Against error in its manifold forms it upheld the standard that the Church of all ages has upheld against error and recusancy—the word of God and the creed of the Church.

needs; while it also furnishes the superficial expositor with an *apparent* solution of many of its “hard sayings,” and affords standing-room for the daily-increasing company of major and minor prophets who are ever and anon perplexing the world with their confident and conflicting vaticinations;—yet it is this, we say, which is one of the chief sources of the difficulty attending the interpretation of this marvellous book.

To discover, in so far as such discovery is possible, what is the *primary* bearing and scope of its successive visions; to discriminate between what is literal and what purely symbolical, and where the two combine, to separate clearly the border territory of *adaptation*, from the region of legitimate interpretation;—here are, and here ever have been, some of the great difficulties in which its exposition is involved.

And hence too, in a measure, arises the infinite importance that the student who would really arrive at a knowledge of the book itself, and sound its mystic depths, should primarily seek to fix its sacred imagery and interpret its symbols by the sure light of Holy Scripture, and not by the thousand fitful and illusive gleams thrown back upon them by the histories of the world.¹ [351] Not that we would be understood in the least to deprecate the humble study of the world’s history as a useful auxiliary to the understanding of the Apocalypse, or the reverent endeavour to trace out some of the images, more or less indistinct, projected by its deep and mysterious predictions upon the world’s canvas,—far from it. Nay, we think such a study, if carried on in a devout and humble spirit, interesting and instructive to a degree. But what we chiefly complain of in so many of our modern Apocalyptic expositors, is this,—that they seem to elevate history from its subordinate position, and impose upon it functions which it is utterly unable to discharge; forcing it whether it will or not, to unlock all the mysteries of prophecy. And hence the melancholy failures which follow their attempts.

It is, indeed, most sad to see this divine book, this “Holy of Holies,” as it has been called, of the Word of God, converted into a dry historical and arithmetical puzzle, nay, still worse, to find it stripped of its glory, bound in fetters, and constrained to serve as the miserable slave of near-sighted and uncharitable prejudices! And yet it requires but a very moderate acquaintance with our multitudinous modern expositions, to evidence how much this is the case. It would be endless to give examples. Historical failures are pardonable; but let a single example serve as an illustration how this holy book may be degraded to be the minister of party prejudice.

All our readers will have heard of, many, perhaps, will have read, Mr. Elliott’s laborious and learned work, “*Horæ Apocalypticæ*,” and none are more willing than ourselves to testify to the vast amount of painstaking research of which it everywhere gives evidence. But how melancholy it is to see a work, in many respects so valuable, yet so incurably disfigured with this near-sighted prejudice. Conceive an English Clergyman, a man, too, of undoubted learning and piety, seriously endeavouring to demonstrate that the great Church revival which, through the unmerited mercy of a gracious God, has been for many years, and still is taking place amongst us, is predicted in the Apocalypse, and alluded to by the inspired seer under the figure of “*one of the unclean spirits like frogs*,” which were

¹ Mr. Williams remarks: “S. John looked to the countenance of his Divine Teacher, did not cast it down to the historical developments below—his interpreter must do the same. The knowledge of the Blessed is said to consist in reading all external events of the world in the vision of God. It is in gazing into His Holy Scriptures, not in the histories of the world, that men become divinely wise. The attitude of the learner must ever be that of one looking as for the morning watch, looking for what God may do, listening to hear what God will say.”—(Preface, p. ix.)

seen issuing from the mouths of the Dragon and the Beast, and the False Prophet (ch. xvi. 13, 14.) And yet Mr. Elliott positively endeavours to demonstrate this, and at some length too. We are glad, for his sake, that he was not the author of this edifying interpretation. The honour of parentage is due to the good Mr. Bickersteth. Mr. Elliott, however, adopts it with great satisfaction. After demonstrating that Infidelity and Popery are the [352] first and second respectively of these evil spirits, he arrives at the third, namely, the spirit from the mouth of the False Prophet: and thus solemnly commences:—

“The warning cry of a watchman of our Israel . . . has been lately heard to denounce the modern *Oxford Tractarianism* as, in part, the *very voice* of the False Prophet in the text. Can this be the case? Is it really the *voice of the unclean spirit Apocalyptically prefigured as issuing like a frog out of the mouth of the False Prophet* that has been *resounding* these last eight or ten years from the banks of the Isis?

“This is a grave question. Certainly,” &c.,¹

He then proceeds to prove his point; and after adducing many ingenious and instructive parallels between Tractarianism and a frog, showing, among other things that—

“Its mode of speech and action has well answered to the symbol of a frog . . . its unceasing emissions of *voice* in conversational or more formal discourses,—from the pulpit and from the press; in tracts, sermons, essays, reviews, romances, novels, poems, children’s books, newspapers; in music too, and paintings, and *church decoration*, (!) and architecture (e.g. the Camden Architectural Society, at Cambridge,)” &c., &c.

with a great many more equally obvious parallels,² he concludes—

“So the parallel between the spirit of the modern *Oxford Tractarianism*, . . . and the spirit prefigured to S. John as *going forth like a frog* from the mouth of the *False Prophet*, has been made out, as I think, *clearly and completely*.”—Hor. Apoc., pp. 1226—1242, 1st ed.

Now, all this would be very ridiculous, if the subject were not really far too solemn for merriment. So long as expositors approach this book with minds darkened by prejudice, expecting to discover in its sacred depths but the imaged reflection of their own vain imaginings,—their own likes and dislikes,—it is hopeless to expect that any real advance will be made towards fixing its interpretation.

Leaving out of consideration, however, interpretations of this kind, and coming to the more general questions of Apocalyptic exegesis, we are free to confess that our objections to the generality of our modern expositions are rather of a negative than a positive kind, and are grounded not so much on what they severally admit, as on what they deny.

[353]

There are, as all our readers know, three great classes of interpreters,—the Preterists, the Presentists, and the Futurists,—each maintaining that themselves alone are right, and their brethren necessarily in error: the first asserting that the great bulk of the Apocalyptic predictions have already received their accomplishment; the second proving incontrovertibly that they are now in course of fulfilment; and the third contending that they are still future. Now, our own opinion with regard to these three schools has always

¹ φ The emphases in this and the following quotations from Elliott are Dykes’s.

² The method in which Mr. Elliott seeks to establish the parallel between Tractarianism and another feature of these unclean spirits, (viz. when it is said that they are “the *spirits of Devils working miracles*”) reminds us—we say it in all sober seriousness—of nothing else save S. Matt. xii. 24—31. It is unnecessary to say more than that Mr. Elliott’s awful parallel is grounded upon the words of our LORD: “Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go to the FATHER;” and on the fact of the Church’s faith that in Baptism and the Holy Eucharist there is some *real* work effected. (Ib. p. 1233.)

been, that so far as their positive statements respectively extend, they have each of them a certain amount of truth on their side, but that in their negative statements they all alike fail; in fact, that, to a certain extent, all are right, and all are wrong.

That S. John, writing, as he did, in the time of a bloody, persecution,¹ himself an exile on the lonely isle of Patmos, “for the Word of GOD, and the testimony of JESUS CHRIST,” should be inspired by the HOLY GHOST to write a book for the benefit of the Church, in which his suffering brethren should be well-nigh forgotten, and the infant Church of his own day, struggling as though for very life, should be overlooked, and the consolations and warnings all reserved for a future age,—is what an examination of every other prophetic book in the sacred Canon absolutely forbids us to imagine.

But again: that S. John should be inspired to write a prophetic book, the only one in the New Testament Canon, addressed to the “Holy Church throughout the world,”² which was only intended for the guidance of the Christians of his own, or immediately succeeding generations, and was in no way designed to throw light on the several crises which might arise in the subsequent history of the Church,—this is what we can still less bring ourselves to believe.

Now far be it from us to attribute any vagueness or aimless generality to the Divine predictions. What we are anxious to maintain is their comprehensive character—looking not merely in one direction, but behind, before, and around. The truth, we feel convinced, is that they have different stages of fulfilment, progressive developments. “It is the Divine custom,” says Mr. Williams, “to combine literal and spiritual meanings, and to intend by the same words successive fulfilments. For judgment moves cycle on [354] epicycle—thus sending warning shadows before, that wisdom may teach through analogy.” (p. 108.)

If any feel disposed to question the comprehensive character of the Divine predictions, we would beg them to turn for a single moment to one of the earliest, recorded in the Old Testament. “GOD shall enlarge Japhet and (He) shall dwell in the tents of Shem,” Gen. ix. 27, (where the intentional ambiguity as to the subject of the verb “shall dwell,” whether “GOD” or “Japhet” must be noticed,) and we would merely ask when did this passage receive its accomplishment,—nay, has its deep meaning yet been exhausted? Will it ever wholly be until “the Tabernacle of GOD is with men and He shall dwell among them, and GOD shall wipe away all tears from their eyes”?

In further illustration of the comprehensive character of the Scripture prophecies, we have but to refer to any of those passages in the New Testament wherein the accomplishment of an Old Testament prediction is noticed, and in almost all these cases we shall feel morally certain that the fulfilment there announced is not the only one, nay, not even the *primary* one, but merely *a* fulfilment, *an* historical reflection, as it were, of the Divine saying. So that in almost every case the words [Greek] should be rendered “then did that receive *a* fulfilment which was spoken,” &c., &c.

And so too with many of those great Apocalyptic symbols which have given rise to so much controversy and angry altercation. The most that a modest interpreter will feel

¹ Hengstenberg has an admirable section (pp. 1—36) on “the time of writing the Revelation” in which he establishes most conclusively the truth of the general Church tradition, that Domitian was the author of S. John’s banishment—and that the Revelation was written during the time of a bloody persecution, the *first* regularly organized one which extended *all over Christendom*, (that which took place in Nero’s time was confined to Rome) and which shortly preceded the death of Domitian

² “*Septem Ecclesiis*”. (cap. i. 4) “per has septem Ecclesias *omni Ecclesiæ* scribit. Solet enim universitas septenario numero designari, quod septem diebus cunctum hoc seculi tempus evolatur.”—(Beda in loc.)

disposed to say in offering a suggestion for the interpretation of any of them (we allude to any *historical* interpretation) will be that such and such an event appears to be *an* accomplishment of the prophecy, *one* of the shadows cast by it.

Take, for instance, the prophecies which have caused so much discussion between Romanist and Protestant writers, between the schools of Bossuet and Mede. We allude chiefly to those which relate to the Beast from the sea, and the Harlot Babylon.

They refer to the Papacy and the Church of Rome, say the one party. Nothing of the kind, rejoin the other, the thing is impossible; they evidently refer, and refer exclusively to the Roman Empire and the heathen city of Rome.

Now without giving an opinion at present as to which party appears to have the *best* of the argument, all we can say is that it is manifest at the very outset that neither of them has the *whole* truth with it, and that the predictions have a wider scope, and a more comprehensive grasp than either is disposed to admit. We are emphatically told with regard to the Beast, (and the statement is reiterated) that "*all who dwell on the earth whose names are not written in the book of life shall worship him,*" (ch. xiii. 8.) and with regard to the Harlot Babylon that "in her was found the blood of [355] *all* who were slain on the earth." (xviii, 24.) We maintain then that the œcumenical character which is thus seen to attach to these predictions, prohibits our *limiting* them to any *one* historical realization; and that, however we may see strange lights cast by them upon events of passing or past history, yet we are not justified in confining their range within arbitrary or circumscribed limits.

The two works which form the heading of this article are in a great measure free from the faults to which we have alluded, and in so far we give them our cordial approbation. Mr. Williams' work we have read throughout with very great gratification; and, without professing to agree with him in every minor point of his exposition, we yet have no hesitation in saying that we have met with no exposition of the Apocalypse with which we feel to agree so thoroughly. It is quite refreshing to meet with a work on this sacred subject free from controversy and party prejudice, and breathing throughout such a spirit of real Christian love and of such deep unaffected humility. The general aim of the Exposition is practical and devotional, and on that account we may devoutly trust that it will be a means of inducing many a humble Christian who has hitherto shrunk from it, from feelings of awe perhaps, or it may be, dread of finding himself upon this great controversial arena, to study its "Blessed"¹ contents. And whatever speculative difference he may have on minor points, with the writer, we can promise him that he will be amply repaid by its perusal.

"Nothing," says Mr. Williams, "appears so much to be apprehended and avoided as any mode of interpretation which will put it far from ourselves. The fact that any line of exposition does not tend to Practical edification is, to the writer's mind, a strong argument against its truth. It is not the guidance intended. * * *

"Wrong, therefore, as many of the points maintained in this volume doubtless are, yet the writer is of this most fully convinced, that in this direction alone the truth is to be found, viz., when the interpretation is made a matter for 'instructing in righteousness,' warning, and comfort; that every Christian is bound to make the Apocalypse a subject of study; and richly indeed, by GOD'S mercy, would these labours be crowned, if the writer could but instil into others one spark of that love which he entertains for this most Divine book."—*Preface*,

¹ *Vide Rev. i. 3.*

The work of Professor Hengstenberg is one of greater pretensions than that of Mr. Williams, containing nearly one thousand pages of closely printed 8vo. It is undoubtedly a very valuable work and one likely to prove of eminent service to the critical student of the Apocalypse. Though many will consider his exposition unsatisfactory in certain points (some of which we shall have occasion to notice) yet few will deny it to be a great advance on the ordinary run of Apocalyptic commentaries. From his very careful [356] and critical examination of the text and from the immense amount of Biblical illustration which he brings to bear upon it, tracing almost each several clause to its “fundamental” passages in the Old Testament, his work must ever continue one of great value.

A writer so well known in the Theological world as a man of deep piety, a profound student as well as voluminous expositor of Holy Writ, he is in many points eminently fitted for a task which he has, on the whole, admirably performed.

The portion of his work in which we feel ourselves the least able to coincide with him is that wherein he treats of the first resurrection, and the thousand years’ reign (vol. ii. pp. 271—298.)

Rejecting alike the theory of the modern (as well as the ancient) Chiliasts, and also the more sober Church theory, he propounds a theory, and maintains it with considerable earnestness, which to ourselves, at least, is perfectly novel. He argues that the millennium is now past; that it commenced on or about the first Christmas Eve of the year 800, “the day of the inauguration of the Western Christian empire, when the Pope placed the crown on the head of Charlemagne, and the joyful proclamation sounded forth, ‘To Charles Augustus, crowned by GOD, the great and peaceful Roman Emperor, life and victory.’” (p 275.) He, of course admits that the beginning and end of the space bear somewhat of a floating character, and that it is not possible to point them out with precision, so that we must satisfy ourselves with a period which *nearly* corresponds to it.

Writing as he does in the eventful year 1848, he fancies (and not without some show of reason) that he sees evident indications of Satan having been loosed from his stronghold, and having, gone forth to seduce the nations.

But here is one of the evil effects of reading prophecy in the light of the history of our own time rather than in that of Holy Scripture. Moreover it appears evident that our author has mainly adopted this view because it enables him thereby to settle the other portions of his hermeneutic scheme. This passage has had to bend to his system of interpretation, not his system of interpretation to this passage.

The great fault of a view of this kind is its excessive vagueness and the absolute uncertainty which it tends to produce, whether Holy Scripture really means anything or not.

Now, in the Church’s mode of interpreting this passage, (Rev. xx. 1—6,)—we mean that advocated at length by S. Augustine, in the *De Civ. Dei*, lib. xx. cap. 6, sqq., which entirely superseded the ancient Chiliast view, and has been followed by the great bulk of the Church expositors, we have at least Scripture ground to stand upon for every part of the explanation.

The great angel (xx, 1,) who holds the key of the abyss, is evidently CHRIST, “The Angel of the Covenant,” Who hath the keys [357] of Death and Hell. And the *binding* of the Devil with “the great chain,” which He effects, is manifestly that which our LORD Himself refers to, when He says, in allusion to His Incarnation, “No man can enter into a strong man’s house and spoil his goods, except he first *bind* the strong man, and then will he spoil his goods” (S. Mark iii. 27,) “signifying the *Devil* by the *strong man*,” adds S. Augustine,

“quia ipse genus humanum potuit tenere captivum;” and by “*his goods*,” “fideles suos futuros, quos ille in diversis peccatis atque impietatibus possidebat.” The “*binding*,” he¹ thus explains; “ejus potestatem ab eis seducendis ac possidendis, qui fuerant liberandi, cohibuit atque frænavit” (ib. lib. xx. cap. 7.) By “the *abyss*” into which Satan is cast, he understands “multitudo innumerabilis impiorum . . . non quia ibi Diabolus ante non erat, sed ideo dicitur illuc missus, quia exclusus à credentibus plus cœpit impios possidere.”

This last, perhaps, hardly gives the *whole* meaning of the expression.² But the other parts of the prophecy also seem capable of a most satisfactory solution, if we only take Scripture for our guide. Let us but bear in mind what this book—more, perhaps, than any other in the Canon—presses by every conceivable form of expression upon us,—the absolute *oneness* between CHRIST and His people, and all becomes clear.

The prophet Isaiah beholds Zion travailing, and giving birth to a “*man-child*.” But in the very next verse, the “*man-child*,” the type of CHRIST, is explained by the plural “*children*” (Isa. lxvi. 7, 8.)

So S. John (Rev. xii.) sees this same “*woman*” and the same birth of the “*man-child*,” which the context equally shows to signify, not the Man CHRIST JESUS alone, but His mystical Body, the Church. So that the *man-child* who, in ch. xii., is caught up to GOD’S “*throne*,” corresponds to the *children* who, in ch. xx., are seen sitting on “*thrones*,” of whom our LORD elsewhere speaks. “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*” (S. Luke xxii. 29.) And with regard to what is said of the *man-child*, (ch. xii. 5,) that “he was to *rule* all nations *with a rod of iron*,” this is precisely what is said respecting [358] Christ’s people, “those who overcome and keep His word,” namely, that they shall “have power over the nations,” and shall *rule* them *with a rod of iron, even as* I received of My Father” (ii. 26.) “Thou *hast* made us *kings* and priests, and we shall *reign* on the earth.”

And with regard to the other expression “*they lived*” (“they lived and reigned with Christ,” xx. 4.) It has already been explained, and by our Lord Himself in those profound and blessed words, “He that believeth on the Son *hath* everlasting *Life*, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is* passed from death unto *Life*.” “Whosoever liveth and believeth on Me shall *never die*.” We feel persuaded that it is mainly from the low and unscriptural view which is taken of the blessings of the regenerate state that this, the Catholic view of this striking passage has been so very generally rejected. Men have been saying “Lo, here,” and “Lo, there,” merely because they disbelieved Christ’s word that “the kingdom of Heaven was within them.”

¹ “Alligatio diaboli, est non permitti exercere totam tentationem.”—De C. D. xx. 8.

² “Alligatio diaboli secundum litteram intelligenda est, ut in aliquo abyssi loco, vel in Profundo inferorum, virtute divinâ, religatus teneatur usque ad tempus Anti-christi, quo solvetur et maximè sæviet in sanctos. Aliqui interpretantur non de omnibus dæmonibus, sed de Sathana principe dæmonum, qui ita in infernum detrusus est, ut inde exire non possit, neque homines per se ipsum tentare. Ita exposuit Gregorius, lib. 4, Moral. cap. 13. Si id exponamus de universo dæmonum imperio, intelligendum est eo sensu dæmonem fuisse ligatum ut non possit ad tentandos homines ex abyssu exire nisi permittente angelo, eum ligavit, i. e. Christo. Unde fit ut neque in hoc mundo tam liberè regnet sicut antea, neque tam acriter possit homines tentare ac seducere, ut ligare dæmonem sit ejus coercere ac cohibere potestatem.”—L. Cequæi Comm in lib. xx. S. Aug. de Civ. Dei, cap. 7.

It is most worthy of notice how entirely the death of the body is overlooked in this passage. It is in fact no *death*, but merely a transition to a higher stage of development of the resurrection Life. For these who are here represented as “living and reigning with Christ” are, evidently, as well those in the body as those who are out of the body; they consist as well of “those who have been smitten with the axe” ([Greek]) as of those who have continued firm in their allegiance to Christ, who have resisted the seductions of “the Beast and his Image,” and thus have not fallen from those “heavenly places” to which they had been raised by Christ and from which Satan had been expelled.¹

It is but fair to state that Hengstenberg considers the first part of the 20th chapter as chronologically subsequent to the close of the 19th, and thus is compelled to look out for an historical realization of the contents of the former passage, *after* the final discomfiture of the Beast which is described in the latter. The “Beats” he considers to be the whole state of heathendom, and the “kings of the earth with their armies” (ch. xix. 19) to be the ten horns on its seventh head, and so to correspond with the last phase of the God-opposing principle; with whose extinction, which was effected [359] “partly through the peaceful mission of the Church (xvii. 14), partly through severe judgments of God” (xix. 11—21) he considers the dominion of the world to have been broken, and the Beast, whose last instruments these kings were, to have retired from the stage. (Hengst. vol. ii. p. 272.) So that the Church was left for the space of a thousand years to enjoy a peaceful and undisturbed reign. But just at the threshold of this millenary period he conceives that “those who had departed earlier whether by martyrdom or a common death, if only they died in the Lord, are *represented*” (?) by S. John “as solemnly inaugurated in their possession of the heavenly inheritance.”

Our readers we feel convinced will agree with us that this *ideal* inauguration to a kingdom is very unsatisfactory. If we forsake the landmarks which Holy Scripture affords us in our prophetic investigations, we shall soon find ourselves lost in the intricate mazes of profitless speculation.

Two resurrections, and two only, are spoken of in Holy Scripture: the first, when we are made members of Him who is “the Resurrection and the Life”; which resurrection, with its inestimable privileges and dread consequent responsibilities, is perpetually employed by S. Paul as the ground of his practical exhortations to holiness of life. “*We are, now, risen with Christ,*” “our life is hid with Christ in God.” “*We are come to Mount Sion.*” GOD “*hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.*” He “*hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of His dear Son.*”

Now surely if words mean anything, the regenerate state is here represented as a resurrection. But Holy Scripture speaks of *none other* save the “general resurrection at the last day.” Therefore the expression “the first resurrection” would undoubtedly seem to

¹ Mr. Williams thus beautifully alludes to the expression “they lived.” He tells us that in this passage there is no mention made of *death*, and that it is only afterwards that any notice of death occurs; “I saw the *dead.*” “But here,” writes Mr. Williams, “it is not the dead, but *the souls*’ of the living; of those who are not dead, and cannot die, although *smitten by the axe.* Scripture avoids, in a remarkable manner, applying the word *death* to the departure of the good: ‘Lazarus sleepeth;’ ‘the maid is not dead, but sleepeth;’ ‘they that sleep in Jesus;’ or that ‘depart hence in the Lord.’ It is ‘to depart and be with Christ which is far better.’ And it may be observed that S. John avoids saying ‘lived again;’ it is ‘lived’ with Christ. He says not of them [Greek], but [Greek]. ‘He that believeth on me shall never die.’ Here on earth their ‘life is hid with Christ in God;’ and though *smitten with the axe,* yet safe in that better life they die not.

refer *as plainly* to our salvation from our first death (the death entailed upon us at our birth) as the “second resurrection,” to our salvation from the “second death.”¹

With regard to the expression “the thousand years,” it will obviously be merely a definite number put for an indefinite—the day of grace; the day of the Lord, which is as a thousand years. “Mille annos pro annis omnibus hujus seculi posuit ut perfecto numero notaretur ipsa temporis plenitudo. Millenarius enim numerus denarii numeri quadratum solidum reddit.” (C.D. xx. 7.)²

[360]

The verse “But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished” (v. 5) is thus explained by S. Augustine.

“*Reliqui eorum non vixerunt.* Mora enim non est cum mortui audient vocem Filii DEI, et qui audierint, vivent, (Joan. 5.) *reliqui* verum *eorum non vivent.* Quid veto subdidit, *donec finientur mille anni*, intelligendum est, quod eo tempore non vixerunt, quo vivere debuerunt, ad vitam scilicet de morte transeundo. Et ideo cum dies venerit quo fiat et corporum resurrectio, non ad vitam de monumentis procedent, sed ad iudicium: ad damnationem scilicet, quæ secunda mors dicitur. *Donec enim finiantur mille anni* quicumque non vixerit, id est, isto toto tempore quo agitur prima resurrectio non audierit vocem Filii DEI, et ad vitam de morte non transierit; profectò in secundâ resurrectione, quæ carnis est, in mortem secundam cum ipsâ came transibit.”—*Ibid.* c. 9.³

Mr. Williams is very satisfactory on this millenarian question; he follows, in the main, the view we have briefly sketched out; supposing that Chap. xx. is one of the numerous recapitulations which all admit to be of frequent occurrence in this book, and maintaining as he says, “with S. Augustine, Tichonius, Andreas, S. Gregory, Primasius, Bede, Cornelius à Lapide, that the binding of Satan is from our LORD’S incarnation.” (p. 410.)⁴

His chapter on the loosing of Satan for the little season (pp. 414—428) is most deeply interesting and suggestive. But we must hasten on to some other portions of the works before us.

Few questions can be more interesting than that relating to the four mysterious “living creatures” seen by S. John “in the midst of the throne and round about the throne.” (ch. iv. 6—8.)⁵

¹ “Sicut ergo duæ sunt regenerationes, una secundum fidera quæ nunc fit baptismum: alia secundum carnem quæ fiet in ejus incorruptione atque immortalitate per iudicium magnum atque novissimum: Ita sunt et resurrectiones duæ; una prima, quæ et nunc est, et animarum est, quæ venire non permittit in mortem secundam: alia secunda, quæ nunc non est, sed in seculi fine futura est: nec animarum, sed corporum est, quæ per ultimum iudicium alias mittit in secundam mortem, alios in eam vitam, quæ non habet mortem.”—(De C. D. xx. 6.)

² We feel surprised that Hengstenberg, who throughout maintains the symbolical character of the Apocalyptic numbers, should, almost in this solitary case, have maintained, and apparently on the slenderest grounds, a literal meaning. We will advert to this interesting question of numbers by and by.

³ Mr. Williams takes a different view from this of S. Augustine, of the meaning of the expression, “*the rest of the dead* lived not.” He rather inclines to the notion that they are the *Old Testament saints* who had been previously mentioned under the fifth seal, (who are there spoken of as having died “for the word of God,” but *not* “for the testimony of Jesus,”) and who are there told that they are to “rest for a little season till their brethren should be fulfilled.” (Ch. vi. 11.)—*Vide Williams*, pp. 99—101; and 436—7. The view is certainly most worthy of consideration.

⁴ Dr. Wordsworth advocates the same mode of interpretation, with great eloquence and force, in his Lectures on the Apocalypse.

⁵ Hengstenberg notices the very striking recurrence of the number *three* in the description of the [Greek].

[361]

What is the precise import of these remarkable symbols?

We often hear them explained as being certain Angelic manifestations. Hengstenberg considers them to be “a representation of living beings, of all that is living on the earth,” (vol. i. p. 212) “a concentration of created life,” (ib. p. 218) a kind of epitome of the whole animal creation.

But all such hypotheses are proved to be absolutely untenable by this simple fact, that *these cherubic figures are represented as giving thanks for redemption*. “*Thou hast redeemed us*” is the joint song of themselves and the twenty-four elders “out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and made us to our GOD kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.”¹ (ch. v. 9, 10.)

Now the first thing here to be noticed is the well-nigh universal, Catholic tradition which connects these [Greek] in *some* way with the four Evangelists, or four Gospels. Hengstenberg, after giving *his* interpretation, merely alludes to this Catholic interpretation for the purpose of informing us that “all such notions are exploded,” that “besides being untenable in themselves, they are quite unsuitable here,” that it is entirely out of date to attempt any revival of them now, (Hengst. i. 214.) Now compare with this, what Mr. Williams says (p. 67). He refers to the Catholic interpretation and simply adds, that *this* therefore “must be taken as the basis of all other interpretations or co-ordinate with them.” And most significant and beautiful do these Divine emblems become when we arrive at their full import.

For what do we mean when we identify these [Greek] with the four Gospels, or the four Evangelists?

<p>“And the four Beasts saying</p> <p>And when those Beasts give The four-and-twenty elders &c.</p> <p>Saying, Thou are worthy to receive For</p>	<p><i>had each six wings</i> and <i>were full of eyes;</i> and <i>rest not;</i> &c.</p> <p><i>Holy;</i> LORD; <i>which was;</i></p> <p><i>Glory;</i> <i>fall down, &c.;</i></p> <p><i>Glory;</i> <i>Thou hast created, &c.</i></p>	<p>and <i>were full of eyes;</i> and <i>rest not;</i> &c.</p> <p><i>Holy;</i> GOD; <i>and is;</i></p> <p><i>and Honour;</i> <i>and worship, &c.</i></p> <p><i>and Honour;</i> <i>and for Thy pleasure they are;</i></p>
		<p><i>Holy;</i> ALMIGHTY; <i>and is to come;</i> <i>and thanks to Him, &c.</i> <i>and cast their crowns,</i> <i>and Power;</i> <i>and were created.”</i></p>

—(Ch. iv. 8—11.)

An *eight-fold three*. How, even the very language itself strives, as it were, to give testimony to the fact that we are here very near that abyss of light unapproachable which shrouds the tabernacle of the Holy, Blessed, and GLORIOUS TRINITY!

We have an intimation of the same kind shortly afterwards, (ch. vii. 15—17) where, as Hengstenberg notices, the blessedness of the redeemed is described in a *three-fold three*.

<i>They are before the throne;</i>	<i>they serve;</i>	<i>they are tented;</i>
<i>They hunger not;</i>	<i>they thirst not;</i>	<i>they suffer no heat;</i>
<i>The LAMB feeds them;</i>	<i>and leads them;</i>	<i>and wipes away their tears.”</i>

But examples of this kind are of frequent occurrence in the Apocalypse.

¹ Hengstenberg endeavours to evade the force of this argument by the unwarranted assertion that it is only the twenty-four elders who sing this song. Corn. à Lapidé who seems to consider the four [Greek] to be the “*quatuor Angelos Primarios,*” meets this difficulty quite as unsatisfactorily.

We cannot mean that they are merely the Gospels *themselves*, for the [Greek] give thanks for *redemption*. Nor merely the four *personal* Evangelists.¹ For they have been redeemed out of “every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.”

But what are the Evangelists? and what are the Gospels?

[362]

They are the narrators, and the records, respectively, of the *life of CHRIST*, the delineators of *His* perfect, four-sided² character; and thus, as describing the several aspects or features of *His* character they necessarily describe the character of *His people*, who are “complete in Him,” “created after His Image,” and gathered from the east, and from the west, and from the north, and from the south.

We may perhaps be pardoned, if we add a few words on the question of the *appropriation* of these four emblems. Let us, however, assure our readers that we have not the remotest wish to press our view upon others, especially as we feel ourselves in a great minority. Still we feel the less reluctance in venturing what, after all, is offered but as an opinion, because there is really *no* definite or consistent tradition on the subject.³ And the commonly received tradition, which assigns the man to S. Matthew, the lion to S. Mark, the ox to S. Luke, and the eagle to S. John, has not much more claim, on the ground of real Catholic tradition, than others,⁴ and, we venture to add, has little internal consistency to recommend it.

For ourselves we confess that we have always been disposed to connect the four symbols with the four Evangelists *exactly in the order* in which they occur in S. John’s description. And thus to identify the lion, the bullock, the man, and the eagle, with S. Matthew, S. Mark, S. Luke, and S. John respectively.

Now passing over the *primâ facie* argument which *the order in which S. John mentions them* presents to us, and we can by no means deem it unworthy of notice,⁵—we beg to ask one question. Which is pre-eminently the *Royal Gospel*, the Gospel wherein our LORD is more peculiarly identified with the *Kingly* “*Lion of the tribe of Judah*”? And we feel convinced that there is not one of our readers who will not answer with S. Augustine, and say the Gospel of *S. Matthew*, “*qui Regiæ dignitatis in Christo, prosapiam narrat qui et ‘vicit Leo de tribu Judæ;’ ‘Catulus’ enim ‘Leonis Juda;’*” “*Et in quo ut Rex à Rege timetur, à Magis adoratur,*” (Bede in loc.); S. Matthew, who wrote his Gospel first in Judæa, and for the use of Jewish converts, who throughout connects the Gospel with the theocratic glories of the typical kingdom, who, throughout, speaks of our LORD as of the Royal line of David, as the great [363] Lawgiver, and Prophet, the *Kingly MESSIAH* to whom the Old Testament, Scriptures give ceaseless testimony.

¹ Corn. à Lapede argues against the Evangelical allusion, solely on the ground of the four personal Evangelists being supposed to be referred to.

² So [Greek]. The square being a symbol of completeness.

³ Suicer says that ancient writers “in assignandis Evangelistis animalibus *mirè variant.*” (voce [Greek]).

⁴ “Ex his igitur patet veteres Matthæo hominem; Marco aquilam; Lucæ vitulum; Johanni Leonem tribuisse.”—(Suicer. voce [Greek].)

⁵ We believe that our present tradition had its origin solely in the fact that Ezekiel, in his description of the cherubim (which, we must bear in mind, differ in important respects from the [Greek] of S. John) mentions the four beasts in this order: the man, the lion, the bullock, and the eagle, and that thus these emblems gradually became associated with the four Evangelists in *the same order*, an appropriation which S. John’s altered arrangement did not disturb.

Still less can we doubt the answer, if we ask another question.

Which is pre-eminently the *Human Gospel*? Which Gospel does more particularly represent our LORD as the “*Son of Man*”?

That *this* is the, distinctive character of S. Luke’s Gospel, none can fail to see.

In S. Matthew, CHRIST is the Son of David, the Son of Abraham. In S. Matthew, the Birth of JESUS is connected with national glories. In S. Luke, with pious hopes, “with a recital of the acts of GOD’S mercy to the just and prayerful, and his grace to the holy and believing.” In S. Matthew we read of the Incarnation as it was revealed to Joseph, a type of the ancient people. In S. Luke, to the Blessed Virgin, the type of the Christian Church. In S. Matthew, the Magi. offer adoration to the new-born *King*. In S. Luke, the humble shepherds proclaim with praises the SAVIOUR of the ‘meek in heart.’ In the one we read “the fulfilment of the Jewish idea of the Royal MESSIAH. In the other, the realization of the indistinct cravings of the *human heart*.” (Vide *Westcott’s Gos. Harm.*, Cap. iii.)

In S. Luke’s Gospel we see peculiarly the *Manhood* which was taken up into GOD. Manhood with its affections, and sympathies, and sinless infirmities. But this great feature of S. Luke’s Gospel is so universally recognized as pervading not only the narrative, but even the parables and miracles, which are peculiar to this Gospel, that we feel it would be needless to dwell longer upon it.

As the *Eagle*, gazing upwards towards the Sun, is so uniformly identified with the Gospel of S. John, [Greek], we need say nothing more in support of an appropriation so obvious and beautiful.

In fact, the second emblem, the *bullock*, is the only one which at first sight appears to present the slightest difficulty.

But we cannot but think that this difficulty vanishes so soon as we ask ourselves this question. What aspect of our SAVIOUR’S character should we naturally *suppose* to be shadowed forth under the symbol of the bullock or ox? Scripture speaks of the “oxen strong to labour.” And we feel that if we express the character typified by the bullock to be that of un murmuring, untiring, active *usefulness*, we have exactly delineated that aspect of our LORD’S character which S. Mark’s Gospel peculiarly brings out. It is most true that the bullock was a “sacrificial” animal, it was one of the *burnt* offerings. But as all the offerings had their fulfilment in CHRIST, so did each several offering shadow forth some particular feature of His perfect work, or His perfect character. So that the question still arises, what aspect of our LORD’S work or character was the offering of the bullock designed to prefigure? and we believe the answer to be that which we have already given above, viz. that of patient, self-sacrificing, laborious *usefulness*.

In corroboration of this view let us quote a single passage from a very thoughtful and (in many respects) valuable¹ little work on the subject of “the offerings”; in the course of which the writer adverts to the offering of the *bullock* and its peculiar significance, and after pointing out that in it, we have CHRIST represented to us as the toilsome, un murmuring, labourer for others, and have therefore the same character pressed upon us as one of the necessary features of the perfect Christian; he proceeds to make this incidental (though, apparently, quite unintentional) allusion to the very subject we are now considering.

¹ As the writer is a dissenter we must be understood to speak with certain important qualifications. He was once a member of the Church of England, and in Holy Orders.

“The fact is, we need to be ourselves in service, and to know practically something of its toil and trial, before we can at all rightly estimate the aspect of CHRIST’ offering which is presented in the offering of the bullock. The Gospels, however, are full of this view of the burnt offering; in fact, *one whole Gospel is specially devoted to it*. In *S. Mark*, JESUS is not brought before us as in the other Gospels, either as Son of Abraham, Son of Adam, or SON of GOD; He stands rather as the *patient, untiring labourer for others*. In *S. Mark*, turn where we will, we see JESUS always the ‘girded Servant’; always at the disposal of others, to spend and be spent at their bidding.”—*Jukes on the Offerings*, p. 72—3.

Far be it from us, however, as we have before said, to press this view of the appropriation of the Evangelical symbols. The question is an interesting one, and we have but volunteered our own opinion.

Such then do we conceive to be the general signification of the [Greek]. Symbols of the aspects or sides of the perfect character of our Blessed LORD and Master, and therefore, of the different features which, in greater or less measure, are manifested in the members of His Body;—aspects which the several Evangelists have been peculiarly guided by the HOLY GHOST respectively to delineate.¹

We need hardly stay to remind our readers of the Awful and Blessed union which this mysterious vision represents to us as subsisting between CHRIST and His people. “*In the midst of the [365] Throne.*” Even as our LORD elsewhere expresses it—“*Shall sit with Me on My Throne.*”

There can be no question that there is some profound connection between the [Greek] of which S. John’s Gospel is so full, and these [Greek] which here tenant the throne of GOD.

It is not mere *animal* life (as Hengstenberg would seem to imagine) which these “Living creatures” embody, and with which S. John has here to do, but “*Life hid with Christ in God.*”

CHRIST alone is [Greek], Life essential. His people are *manifestations* of that Life.

But what is meant by the statement that these [Greek] are “*full of eyes*”?

It is, we believe, a most beautifully significant one.

The eye, we know, is the organ through which the *Light* visits us.

So that in order to benefit by that light our eyes must be “single” (for if “evil” our whole body will be full of darkness).

We can only drink in the light through the medium of our eyes, and if they *be* single “our whole body shall be full of light.

Why then are these symbolical figures represented as “*full of eyes*”?

Plainly in order that they may drink in the fulness of Light from the Source of Light. Now CHRIST is the source, to His people, of *Life* and also of *Light*. For “in Him was Life, and that *Life* was the *Light* of men.” It is then because these Beings take in so much of that

¹ Haymo tells us that “besides the Gospels,” the four living creatures “represent the Lord Jesus Christ and His Saints.”—(Quoted by Williams, p. 69.) Bede says “Animalia nunc Evangelistas, nunc totam significant ecclesiam cujus fortitudo in leone, victimatio in vitulo, humilitas in homine, sublimitas in aquilâ volante monstratur.” Joachim (quoted by Corn. à Lapide) says, “Quatuor animalia sunt quatuor ordines et status in Ecclesiâ. Leo significat fortitudinem fidei Apostolorum; Bos, invictam patientiam et victimam martyrum; Homo, doctorum sapientiam; Aquila, virgines angelicè viventes, et religiosos contemplationi addictus.”

Light that, therefore, they *live*. They live through Him. “*Because I live, ye shall live also.*” They are merely receptacles of Him the “True Light.” And beholding in such full measure “the Glory of the LORD, are changed into the same image from glory to glory even as by the Spirit of the LORD.”

There is a manifest difficulty attending Mr. Williams’ suggestion that the *four and twenty elders*, whom S. John beholds seated “round the throne and the living creatures,” are a representation of the Christian Priesthood. Nor can we think the reason he assigns for the fact of their *having a subordinate position* to the [Greek] other than very unsatisfactory.

The living creatures (he says) i.e., “the whole body of the elect, are more near than the twenty-four (or the Christian Priesthood,) inasmuch as this indwelling of CHRIST speaks of closer union with Him than any ministerial function can be.” (p. 69.)

But has not “the Christian Priesthood,” as such, the very same privileges and dignity which “the whole body of the elect,” as such possess, but with certain peculiar privileges *superadded*? And we feel at a loss to conceive how the superaddition of the ministerial functions over and above their common privileges as members of Christ’s BODY can be represented as a reason for a subordination in position.

Will not rather S. Jerome’s suggestion help us to the explanation [366] of this part of the vision? He says that the twenty-four elders were considered by some of the ancients as representatives of the *twenty-four books of the Old Testament*.¹

The Old Testament, we know, was frequently called by the Jews the *twenty-four*. “Præfigitur hoc nomen ut plurimum fronti Bibliorum Hebraicorum et impressorum, et manusciporum.”² S. Ambrose thus explains the vision. “Viginti quatuor seniores sunt Patriarchæ, et sancti Patres veteris Testamenti qui in lectione et meditatione viginti quatuor librorum veteris Testamenti, quasi in viginti quatuor sedilibus quiescebant.”³

Moreover we know that the number of the courses of priests amongst the Jews was *twenty-four*. Is it, then, unreasonable to conjecture that this vision may represent the Ancient Jewish Church, those “Israelites indeed” in whom had been no guile?

Thus, only, do we think, can the relative position of these two orders of the Celestial Hierarchy be explained.

We might, perhaps, also mention another circumstance here. The twenty-four elders all appear one to resemble the other. They are all *elders*, representatives of but *one* people. They are “the *elders*” who “obtained a good report through faith.” (Heb. xi. 2.) Whereas in the [Greek] we see a picture of the *various* tribes and people of whom the Catholic Church consists, gathered out of *all* nations from the East, and West, and North, and South

¹ “Nonnulli putant. . . . esse priscae legis libros viginti quatuor, quos sub numero *viginti quatuor seniorum* Apocalypsis Johannes inducit adorantes Agnum.”—(vid. *Prologum Galeatum*.) This identification, however, seems to have been very common in the early Church. e.g. Victorinus (in the third century) says, “Viginti quatuor faciunt tot numeros quot et seniores. Sunt enim libri veteris testamenti qui accipiuntur Viginti Quatuor.” Primasius says, “Veteris Testamenti Libros canonicâ auctoritate suscipimus tanquam viginti quatuor seniores tribunalia præsidentes. See also quotations from Ambrosius Ausbertus, Berengaudus, Bede, Haymo, Aquinas, &c. in a note of Dr. Wordsworth’s. (Lecture on Apoc. No. iv.)

² Hottinger, quoted by Wordsworth, Can. of Scrip. App. C.

³ Vid. Corn. à Lapide in loc.

(the number *four* always including in it some idea of universality); we see the Bride's vesture "wrought about with *divers* colours."¹

Glorious then, indeed, is the salvation to which the *four-and-twenty* are represented as having attained. They are crowned, enthroned, seated around the throne of GOD.

But there is a higher dignity even than this. There is the position in the very "midst of the throne." In which may we not reverently behold a picturing forth of the wondrous truth contained in these profound sayings: "*The Glory* which Thou gavest *Me* have I given them." "*I in them* and they in *Me*. . . . that they also may be *one in Us*." "We being many are one Bread and *one Body*, [367] *for* we are all partakers of *that one Bread*." "We are members of *His Body, of His Flesh, and of His bones*." "The mystery which hath been hid from ages, but now is made manifest to the saints, to whom GOD would make known what is the riches of the *glory of this mystery* which is CHRIST IN YOU." "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; notwithstanding he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is *greater than he*."

One further remark we will make before leaving this part of the subject.

We have noticed the relative positions of the "living creatures," the "four-and-twenty elders," and "all the angels"; "In the midst of the throne"; "Round about the throne and the living creatures"; and, at a still greater distance, "Round about the living creatures and the elders."

Now we confess that it is not without considerable regret that we have so frequently occasion to notice the unguarded use, and unconscious misapplication of the English version of our LORD'S expression [Greek] "equal to the Angels." E.V. (Luke xx. 36). For it is not more manifest that the rendering "*equal to*" is liable to a most grave misapplication, than it is certain that such misapplication is constantly being made.

[Greek] does not mean "equal to" or "of the same nature as" the wind; but "like to the wind in one particular respect," viz: that of fleetness. So [Greek] is not "equal to a star," but like to a star in one respect, viz: that of brightness.

And so in the passage before us. Our LORD is replying to the Sadducees and their carnal question respecting the resurrection. And He merely tells them that they totally misconceive the nature and dignity of the Resurrection body. The risen saints, says our LORD, do not marry or give in marriage—for in this respect (viz: that of having no sexual intercourse) they resemble the angels—like them too, they are immortal. But He does not stop here, for He immediately adds something else, something which raises them far above all Angelic Intelligences—"Yea, further, seeing that they are 'Sons of the Resurrection,' they are '*Sons of God*';² And what the fulness of meaning contained in *that* expression may be, the day of "the manifestation of the Sons of GOD" will alone declare. "Beloved, now are we the Sons of GOD, and it doth not *yet* appear; what we *shall be*; but *we know* that when He shall appear we shall be *like Him*." Our hope is, not that we shall be like the holy Angels—No!—but that we shall be like CHRIST. And we must have "*this hope*" in us,

¹ Whether in the introduction of the several animals into this wondrous vision, and in thus dignifying them by making them serve so Divine a purpose as to figure forth some of the features of CHRIST'S Body, there may be any secret parallelism with what S. Paul tells us of the Creature taking part with, and having a mysterious interest in, man's restoration; of creation waiting and "longing for the manifestation of the sons of GOD," we dare not presume to say.

² The words [Greek] are evidently in a parenthesis. In S. Matthew and S. Mark the words are [Greek]—Cf. Heb. i. 5.

if we would “Purify ourselves as He is Pure.” The *servants* in the parable rejoice when the master’s *child* comes back. “Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the [368] presence of the *angels* of GOD over one sinner that repenteth.” “To which of the Angels said He at any time, Sit thou on My right hand? Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to *minister* to them who shall be *heirs of salvation*?”

“To him that overcometh will I grant to sit *with Me* on *My throne*, even as I also overcame and am set down with My FATHER on His throne.”

But we must hasten on to another point.

In our remarks upon the four living creatures we incidentally noticed that the number *four* always included in it some idea of universality. We are thus brought to a most important subject, and one bearing closely upon the general question of Apocalyptic interpretation. And we rejoice to say that in both the works before us (Mr. Williams’ especially) the subject is very satisfactorily treated: both writers concurring in the main, in the opinion, which we feel intimately convinced is at once the most safe and the most correct, that the *numbers* in this Book are generally the symbols of *ideas*, rather than measures of time and quantity; in fact that there is a sacred language of numbers which must be interpreted, like every other part of prophetic imagery, by a reverent examination and comparison of Holy Scripture.

“The numbers in the Apocalypse,” says Hengstenberg, “have only an ideal signification, they belong not so properly to the chronological as to the symbolical forum” (vol. i. 396.).¹

Mr. Williams says:—

“With regard to the periods and dimensions of time, let us endeavour to learn the reverential caution of early writers, not rashly supposing that it is for us to know and determine what was denied to Apostles, to Angels, and to the Son of Man Himself.” (Preface, x.)

And again,

“There are reasons for believing that it is not intended that we ever know the times or the seasons which the FATHER hath put in His own power. And it is remarkable that in no single instance has any modern interpreter succeeded in explaining any period of time in the Apocalypse: from the ten days of Smyrna’s persecution, or the five months of the locust plague, to the thousand years of CHRIST’S reign on earth. The reason is obvious, they do not perceive that, like everything in the Apocalypse the numbers are allegorical, and that although it is not for us to know the secrets of GOD, yet, by comparing things spiritual with spiritual, they furnish us with a hieroglyphic language which is in the highest degree instructive.”—P. 187

Now to take the most obvious example. Let any one, be he never so opposed to anti-literal interpretation of Scripture, merely notice the manner in which the number *seven* is employed in the sacred volume, and it will be simply impossible for him to deny [369] that it is manifestly the exponent of some important *idea*. It is used above *fifty* times in the Apocalypse alone, and, there is no question that could we but discover the precise meaning conveyed by it in these several places, and by the other numbers with which it is shown to be related, we should have advanced far in arriving at an explanation of many of the difficulties with which this book is so thickly strewn. For in the first place we have the *half a seven*, the number *three and a half*, demanding an explanation; a number, as our readers will well know, filling a most important place in the Apocalypse, as indicating the term of the duration of the woman in the wilderness, the Beast, and the ministry of

¹ Dr. Wordsworth takes the same view in his “Lectures.”

witnesses. Then again we have the numbers *three* and *four* which together make up the *seven*, and into which we find the number frequently divided in this book (Hengstenberg endeavours to show that in almost every *seven-fold* group in the Book there is a division of this kind marked: and a distinction between the *four-fold* and the *three-fold* group plainly indicated). Let us turn, for a moment, to these two last mentioned numbers.

And first, the number *three* is manifestly a sacred number, based on the Awful Mystery of the ever Blessed Trinity. While the number *four*, as Hengstenberg constantly notices, is “the signature of the earth.” The use of this number appears marked and definite. It is an *earthly* number as distinguished from a *spiritual*, and yet almost always conveys the idea of universality.

How continually we have “the four winds of the earth.” “The four corners of the earth.” “The four winds of Heaven.” So too with the inhabitants of the earth, we find them arranged in four-fold groups. “Every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation” (Ch. v. 9). “They of the people, and kindreds, and tongues, and nations” (Ch. xi. 9). “Every tribe, and people,¹ and tongue, and nation” (Ch. xiii. 7). “Every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people” (xiv. 6). So the universe is “the heaven, the earth, the sea, and the fountains of waters” (xiv. 7).² Human characters are “the unjust, the filthy, the righteous, and the holy” (xxii. 2).³ Human griefs are “death, sorrow, crying, and pain” (xxi. 4). So also Satan, to indicate his universal *worldly* sway, is twice designated by a four-fold group of names, “the Dragon, the Old Serpent, the Devil, and Satan” (Ch. xii. 9; xx. 2). And we have no doubt we could extend the list much farther.

“Four days of the seven completed the *material universe*, and living creatures followed ‘*four is of body*’ says S. Augustine, ‘*three is of spirit*, four is of man, three is of GOD.’ ‘Four,’ says the same writer, ‘is of things temporal, and the temporal distribution of the year is varied by four seasons. And in time, there appears a kind of four-fold [370] vicissitude. Hence the Gospel on four cardinal points is spread, which is a temporal dispensation.’”—*Williams*, p. 149.

“*Four is of man, three is of God*,” says S. Augustine. So that in the number *seven* which combines the two we may perhaps see some hidden allusion to the mystery of the Incarnation. God reconciled with the world. And so Mr. Williams suggests, adding•

“There may be a reason therefore why in the seven of the Apocalypse there is a distinction between the 3 and 4, developing itself occasionally in various combinations. For, as a matter of fact, in the 7 seals, and the 7 trumpets, and in the 7 vials, a marked distinction will be found between the 4 and 3, of which there is this slight intimation⁴ in the 7 epistles.”—p. 51.

Our readers will hardly need to be reminded of the beautiful illustration of the division here alluded to which is afforded us in our Lord’s perfect form of prayer. Here we have the sacred 7 and its separation into its two elements, the 3 of Heaven, and the 4 of earth, most strikingly exhibited. The 3 first petitions relating solely to God:—the Hallowing of *His* name, the coming of *His* kingdom, the doing of *His* will, containing moreover a

¹ Omitted in some editions.

² Cf. Ps. cxxxv. 6; vid. Ps. xcv. 4, 5; Ps. cxlviii. 9—12, &c. &c.

³ Cf. parable of the sower.

⁴ He is alluding to the relative position of the two appeal—“He that overcometh,” and “He that hath an ear.”

manifest allusion to the 3 several Persons of the ever Blessed Trinity; the last 4 relating to ourselves—*our* daily bread, the forgiveness of *our* sins, *our* preservation from temptation, *our* deliverance from the Evil one.

Thus is the number 7 peculiarly the number of the Christian covenant. The number of forgiveness of sins, of the rest remaining for the people of God. The number of the Christian's armour; of his daily prayer; of the eternal Hymn of Praise of the Church triumphant in Heaven (Rev. v. 12; vii. 12); of the Christian ministry, and the Church Catholic (Rev. i. 20).

The warnings and exhortations of the Great High Priest to the Church are contained in 7 epistles; the Church's prophetic history unfolded at the opening of 7 seals; the corrective judgments whereby the Church is visited are heralded forth by 7 trumpets. The punitive judgments on Antichrist and the world poured out from 7 vials.

Whatever else, then, we may notice respecting the mystical meaning of this number, one thing is evident, that it is a kin of Divine Symbol of perfection, and completeness.

And this brings us to another number, the symbolical mention of which, like that of other numbers we have mentioned, is intimately connected with, and dependant on that of the number seven.

We allude to the number *eight*. The idea expressed by which is at once most simple, most obvious, most beautiful. It is merely [371] this. The seven-fold cycle is supposed to have completed its revolution, and there follows *a new commencement*. It is the *octave*: the *repetition of the first*, though in a different phase; and thus it is ever considered by the fathers as an exponent of the idea of *re-creation*, *re-generation*, *re-newal*, *re-surrection*. The *eighth day* exactly illustrates its meaning,¹ the seven-fold cycle of the week has performed its revolution, and then succeeds the *eighth day*, the repetition of the first, the new commencement. So the fathers consider the circumcision on the eighth day, a type of our recreation in CHRIST.² They consider the same also to be typified in the *eight* souls who were saved of old "by water."³

So CHRIST, as being the Resurrection, is in that respect peculiarly *the eighth*.

And, therefore, Mr. Williams is undoubtedly right in his incidental allusion to this at p. 139.

We have been reading of the "Seven Angels," and then follows the mention of "*another* angel."

¹ So S. Barnabas, XV. (near the end.) "The eighth day—that is the *beginning* of the other world. For which cause we observe the eighth day with gladness in which Jesus rose from the dead."

² Vid. Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. XLI. "The precept which commands you to circumcise male infants on *the eighth day* was a type of that true circumcision by which we are circumcised from sin and error through Him who rose again from the dead on *the first day of the week*, viz. JESUS CHRIST. For the first day of the week is the first of all the days: but when all the days of the week are gone regularly round again in their course, it is called *the eighth*, and still continues to be, as it really is, the first."

³ Ib. cxxxviii. "The mystery of man's salvation was in the deluge; for righteous Noah . . . with his wife and three sons, and his sons' three wives, *being eight in number*, were a type of that day in which CHRIST appeared when He rose from the dead, which was the *eighth* indeed in number, but *first* in power, rank and order. For CHRIST, though He was the first begotten of every creature, was also again made the Author of a new race, who are regenerated through Him by water, faith, and wood, which was a type of the cross; even as Noah was saved by wood sailing on the water with his family."

“Another Angel,” writes Mr. Williams, “one in addition to the 7, i.e. the eighth, and as such must represent CHRIST Himself, the first, and the last, the first-begotten from the dead. It is,” says Tichonius, ‘the LORD’ JESUS CHRIST.”—

David we must remember, that great type of CHRIST, was the eighth son of his father.¹

But the meaning of this number is of importance in another respect, viz., as affording, at least, *some* clue to the meaning of that remarkable expression concerning the Beast or Antichrist, which seems to defy all the separate and combined ingenuity of the literal expositors, that he is “*an eighth*.” (xvii. 11.)

Now whatever further meaning this may have, it is clear that this feature of being *an eighth*, mainly appertains to him in virtue [372] of his character, not only of Adversary, but of being also a kind of *diabolical reflection*, of CHRIST.

CHRIST’S term of ministry lasted *three years and a half*. So CHRIST’S Church, as living again His Life on earth, is represented as also existing for the same length of time; for this is the period of the woman’s sojourn in the wilderness.

Three years and a half, therefore, is the term of Antichrist’s reign.

But Christ died and rose again, and reappeared “no more to return to corruption,” the eighth—The first-begotten from the dead. Even so of Antichrist do we read that “He was, and is not, and shall appear.” He died, and yet underwent a marvellous revivification, insomuch that “all the earth wondered after him.” And, in virtue of this,—of his dying and subsequently reappearing (apparently in a more dreadful phase) he is also designated “*an eighth*.”²

But we must reserve all detailed notice of “the Beast” with his awful associates “the Dragon,” and “the False Prophet,” together with the Harlot-Rider, till a future occasion.

We cannot refrain, however, from referring our readers, for a single moment, to a beautiful scripture illustration of the use of the number Eight. We allude to the heptad of Beatitudes in the beginning of the Sermon on the Mount (S. Matt. v. 3—10); the full, perfect, seven-fold Benediction of GOD’S children.

The *first* blessing promised is “for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.” The Benediction then proceeds through the whole of its seven-fold cycle, and then extends to the octave, or eighth. And what is the eighth blessing promised? It is but *the repetition of the first*, “for theirs is the kingdom of Heaven.” Thus shadowing forth the most important and blessed truth, that the kingdom of Heaven, upon the fruition of which we shall enter at the *second* resurrection, is no *new* state, but merely a new and more exalted phase of that *selfsame* “*state of salvation*” into which, by GOD’S infinite mercy, we were introduced at our *first* Resurrection in Holy Baptism. “The kingdom of Heaven” is thus the *first* and the *eighth*; begun in time, developed and consummated in eternity.

¹ We may mention in connection with this, the singular fact, first noticed by S. Irenæus, that the letters in the name [Greek] (added together according to their numerical value) make up the number 888.

² There is an apparent difficulty connected with the death of the Beast which will doubtless strike every reader of the Apocalypse; viz.: that while at one time we read that it is the Beast *itself* which has received the mortal stroke, and so died; at another time it appears that it is only *one of its heads* that has been “wounded to death.” But the solution is most obvious. For the beast can have no separate existence, (save a purely ideal one) independent of his heads. Nor has he more than “*one active head*” at any particular time, the others having only “either an historical or prophetic import.” So that when the head *for the time being* dies, the Beast necessarily dies with it. And when the head returns to life, the Beast revives with it.—*Vid. Hengst.* vol. ii. p. 11, 12.

With one further remark respecting those scripture numbers of whose symbolical import we have been latterly speaking, we will conclude for the present.

It is impossible not to observe how strangely this mysterious language of numbers, which fills so important a place in the volume [373] of God's *Word*, is found written, in like manner, on many pages of the sister volume of His *Works*. And if we would seek to decypher these significant hieroglyphics in *one* volume, we must not reject the reverent use of any helps (whether in the way of suggestion, or analogy) which we may find ourselves furnished with in the other.

But our meaning will be best explained by illustration. We will, then, confine ourselves to one or two of the significant analogies that are presented to us by the ordinary phenomena of sound and light.

Now in regarding these wondrous creations, the first thing that arrests us is this, viz., the mysterious interest with which they are found to be invested from the fact of the sacred number *seven* being indelibly impressed upon each.

Look at the common diatonic scale in music, consisting of seven tones, and of seven only; for this is no arbitrary division of the scale, but one borne witness to, as well by the investigations of science, as by our natural instincts.¹

Look, again, at the Solar Spectrum, at that marvellous picture obtained by the decomposition of the rays of light. Here, too, we find this same sacred number, keeping guard at the shining portals, and paying silent and ceaseless homage to Him by whose Almighty fiat light was first called into being.

But we have noticed also the use of the number *eight* in sacred symbolism. That use is here most beautifully illustrated and confirmed.

Turn we to the musical scale. The scale terminates with the *seventh* tone. But the *eighth* or octave next appears. And what is it? *It is but the repetition of the first in a new phase.*

So again with the Solar Spectrum. The luminous scale terminates, in like manner, with the *seventh*, or violet colour. But if we observe the violet band as it gradually shades away from our sight, we cannot fail to observe that it is plainly resolving itself into *red*, i.e. the octave of the *first*.

The *extreme* rays, at the top and bottom of the spectrum, are almost exactly similar in colour. The luminous scale commences with *red*, and just as it is returning to the octave of the red, after completing its seven-fold cycle, the light vanishes.

But we have noticed another circumstance connected with the employment of the number *seven* in Holy Scripture, viz., that it is frequently divided into two other numbers, four and three; in fact that it combines two elements, respectively symbolized by these, its two component numbers; whereof, as S. Augustine tells us, the *three* represents the Primary, or Spiritual element; and the *four*, the Secondary or Earthly; and we have witnessed a most significant and sacred illustration of this division in our Blessed Lord's seven-fold form of prayer.

¹ φ This is a very narrow view. Even before the exploitation of quarter-tones in Western classical music (and the music of e.g. Boulez and Stockhausen, which he could not have anticipated) Dykes is ignoring Indian, African, Persian and Oriental scales and the development of the religious music of the Israelites, which (a) appears to have been of limited range (horns and pseudo-trumpets), and (b) eclectic, borrowing from secular sources.

[374]

Now we need scarcely remark the striking and wonderful counter part to this which the luminous, and musical scales severally present to us.

In both cases the *very same division* takes place. The two scales contain, either of them, precisely three primary tones or hues, and four secondary ones.¹

We have already mentioned the awful source whence the number *three* is supposed to derive its mystic meaning. And we will only add, that although all earthly illustrations must necessarily fail (as the melancholy examples furnished us in some of the writings of the Fathers, as well as of our own Divines, sadly attest) to give any adequate representation, however faint, of that ineffable mystery the “Trinity in Unity;” yet it is most certain that no earthly illustration seems to shadow it forth, on the whole, with such faithfulness, as that of the separate and combined functions of the three primary tones and three primary colours.

As well in sound as in light (more particularly in the latter) there is—if we may venture without irreverence to adopt this sacred terminology—a marvellous “Trinity in Unity.” Each single musical sound we hear is certainly *one*; it is no less certainly *three*. There is really no such thing in nature as an *individual* musical sound; each several sound, though apparently single, being but the effect of the consonance of its three primaries in the same or different phases.

And so too, even in a more striking manner, with light.

Every beam of solar light that visits our eyes is in a certain sense *one*; it is no less truly *three*. In the mysterious unity of every single ray of solar light—however uniform and homogenous it may appear,—there are *three distinct rays; each systematically, and unconfusedly, performing its own peculiar functions*. The *red* [375] exercising the heating; the *yellow*, the illuminating; and the *blue*, the wonderful chemical, properties.

But we dare not say more. We know that “God is Light,” and how far He may have been pleased to cast a faint shadow of the mysteries of His Ineffable Being upon His “first-born”

¹ In the Diatonic scale, the Primaries occur at the 1st (or 8th); the 3d; and the 5th of the scale. In the solar spectrum their order is *exactly the same*. So that in both cases the arrangement of the primaries and secondaries will be as follows:—

(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)	(6.)	(7.)	(8.) or (1.)
<i>Prim.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Prim.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Prim.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Sec.</i>	<i>Prim.</i>

We cannot resist giving here one striking Scripture illustration of the sacred seven, in which not only the distinctions between the three primaries; and the four secondaries are most strongly marked, but even the *relative position* of each is most noticeable. We allude to the celebrated passage in Eph. iv. 4—6; the fundamental scale of Christian doctrine: the Divine Diapason. We must of course commence the scale with Him “Who is above all, and through all, and in all;” Whose sacred Name is seen to complete the scale (v. 6,) the ultimate source of all Being, the “Father of an Infinite Majesty.” The sacred scale will thus appear as follows:—

(1.)	(2.)	(3.)	(4.)	(5.)
“One <i>God and Father</i> ;	one <i>Body</i> ;	one <i>Spirit</i> ;	one <i>Hope</i> ;	one <i>Lord</i> ;
	(6.)	(7.)	(8.) or (1.)	
	one <i>Faith</i> ;	one <i>Baptism</i> ;	one <i>God and Father</i> .	

Now if we may venture to compare this with the two scales alluded to above, we find the analogy perfect. Even the relative order of the primaries and secondaries precisely identical. Far be it from us to presume to draw any inference from this. We merely allude to it as a remarkable (it may be, to some, suggestive) coincidence.

Creature, Himself only knows. We can but reverently and silently adore, not daring to let our fancies indulge in presumptuous trifling with His dreadful secrets; or yet to allow ourselves thoughtlessly to cast from us any means He may have mercifully vouchsafed us for strengthening our faith, and aiding our weak apprehensions.

Here then we must stop for the present, hoping on a future occasion to treat of some other interesting subjects which are handled in, or suggested by, the volumes before us, and which the Revelation of S. John in such abundant measure opens out to us.

[411]

We have already alluded to the fact of the “Beast from the sea” (chap. xiii. 1—8,) being, in regard to many of its features, a kind of *Diabolical reflection* of CHRIST: in consequence of which, perhaps, together with other significant marks whereby it is characterized, the mysterious designation of S. John “the Anti-Christ”¹ has been usually appropriated to it by the Church.

Let us turn, for a short time, to the associates of “the Beast;” and we shall probably see other reasons for this appropriation.

We thus come to speak a few words concerning “the Dragon” (ch. xii.) and the “Beast from the earth,” or “False Prophet” (Rev. xiii. 11—17, xvi. 13.)

Now the first thing that strikes us in this three-fold “mystery of iniquity” is, that in it we see a kind of satanic counterpart to the mystery of the Ever Blessed Trinity.”

“The Dragon,” the dread Ruler of the Kingdom of Darkness, being the infernal correlative, so to speak, of GOD the FATHER.”

“The Beast,” to whom the Dragon delegates his Power and Authority,—of GOD the SON,² into whose hands the FATHER hath committed all things.

And the “False Prophet” or “Beast from the earth,” who silently furthers the worship of “the Beast,” influencing men to accept his authority by means of the miracles he is enabled to work, who has power to cause “fire to descend from Heaven,” and to [412] “give life³ ([Greek]) to the Image of the Beast,”—of GOD the HOLY GHOST, whose office it is to glorify CHRIST, to take of the things of CHRIST; and show them unto men.⁴

And as the mystery of godliness, and the truths of our most Holy Faith have their origin deeply seated in the eternal relations of the three several Persons, and their mutual actings towards each other, towards the universe, and towards man; so would the mystery of

¹ We must bear in mind, as Mr. Williams justly notices (p. 422), that there is not only a [Greek], a [Greek], but also a [Greek]. Now the “*the [sic] beast*” *itself* would appear to be a personification of the former of these. The *last head or phase* of the Beast, which has not yet appeared, will probably develop the latter, but we must allude to this more fully hereafter.

² “*Et adoraverunt Draconem qui dedit potestatem Bestiæ.*” Illi dicunt adorare se Deum qui dedit potestatem Christo.”—*Bede, ad loc.*

³ “*Spiritum veritatis se dare simulabit.*” *Ibid.*

⁴ Moreover as the Holy Ghost is the great Invisible Agent among men in the Divine Economy (S. John xiv. 26; xvi. 8—15)—for “all these things *worketh* that one and the self-same Spirit,”—even thus is it with His Rival in the kingdom of darkness. For, as Mr. Williams remarks, “so much is this mysterious *efficacy* applied to the second Beast, that the expression ‘he works,’ or brings about and effects, arrests attention as eight times repeated in this short account.” (P. 247.)

iniquity appear to be the result of a Diabolical transcript (so to speak) of these relations and actings in the Kingdom of Darkness.

The Prince of that Kingdom is far too wise not to arrange this GOD-opposing machinery with consummate skill. And hence we may conceive it not so much the result of mere impious defiance, as of deep-penetrating craft that, so far as his created powers enable him, he has striven to copy from Divine Wisdom Itself, and to have recourse to the Awful “Pattern shown in the Mount”—thus giving unwilling homage to that Great Supreme, against whom his impotent rage is directed, and by whom he is yet to be crushed.

As however the faith of the Holy Trinity is peculiarly designated the “faith of CHRIST,” as to be baptized into the Holy Trinity is to be “baptized into CHRIST” as a knowledge of the mystery of godliness is peculiarly seen to consist in “knowing CHRIST:” So the GOD-opposing mystery is, in a peculiar way, the mystery of Anti-Christ. These are the two great manifested Antagonists of the present dispensation.

CHRIST who is the *Eighth*; Anti-Christ who “*is also an eighth.*”

CHRIST who died and rose again; Anti-Christ who was, and is not, and shall appear. CHRIST who has the Bride the Church; Anti-Christ who has the Harlot Babylon. CHRIST the [Greek]; Anti-Christ the [Greek].¹

But to return. This marvellous triplicity of iniquity may perhaps be the result of some mysterious necessity.

It is against man, the master-work of GOD that this dread organization of evil is directed; and therefore, to be effectual, it must necessarily be framed so as to meet the peculiar constitution of man.

But man was created in the “Image of GOD.” And one consequence of this creation may doubtless be traced in the mysteri[ous] tri-personality of his being; in the [Greek] (1 Thess. V. 23,) which combine to form his complex nature. Whence it appears that the seduction of man from his Creator must necessarily be adapted to the several elements of his being.

For the *first* of these ([Greek]) there is, as we learn from Scripture, “the lust of the flesh”—the gratification of the mere animal nature, “the rebellion of the lower appetites against the powers of reason and conscience which should naturally control them.”²

For the *second* ([Greek]) we find that which is designated in Scripture by the two-fold title “the lust of the eye” and “the world”—“the illusion” (namely) “produced in our higher mental nature by outward things,” the pomps and allurements of the world, &c., seen in other light than that of God.

For the *third* ([Greek]) we find all that is classed in Scripture under the generic expression “the Devil,” i.e., an impersonation of all purely *spiritual* wickedness; or sometimes under the specific title “Pride,” as one great and particular form of spiritual evil, and as that which is, in a peculiar way, the Devil’s sin, the sin which prevailed to ruin him, and “with worse ambition” to

¹ See also the striking parallel between the two expressions, [Greek] and [Greek], alluded to in a note in Dr. Wordsworth’s 12th Lecture.

² Vide Mill on “the Temptation,” p. 60.

“Hurl him down,
Warring in heaven against heaven’s matchless King.”¹

By these three Antagonists we find the first Adam to have been assailed. And let that sad verse which records the result of the complex temptation testify to its success.”

“When the woman saw that the tree was *good for food*,” here is the lust of the flesh; “*and—pleasant to the eye*,” here is the lust of the eye; “*and—a tree to be desired to make one wise*,” here is spiritual pride and ambition,²—yes, when she came under the malignant influence of this three-fold delusion—“she took of the fruit and did eat, and gave to her husband also, and he did eat.”

And we all know how, through the same three avenues of His Man’s nature, the second Adam was assailed.

First through His bodily appetites; when the keen hunger consequent upon His protracted abstinence is engaged as a means to shake His confidence, as man, in God.

[414]

Secondly through His [G; when His mental vision morbidly stimulated perhaps by the long absence of bodily support is powerfully excited by a dazzling panorama, a glorious visionary concentration of “all the kingdoms of the world and their glory;” and the immediate possession of all is pressed upon His reeling imagination, if He will but consent to offer [Greek] to that radiant Being³ who offers them.

And thirdly through His [Greek]. When His spirit is assailed by pride and presumption; and the glorious title “Son of God” lately bestowed by the voice from Heaven is paraded before Him (as doubtless it had been before the first Adam) in order to induce Him to transgress the bounds which His Human dependence on, and allegiance to, Another circumscribed around Him, and arrogantly challenge a continuance of the Divine Favour and protection, even while not walking in the “ways” of the Lord.

Thus then were the first Adam, and the first Eve assailed, and vanquished; thus also was the second Adam assailed—and victorious. But there is a *second Eve*. And when S. Paul adopts the parallel in his Epistle to the Corinthian Church, (2 Cor. xi. 3,) he adds this significant warning, “I fear lest by any means, *as* the serpent beguiled Eve, *so* your minds should be corrupted.”

Is there then in this Book, which contains the prophetic history of the second Eve, the Church, any distinct notice of her being similarly assailed?

¹ φ *recte* ‘Till pride and worse ambition threw me down,
Warring in Heaven against Heaven’s matchless King!’ (*Milton, Paradise Lost*)

² The Spiritual Element in the temptation of our first parents appears to have been twofold, consisting,—not only

(1) In *pride and presumption*,—in the complacent conviction that, being objects of such *peculiar* regard on the part of the Almighty, their continuance in His favour was necessarily guaranteed, whatever their subsequent conduct might be: *they* “*should not surely die*,”—in which delusion we may plainly see the first germs of what has developed itself in the Church, on one side in the Calvinistic tenet of indefectible grace, and on the other in the equally dangerous figment of the inerrancy and unconditional security of a particular branch of the Church:—But also

(2) in *ambition*,—in an illicit desire after a higher dignity, and for a knowledge of mysteries *over and above what God had been pleased to reveal*: “*Ye shall be like GOD, knowing good and evil*,”—in which we may certainly trace the first dawnings of that presumptuous “intrusion into things not seen” which (in the career of the *second Eve*) has issued in the daring addition to the Church’s creeds.

³ Cf. 2 Cor. xi. 14.

We cannot withhold our belief that in the three Dread Enemies of the Church already alluded to, whatever else may be therein symbolized and prefigured, we may see a mystical representation of something in Her history and career correspondent to the fleshly, worldly, and spiritual temptations, severally brought to bear against the first and second Adam.

Let us look at the symbols themselves. A “great red Dragon.” A “wild beast.” And a “False Prophet” (for so the second Lamb-like Beast is afterwards designated); where we might even at first sight not deem it inappropriate that Antagonists, answering in some measure to the lower, middle, and higher regions of our being should be severally represented under three gradations of created intelligence.

Under the first symbol then, “the great Red Dragon”—a huge unwieldy mass of flesh—we undoubtedly, in one sense, see the Devil himself (even as we may in like manner recognize him¹ [415] ultimately, as the animating principle of the “Beast” and the “False Prophet”); But it is not Satan *abstractedly* whom we here witness, but rather one of his particular phases or manifestations.

Within the sphere of this first symbol then, we conceive to be included every thing which is absolutely and *openly* opposed to CHRIST’S religion. Not as “the world,” which *avowedly* professes neutrality, and, like Gallio, to “care for none of these things;” nor spiritual wickedness, which so often derives its dangerous potency from this, that it professes to *side with* CHRIST: but rather, all which is included in the general and comprehensive designation “the flesh:” “the flesh” which openly and professedly “lusteth against the Spirit:” the “carnal mind which is *enmity* against GOD.” The developments of this first class of assailants we may see displayed in the grosser forms of Heathen Idolatry: devil worship and other awful exhibitions of man left to himself, uninfluenced by the restraints of Reason and Religion. We may see them in the dreadful influences exerted of old by Satan over the *bodies* of men; as the case of Job, of the wretched cripple “whom Satan had bound” down to the earth “for eighteen years,” of the poor demoniacs, and many others so fearfully attest.

Now this Draconic phase of the Devil’s power was crushed by our LORD. Satan, the *open Adversary*, was cast from Heaven. He had thought to overwhelm the infant Church by external assault, to *put it down* by mere brute force, but he was doubly foiled, for not only was “the blood of the Martyrs the seed of the Church,” but his open violence was also restrained. Satan was bound, the Dragon received a mortal stroke from the sword of Michael. And though his death was a lingering one, and his expiring efforts most awful—witness the Hellish persecutions raised by him through the instrumentality of the Heathen

¹ Mr. Williams says, “In the Apocalypse . . . S. John speaks not of *persons*, but throughout of great principles, their developments in the course of time, their operations in whole bodies of men, and the phases they assume in successive generations It appears doubtful whether S. John ever speaks in it of our Blessed Lord Himself, as it were, *personally*, but only in His Manifestations in and through His Church, by His Spirit, and in His Members, or through the medium of His Angels in allegoric visions.” (P. 414—5.) And the same is true, to a great extent, of our Lord’s great adversary the Devil. While, then, we fully admit that in one sense the Dragon is the Devil (and that the expression *sometimes* appears to be employed as a mere personal designation, —even as we must also in a certain sense admit, what many of the Fathers seem to hold, that the *Beast itself* is also the Devil, —we yet maintain that we are not justified in regarding either the one or the other as merely Satan *abstractedly*, but that ch. xvi. 13, constrains us to try and discover, if we may, what are the *distinctive* features which discriminate these three great manifestations or emissaries of the evil one, —a question, we believe, of considerable importance.

power of Rome;¹ yet his end was come, his power broken; for we [416] read that *the Earth* now sided with the *woman*. The Empire itself became Christian. And the Draconic phase of the Evil-one was no more.

Alas! it has yet to be revived, though but for “a short space.”

We come then to the *second* assailant. Persecution, it appears, has doubly failed. Not only has it given life to the very cause it was meant to crush, but it has *itself* been crushed. Cast out of the bodies of men, the Evil-one will attack their minds and spirits. The fury of the Dragon gives place to the wiles of the Serpent.

Let us turn to the second symbol “*The Beast*.”

And here there can be no doubt we have an emblematic representation of the power of the *world*. It is a *wild Beast, seven headed, ten horned, ten crowned*, where the numbers *ten* and *seven*, both alike mystical numbers, seem evidently to symbolize (we are not stating that they have no further meaning as well)—the former, the *wide extent* of its dominion,² the latter, the important truth that its sway is not merely an external and temporal one, but rather a *mystical* one involving a secret influence upon the hearts and minds of men.

The Monster we see is composed out of the four Beasts of Daniel, which were identified by the interpreting Angel with the four empires of the world. Now, the number *four*, as we before remarked, being an earthly number, and yet containing the idea of universality, there can be no doubt that in this huge four-fold monster with its many heads and diadems we see *that very thing*—only clothed in a symbolical dress—which was presented as the second temptation to our Blessed LORD Himself—“*All the kingdoms of the world and their glory*.”³

¹ We must not be thought to intimate that persecution and bitter opposition to Christianity will not *as* certainly follow in the train of the other two enemies of the Church. Still it will be only secondarily and by implication. These latter will persecute Christianity, not *quâ* Christianity, like the Dragon, but simply because it comes into collision with them, interferes with their authority, or testifies against them.

We may, of course, see other fulfilments of this Draconic Symbol besides the one noticed above,—*e.g.*:

In the restless anxiety of *Herod* to discover the Infant Jesus in order “to destroy Him,” and in his subsequent brutal command that all the little nurslings in “Bethlehem and all the coasts thereof” should be butchered, we plainly see a realization of this picture of the great Red Dragon standing before the woman, to devour her child as soon as it was born, and casting forth a flood out of its mouth to destroy it. (Even as we may see the same spiritually fulfilled whensoever CHRIST is being formed in any soul; external opposition, and the battlings of a corrupt nature, being sure to ensue, and only subsiding to give way to the more dangerous blandishments of the world, and the gentle cajoleries of the Evil *Spirit*.) And further:—in the flight of our LORD’S parents into “*Egypt*,”—the common Scripture type of the “world,”—and their being thus saved from the Dragon, we obviously see something parallel to the next statement, *viz.*, that “*the earth helped the woman*.”

² The idea conveyed by the number *ten* seems to be merely that of numerical multiplication. Mr. Williams thus speaks of it: “The number *ten* is a mystical number in Scripture, the complete aggregate of individuals; itself like unity brought back to unity, the foundation too of indefinite multiplication the number ten stands for a multitude ten horns for many,” &c. (P. 29.)

³ “The form of the Beast,” says Hengstenberg, “is compounded of the different Beast in Daniel,—quite naturally so, since the Beast here imaged the ungodly power of the world *as a whole*, while in Daniel the *different phases* of this power are represented.” (Vol. ii. 15.)

And Mr. Williams: “This Beast, like the four Beast of Daniel, ‘*arises out of the sea*,’ so often put for the nations, and it is in itself composed of those four Beasts. It has the leopard-likeness of the third, . . . the bear-feet of the second, . . . the lion-mouth of the first, . . . and the ten-horned head of the fourth. . . . Nor is that all, for it has also *seven heads* which make up the heads of the four Beasts, inasmuch as the leopard of Daniel has four heads (Dan. vii. 6), which four, together with the other three, form the

{*cont.*}

[417]

Moreover precisely as we see that our LORD was tempted, for the sake of the world, to offer [Greek] to Satan; even so do we here see the very same temptation repeated—yes, and men yielding to it, giving [Greek] to the Dragon *who gave power*¹ to the Beast.

Words, of course, which merely embody the great fundamental truth that “the friendship of the world is,” *really* “enmity with GOD:” that the service of the world necessarily tends, as its ultimate and inevitable result, to *open hostility* against GOD: allegiance to the Beast, to the worship of the Dragon.

As for the peculiar meaning of the word [Greek]; the idea conveyed by it is very well given by Hengstenberg. “The point of comparison,” he says, is not merely “the attribute of wildness and ferocity,” for thus the distinction would be lost between it and the Dragon.

“It must rather be regarded as standing generally in the *want of the Divine Image*, which at the threshold of Revelation (Gen. i. 26, 27) is represented as the properly and distinctively human—the want of the living Breath of GOD.” (Hengst. vol. ii. p. 6.)

So that the idea conveyed by it will be precisely what we have assumed, viz., that it is correspondent to the [Greek] in our nature, and will find its peculiar sphere in those whom S. Jude speaks of as [Greek] (v. 19.)

“The change” from a “*beast into a man*” is “the same with that which . . . passed upon Nebuchadnezzar, in whose personal history the fate of his empire was imaged. In his career of ambition and pride . . . the human heart was taken away, and a beast’s *heart* given him. As a punishment for this he was reduced to the *condition* of a beast in intellect and outward appearance. ‘And at the end of the days,’ it is said, ‘I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes to heaven, and my understanding returned unto me. And I blessed the Most High; and I praised Him Who liveth for ever.’ . . . Here it appears as the characteristic of *man* to lift the eyes adoringly to heaven, to praise and glorify the Most High, in contrast to the senseless indifference toward the Divine . . . as connected with the condition of a beast.” (Ib. ii. 7, 8.)

But we come now to the third symbol. “The Beast from the earth” or “False Prophet.” And here the context plainly shows that some great principle of *Spiritual* deception is impersonated. And not only so; but some, *connected with the profession of* [418] *Christianity*. For He is represented as having two horns like a *Lamb*—[Greek], a word which, occurring as it does twenty-six times the Apocalypse, and *twenty-five* of those times as a designation of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, must necessarily allude to Him here. So that the outward semblance of the “Lamb” must obviously refer to some outward profession of Christianity.

“He ‘comes up out of the earth,’ i.e., from the visible Church of GOD; and he has ‘*two horns like a lamb*.’ ‘He professes CHRIST, His lowliness and sanctity,’ says S. Gregory. The two horns as of ‘the Lamb of GOD,’ the name by which John the Baptist pointed out CHRIST. ‘They are,’ says Haymo, ‘the feigned semblance of His innocency, and purity, His doctrine and miracles.’ Primasius explains them as the two Testaments, which are indeed the horns or powers of CHRIST. Peter Olivi, as false Christs and false prophets which induce men to worship the carnal desire and glory of the first secular beast; others, as ecclesiastical and spiritual powers.” (Williams, p. 247—8.)

seven. This appears to indicate that he represents some great principle of evil found in all the heathen kingdoms,—the four of universality combined in one.” (P. 233.)

So that in their *ultimate* and catholic signification, the solemn warnings against worshipping the Beast and his image will correspond exactly to what S. John elsewhere enforces in plain language, “Love not the world, neither the things of the world.”

¹ [Greek]. Cf. Luke iv.5. [Greek].

And here we must express our utter dissent from those commentators who refuse to see under this symbol any allusion to a *spiritual* delusion and corrupt Christianity. As the first Beast is destitute of every single spiritual mark—merely the GOD-opposing, GOD-denying Anti-christian power of the world—external to the Church, and therefore merely assailing or influencing her from *without*: so is this second Beast some principle *within*, the Church, seducing men to the service of the world and of Satan, and all under the semblance of Christianity.

Many of our readers will be acquainted with Hengstenberg's Chapter on the "Beast from the sea," in which he so ably disposes of the common Protestant notion that it represents "the Papacy" (a notion advocated, to a certain extent, by Dr Wordsworth.¹) [419] This chapter appeared some time ago in the pages of our late and short lived contemporary "The Theological Critic," and we would gladly, did our space allow, quote portions of it here.

But powerful as Hengstenberg is in his essay on the first Beast, we cannot but think him quite as unsatisfactory in his treatise on the second. He considers it merely an embodiment of worldly *heathen* wisdom; and identifies the *image* of the first Beast set up by the second, with the pictures of the Roman Emperor set up of old for public reverence.

"The setting up of the likeness of the Emperor," he says, "was one of the most effectual means which the heathen despotism could employ to place itself in the centre of the world. By means of this image the Beast was rendered in a manner omnipresent Its living representative the Roman Emperor was confined to no particular place. . . . The *Spirit* which, according to v. 15, belongs to the image of the Beast, is not one properly residing in him, but flowing out of him, along with the *speech* given to him by the wisdom of the world." (Hengst. ii. 44.)

Now, without professing to apprehend the precise *meaning* of this last sentence, we may at least say that if 'the Beast' be the GOD-opposing power of the world *generally*, it seems

¹ It is no easy matter to discover what, according to Dr. Wordsworth's scheme, are the distinguishing characteristics of the "Beast from the sea," the "Beast from the earth," and the "Harlot Babylon." All three seem indiscriminately merged into "the Papacy." And this is only one of the many exegetical incongruities with which his (in many respects) able "Lectures" abound.

Take, for instance, his interpretation of the "loosing of the four angels bound at the Euphrates," in the sixth trumpet, where the *four* of universality is to be noticed, and the manifest connection between this vision and the *sixth vial*,—the awful gathering of all nations from the "*four* quarters of the earth" to the final and decisive conflict between the powers of good and evil. Dr. Wordsworth, however, sees in this vision a loosing of the *four gospels* which have been *bound in fetters by the Church of Rome!* (Lect. VII.)

Or again, his interpretation of the "seven thunders," on the "uttering" of which S. John was about to write, but was ordered *not* to write, but to *seal up* what they had revealed, where Dr. Wordsworth interprets S. John's being ordered *not to write* by his being ordered *to write* the Apocalypse, and so *seal up* the Apostolical Canon! (*Ibid.*)

Or yet again, his exposition of the "*two witnesses*," (*i.e.*, Christ's true followers, His "little flock"), whose *dead bodies* lie *unburied* in the Broadway of the Great City, the Spiritual Jerusalem,—a passage, the interpretation of which is fixed by the parallel words of the Psalm, O God, the heathen are come into Thine inheritance, . . . the *dead bodies* of Thy servants have they given to be meat to the *Beasts* of the earth ([Greek])—perhaps some secret parallelism with the [Greek] in the Apocalypse). Their blood have they shed like water on every side of Jerusalem, and there was no man to *bury* them" (Ps. lxxix. 1—3),—in which Dr. Wordsworth sees a marvellous prediction that the two Testaments will be put to death by the Church of Rome, and not be suffered to be *put into monuments*,—*i.e.*, "editions, translations, expositions!" (Lect. VIII.)

Now it is not that we object to Dr. Wordsworth introducing these several passages as *illustrations* of the subjects to which he has referred them, or as admitting a possible *accommodation to them*; but we *do* object, in behalf of the general question of Sacred Exegesis, to having such expositions set forth—nay, delivered from our University pulpits—as *the* interpretation of Scripture, its *real* and primary meaning.

extraordinary that the image of this Beast should be merely the *picture* of a particular emperor.

With regard to the general scope, however, of the symbol, we repeat that the two horns like the ‘*Lamb*’ CHRIST, and the designation the ‘False Prophet;’ coupled with our LORD’S cognate predictions concerning the “false Christs, and false Prophets” who were to arise,—attired “in sheep’s clothing,” deceiving, if it were possible, the very elect—not to mention the numerous other features of this second Beast, which point in the same direction—all, seem manifestly to point to some spiritual, some pseudo-Christian delusion.¹

[420]

We frankly own that it appears to ourselves mere wilful blindness to close the eyes to the numerous intimations, with which this Book abounds, of some grievous defection from primitive faith and from doctrinal purity which is to overrun the Church of CHRIST

Look at the picture of the Catholic Church presented to us in the opening *seven Epistles*, wherein we have a kind of synoptical view of the general state of the “Holy Church throughout all the world.”²

It is still the Church Catholic. There are the *seven* candlesticks. CHRIST’S Presence is still within it. He “walketh in the midst of” it. And yet, we find *five sevenths* of the Church overrun with some secret spiritual idolatry, or corrupt faith and practice;—for that this is what is shadowed forth under the Scripture emblem of fornication we need hardly stay to prove.³

Ephesus has “*left her first love*” and has “*fallen.*” Pergamos has “them that bold the doctrine of Balaam,” who taught Israel “*to commit fornication.*” Thyatira suffers “that woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to seduce” GOD’S “servants *to commit fornication.*” Sardis is “*dead,*” and contains *only* a “*few names who have not defiled their garments.*” Laodicea, though vaunting to be “rich and increased with goods, and to have

¹ Mr. Williams says that it probably represents what is afterwards seen as the Harlot, or Babylon, “but as different forms and aspects of the same spiritual wickedness” (p. 243). The difference between the two, however, would rather appear to be the difference between the abstract and the concrete: the lamb-like Beast representing the *evil principle*, the Harlot Babylon that principle embodied and developed. Or, perhaps, like as *Balaam* taught Israel “to commit fornication,” so the False Prophet here may represent the hidden *seducer*, and Babylon the once faithful, now faithless, Israel, whom his wives have corrupted.

² Hengstenberg strangely objects to the uniform Patristic interpretation which identifies the *seven* Churches with the Church Catholic, maintaining that they are *only* seven *particular* churches which are alluded to. The reason he assigns is most feeble. He appears to think, as the Church of old was symbolized under *one* golden candlestick in the temple, that therefore, were the whole Church here alluded to, it would be symbolized by the same *one* candlestick, and not by seven, which therefore, he thinks, would seem to point merely to seven particular churches. But he appears to forget that the Church is no longer the Church of *one* people. It is the Catholic Church. “The barren hath borne *seven*, which,” says S. Cyprian, “are the *seven churches*; whence also Paul wrote to seven churches, and the Apocalypse sets forth seven churches, that the number seven may be preserved,” (Tract. III. (i.) 20.) The one candlestick has become seven. So the *single trumpet* of the Law has given way to “the seven trumpets which introduce the Gospel.” The “One Spirit” is in this book spoken of as “the Seven Spirits.” And instead of the *One Hill*, Mount Zion, on which the Church is built, we find the Mystic Babylon, with whom the visible Church is, for a time, and in a certain sense, identified, seated on *Seven Hills*. “Her foundations are upon the Holy Hills.”

³ “The crime of *fornication* is a charge of the most definite kind; the idea of it being determined by the idiom and usage of the Old Testament, wherein purity of religious faith and worship is designated under the name of chastity, or conjugal fidelity in the Church of God; and apostasy, or corruption in religion, but especially idolatrous corruption, is branded as the gross pollution of virgin modesty or plighted faith.” (Davison on Prophecy, p. 435.)

need of nothing,” is yet “*the wretched one, the poor, the miserable, the blind, the naked,*” and about to be “*spued out*” of CHRIST’S mouth.

In all these cases condign vengeance is denounced if the fornication is not repented of. Deeply though we mourn to say it, we are yet constrained to believe that the context indicates *it is not*, and that in the history of the great Harlot subsequently recounted [421] we see an awful foreshadowing of the guilt being continued in, of its increasing yet more in intensity, and of its finally drawing down a tremendous retribution.

A remnant of the Church, however, maintains its integrity. *Two* of the candlesticks, Smyrna and Philadelphia, preserve their light pure, keeping diligently open the conduits through which alone the Holy Oil can flow into them, their flame burns steadily, and they still “*shine as lights in the world holding forth the Word of Life.*”¹

But the rest of the visible Church appears overrun with evil. It is Jerusalem, but where “our LORD is crucified,” and where Antichrist reigns. It is the “Great City,” but yet, mystically. Babylon or confusion.² The Holy City, but trodden underfoot, and stained with the blood of GOD’S servants. It is GOD’S Temple, but yet—saving only the inner Sanctuary, where the two witnesses, the true worshippers are—defiled and profaned, (Rev. xi. 1, 2.). The “House of Prayer for all nations,” but yet “a den of thieves.” My FATHER’S House,” but yet a house of merchandise.

The sun-clothed woman, the virgin daughter of Israel, has, like her mother, proved false. She was at first beheld by the inspired Seer as [Greek] (ch. xii. 1) who fled on eagle’s wings into the *wilderness*. The Seer is afterwards borne by the spirit into this selfsame *wilderness*, and beholds [Greek], shorn of her former radiant robe, the sun of righteousness, and girt with her own “filthy rags,” the world’s gaudy attire. “How is the *Faithful City* become an *Harlot!*”³

[422]

We have already dwelt upon the fact that under the three-fold symbol of the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, we may perhaps discover something in the Church’s secret

¹ It is probably the number two in this place, which fixes the number of the *witnesses*, of whom S. John afterwards speaks. They are the “*two witnesses,*” and are expressly identified with “the *two candlesticks* which stand before the God of the Earth” (ch. xi. 4). In the first vision were seen [Greek]. But in this vision we find that a “falling away” has taken place. And what is elsewhere said of the heads of the Beast may be said with equal truth of the candlesticks,—“Five have fallen,” have (even now, in the deep foreknowledge of God) “been removed out of their place;” and here are the two which remain, [Greek], the two candlesticks which *still retain their position* “before the God of the Earth.”

² “Ista civitas quæ appellata est Confusio, ipsa est Babylon, . . . Babylon quippe interpretatur confuzio.” (De Civ. Dei xvi. 4.)

³ “Throughout,” writes Mr. Williams, “since the mystery of the Church has been introduced after S. John’s eating of the Book; all the representations seem connected with some corruption, some [Greek] in the Church itself. . . . The great ten-horned Beast of all Blasphemy and Wickedness never appears apart from some *mysterious spiritual* iniquity, either as the second Beast of lamb-like dissimulation, or the False Prophet, or as the Mystical Babylon and adulterous Church.” The reason of this may be, “that the Apocalypse, being the description of the *Christian Church*, does not speak of the first” or infidel “Beast, *except* as it comes in connection with *it*; or, it may be, that the Church visible will never be separate from it by the wiles of the Dragon. And one great object of this Divine Book appears to be to assure us that, during the desolation of the Church, the Lamb on Mount Sion will be all the while gathering His own out of her; the two witnesses more or less heard; their presence felt; the Word, which under the first seal went forth unaccompanied on the White Horse, will, notwithstanding, be seen to have a great army with Him; and it is not till at last, when her destruction is coming on, that the Sons of God will, by a distinct Divine Voice, be summoned to come out of the Mystical Babylon.” (P. 244—5.)

history parallel to the three-fold temptation of our Blessed LORD. Whether this be really the case or not, we can only conjecture. One thing, however, certain—that we have distinct evidence in this book of the Church *having* been assailed by those fleshly, worldly, and pseudo-spiritual principles to which we have suggested that these emblems may be, in a measure, severally correspondent, and of her having moreover *succumbed to each*. Let one single verse attest the sad truth: we mean Rev. xi. 8, in which the “Great City,” or visible Church, is spoken of as spiritually identical with three notable cities, Sodom, Egypt, and Jerusalem. Sodom, the Scripture type of the “*flesh*,” Egypt, the type of the “*world*,” and Jerusalem, “where also our LORD was crucified,” of *spiritual defection*.

Mournful as it is to have to write thus, still we cannot but think much more healthy for us to look these sad forecastings full in the face, and not wilfully close our eyes against what the HOLY GHOST has so plainly revealed. However we may dislike some of the inferences which may appear to follow from them,—however they may seem to interfere with what we could *wish* to be the truth, and to crush some of our most fervent and deep yearnings,—it can do us no good to try to evade them. For ourselves, we feel not more earnestly convinced of the truth of anything than we do of the absolute impossibility of dissevering many of these Apocalyptic prophecies from the Christian Church,¹ and *confining* them to a single heathen city. This last learned endeavour of Professor Hengstenberg has more than ever convinced us of this; and we cannot but feel deeply indebted to Mr. Williams for having so calmly and dispassionately, with such tenderness, though with such plain speaking, drawn the attention of Churchmen to a melancholy subject which they are but too apt to overlook.

We hope on a future occasion, in conducting our notice of these interesting volumes, to advert to one or two of the important considerations which are so plainly involved in the identification of Babylon with Christendom, and also to the mysterious question [423] whether or not this Book contains any intimations of a *Personal* Antichrist.

At present we will close with one consideration arising out of the comparison we have instituted between the temptations of the Bride and Her Divine Bridegroom. And it is this: How that, in glancing at the recorded history of the Church, we may see strange indications of her having been *really* assailed with temptations, not only *generically* correspondent to those of Her LORD (as we have seen reason from this Book to *anticipate*), but even, to a certain extent *specifically* identical.

We have already noticed that the Great City, or visible Church, is spiritually identified in this Book with the three cities, Sodom, Egypt, and Jerusalem; and we feel it were needless to refer to Her sad *history*—to that “little Book,” the mystical eating of which proved so “*bitter*” to the beloved Apostle (*vide* Will.p. 181—2)—in order to convince ourselves of the justness of these Divine appropriations:—

1. Of the immorality and licentiousness, and of that ruthless persecuting spirit, which have found their way even into her high places ;—or,

¹ One cannot but feel *assured*, by a careful attention to all the parts of the Apocalypse itself, and to the Old Testament, to which all the figures constantly refer, that by the harlot is intended—not the infidel world, or *any heathen city*, but a Christian Church, or the Church Universal,” (“the worldly church, or Christian world,” Mr. W. elsewhere expresses it,) or the whole Christian name. This latter must be added. For as Samaria is represented as an Harlot as well as Jerusalem, the lapsed and broken Israel as well as Judah, so Christian bodies, in form less perfect, and not according to the measured primitive pattern of the Church, may yet be included under the name of the ‘Mother of Harlots.’ Inasmuch as . . . they may yet agree in this alliance more or less, with the great principle of infidelity.”

2. Of her unholy alliance with the *world*, and that lust of *temporal power* which has so marvellously penetrated her; on which head we will merely confine ourselves to this,—the striking indications we behold of Satan’s worldly temptation, wherewith, he failed to seduce the Bridegroom, having been repeated, and *successfully*, in the case of the Bride, and of Her having eagerly grasped that very thing which He so solemnly repudiated.” “All the kingdoms of the world and their glory” were offered to Him and rejected. Let one spectacle, silently though significantly, attest how *real*, even though impotent, are the yearnings which She has entertained after this very *repudiated dominion*. See the Primate of Christendom, at his coronation, not only invested with the Sacred Mitre, the insigne of œcumenical spiritual sway, but subsequently divested of that in order to be crowned with the triple tiara, the badge of *universal temporal dominion*, and thus solemnly addressed, “Accipe tiamam, tribus coronis ornatam, et scias te esse *Patrem Principum et Regum; RECTOREM ORBIS!*”¹

But we come to notice, lastly,—

3. The Church’s spiritual temptations. And here we have already intimated (*vide supra* p. 413, n.²) how the presumptuous desire to be “like GOD, knowing good and evil,” which assailed our first parents, has again manifested itself in the history of the [424] Church.² We have also noticed how remarkably the *other* portion of the first spiritual temptation (and we here further add, our LORD’S spiritual temptation also) has, in like manner, been brought to bear against Her. Satan, we have shown, seduced our first parents with the assurance that, being the children of GOD, they “should *not* surely die,”—they could not forfeit His protection and favour. He repeated the same assurance to our Blessed LORD, “If thou be the SON OF GOD,”—and again, “For it is *written*, He shall give His Angels charge over Thee to keep Thee.” And would it not seem that his words to the Church have been precisely the same in kind? “If thou be the Spouse of CHRIST,”—and again, “For it is written,” “thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall *not* prevail against it.” It is indeed no less remarkable than it appears strictly true, that in this master-temptation of Satan (the awful potency of which he probably first discovered in his terrible *personal* experience), we may discern the secret spring of the sad history of the Roman branch of the Catholic Church. Assuming herself to be *the* Church, not a branch only, and dwelling complacently on the “exceeding great and precious promises” which undoubtedly *are* made to the Church, she has sadly overlooked the *conditions* to which these promises have been tied; and, instead of regarding her security as depending on her fidelity, has rather regarded her fidelity as *guaranteed* by her security. She has imagined herself unconditionally safe, and therefore necessarily pure.

¹ “Ruler of the world!” An ominous title this; when we bear in mind to *whom* it was that our Blessed Lord, so far from claiming it Himself, appropriated the corresponding Greek expression [Greek]. Cf. S. Matt. xxiii. 8—12; S. Luke xxii. 24—26.

² No power can alter a law, save a power *at least* co-ordinate with that of the-lawgiver. Let one awful example indicate our meaning.

Compare 1. The following words of our Blessed Lord, “*Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you,*” and “*This is My Blood,*” (pointing to the cup). “*Do this in remembrance of Me.*” “*Drink ye all of this.*” Compare with this,

2. The following extract from the celebrated decree of the Council of Constance, (Sess. 13.) “*This practice then*” (i.e. of *withholding* the cup) “*is to be held as law.* And any Priest who hereafter administers to the people *in both kinds,*” (i.e. who obeys Christ’s *positive* command,) “*is to be excommunicated as guilty of heresy, (!) and delivered over, if necessary, to the secular arm.*”

There is no need that her peculiar doctrines should be tested by GOD'S written Word, and by the decisions of the Church Universal. The very fact of herself sanctioning any doctrine,—*i.e.*, making that to be doctrine which was not doctrine before,—(be it that of the “Deification” or “Immaculate Conception” of the Blessed Virgin, or of the mutilation of the Blessed Sacrament, or of the [Greek] (Exod. xx. 4, 5), or of the Purgatorial flames),—is in itself sufficient to manifest that it *must* be true. How singularly appropriate, when viewed in this connection, are those ominous words of the Apostle Paul addressed of old to the Church of Rome, “Be not high minded, but *fear*. If GOD [425] spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He spare not *thee*. . . Behold, therefore, the goodness of GOD to thee, *if thou continue* in His goodness; otherwise *thou also shalt be cut off*.”

Passing strange, too, that this assumed grant of indefectibility, which, as claimed for *the individual* (superseding, thus, all necessity for Sacraments and Church Communion), has been the fundamental tenet of modern popular Protestantism, the seductive source of its influence among men, and the “corpus” on which its multitudinous parasitic heresies have grown; strange that this very grant, claimed for *the body corporate*, should have been no less truly the peculiar animating principle and distinguishing mark of that powerful section of the Church, from its opposition to which the former derives at once its being, its “faith,” and its name.

But here our limited space compels us abruptly to terminate for the present. We trust to be able to conclude the subject next month.

[500]

As the cardinal question on which the explanation of all the predictions concerning the Lamb-like Beast and Harlot of Babylon turns, is this—whether those emblems are to have a heathen or Christian application, it is necessary that this should be satisfactorily decided, before any further advance is made into the details of the prophecies themselves. For all other questions are subordinate to this, and will fall into their places, *only* after this fundamental consideration has been determined.

I. We have already offered much direct as well as indirect evidence for the *Christian* interpretation of these symbols: but as the consequences flowing therefrom are so serious and important, and as the interpretation itself is so strenuously opposed by many, with whom on a question of this character we feel such unfeigned reluctance to disagree, we must crave indulgence while we discuss the question a little further.

And to begin with a point to which we have already adverted, but which is of such infinite importance in the investigation as to justify our further reference to it, viz.:—

1. The crime of *unchastity* which marks the Mystical Woman. Here then we maintain that an examination of the use of the expressions “adultery” and “fornication” not only throughout the Old Testament, but even in the Apocalypse itself, prohibits our applying them in this place to mere heathen impieties, or lust of dominion, or infidelity from *without*.

The whole account of the Harlot,” writes Mr. Williams, “the judgment, the name, and the figures by which she is characterized,—is little more than bringing out into distinct mention the descriptions in the Old Testament of Israel and Judah—more especially of the latter, as the Bride or Wife which had become adulterous. The basis of the whole description will be found in those two most pathetic and striking chapters of Ezekiel, the 16th and the 23rd; but it is the usual and acknowledged figure in the Prophets for the Sacred Nation. The term ‘adultery’ is

never applied to a heathen kingdom; that of 'harlot' never as an appropriate designation, or as descriptive of a general name and character, and only *twice* as an incidental expression:—as to Tyre, whose singing on her restoration is compare to that of 'a harlot'; and to Nineveh, 'whose dominion was the sea, and the water her walls;' whose 'whoredoms and witchcrafts' are mentioned. It is evident from the Old Testament that by the term '*the great Harlot,*' is meant, not the world at large, nor any infidel city, but a Christian [501] Church;—the Jerusalem dwelling; 'the great city,' 'the great Harlot;' nay, more, 'the Mother of Harlots.' 314.¹

Now we must own that we cannot regard it as other than extraordinary that Professor Hengstenberg, who appears to possess such a marvellous acquaintance with the Old Testament Scriptures, and who generally is so copious in his quotations from them, should yet, when referring to the symbolical meaning of the terms "fornication," and the like, have passed over in *perfect silence* all the reiterated applications of those expressions to the unfaithful Churches of Israel and Judah, and drawn his *one* illustration from the exceptional case of Tyre. (Vol. ii. p. 191; vide also p. 66.) In like manner too, Bossuet, and the modern expositors who follow him, derive the meaning they attach to these expressions exclusively from their incidental employment in the case of Nineveh and Tyre, while their *general* Scripture signification, and that sanctioned in the earlier part of the Apocalypse itself, they absolutely and entirely ignore.

But even these two cases of Nineveh and Tyre cannot after all be said to prove much. How little do we know of either the one or the other to be able to ascertain the precise force of these expressions as applied to them. We merely know, with regard to the former, that the people of Nineveh had, about fifty years or so before her "whoredoms" are spoken of by the prophet Nahum, "*believed God's word,*" had "*turned in sackcloth*" and ashes "*from their evil ways,*" and "*cried mightily unto God*"; so that even here there may be some allusion to their subsequent defection from the Almighty. And with regard to the passage wherein the expression "Harlot" is applied to Tyre, and which speaks of some "mysterious resuscitation" of her after she has "been forgotten" (Isa. xxiii. 16), [502] there can be no reasonable doubt, as Mr. Williams suggests, that there is, in it, some secret connexion with the prophecies concerning the Apocalyptic Babylon in which "so much has a reference to the Tyre of the prophets. As the old Babylon which had 'been forgotten' 'comes into remembrance before GOD,' so likewise is the lost Tyre revived." (p. 315.)

¹ With regard to the question on which such stress is laid by Bossuet, in the preface to his work on the Apocalypse (Euvres. t. iii. pp. 100—3, ed. 1815,) and by his numerous followers, viz. why the woman is not called an "*adulteress*" if she be a faithless Church, and is only called a "*harlot.*" Mr. Williams adds: "The reason appears to be, in order to keep up more closely the connection with the Old Testament, where the former word (i.e. harlot, [Greek]) is used as applied to Jerusalem of old, as may be seen throughout the above-mentioned chapters of Ezekiel (16th and 23rd) on which this vision is founded, where the term occurs throughout in frequent repetition, especially in the former chapter. Moreover, in that and other places of the prophets, it is equivalent to adultery; and the subject referred to is unfaithfulness to her first espousals to God (Jer. ii. 2,) and to His love and care of her (Hos. ii). Again: an adulteress would imply one instance of unfaithfulness: but in these cases there is infidelity "with many lovers" (Jer. iii. 1), which is the case throughout with the Jerusalem of the Prophets (as may be seen especially in the Prophet Hosea), and with "*the Great Harlot*" of S. John. There may be a further difference in the meaning of the two words. The term translated adultery simply signifies defilement; but the other expression, selling herself for hire ([Greek]) which idea pervades the whole of this subject; the impure Church barter and prostitutes her faith to Christ for the advantages of the world; the gold and the silver, the glories and delicacies of the world, are especially dwelt upon; and for these she sells herself to kings, great men, and merchants. The word "*adulteress*" would be here very weak compared with that of "*the Great Harlot.*" (pp. 314—5.)

In fact we firmly believe that in these very prophecies concerning Tyre and Nineveh, this peculiar language is incidentally employed, merely because that, *besides* the primary reference to the two cities themselves, they contain a further allusion to the crimes, history, and fate of the Harlot Babylon itself—the faithless Church—the carnal Jerusalem of the New Dispensation.

And so writes Tichonius (A.D. 390.)¹

“Nineve . . . bipertitæ *Ecclesiæ* figura est. Erat Nineve civitas magna. . . . adversa Deo . . . Sed in figurâ *Ecclesiæ*, prædicante Jonâ, i.e. Christo, omnis omnino liberata est. Eadem Nineve omnino in sequenti Prophetâ peritura describitur, cui prædicans Dominus ‘Signum est Jonæ in ventre ceti.’ Atque ut et ipse propheta ostendit *non esse illam civitatem specialem*, interponit aliqua quæ speciei modum excedant. ‘Non erat’ inquit ‘finis gentilibus illius.’ Et iterum: ‘multiplicasti mercatus tuos super astra cœli,’ i.e. *Ecclesiam*. Et iterum; ‘super quem non venit malitia tua?’ Numquid potuit *unius civitatis* malitia super omnem hominem venisse? Manifestius adhuc docet Propheta *Ecclesiam esse Nineve*,” &c. &c.²

And with regard to Tyre, the same writer thus speaks in reference to the very mysterious passage in which the prophet alludes to her as the “harlot,” who after being forgotten many years should revive, and “commit fornication with *all the kingdoms of the world*,” her “merchandize and hire” being “holiness to the LORD,” “It is incredible,” he says, “that all the world should be spoken of as negotiating with Tyre, si non Tyrus *Ecclesia* est in quâ omne terrarum negotium est æternæ vitæ.” (p. 118.)

[503]

On the whole then, it appears quite impossible to build any solid argument against the system of interpretation which would attach to the words “fornication” and the like, in the case of the Mystic Babylon, their ordinary and recognized Scripture meaning, merely on the ground of their incidental and exceptional application (and even then apparently not without some ulterior spiritual design,) to the two cities Nineveh and Tyre; cities, be it also remembered, alluded to in a peculiar way by our Lord in connection with the fate of His Apostate Israel.

But there are many other expressions which occur in these prophecies which equally refuse and repel a heathen application.

2. Look, for instance, at the word [Greek] inscribed on the Harlot’s face, a word occurring nearly thirty times in the New Testament, and always with a deep spiritual meaning.

¹ In his “*seven rules for interpreting Scripture*.” (Gallandi, vol. viii. P. 117) The rule in illustration of which he introduces these passages, (Reg. iv. ‘De specie et genere’) relates to the frequent transition observable in prophetic Scripture from a particular subject to a more general cognate one, from a part to the whole, from the species to the genus, and conversely; as (e.g.) from the city Jerusalem to the Church Catholic, or from the individual King Solomon to the same. And he truly says of the Holy Spirit, when “speaking by the Prophets,” that “dum in *speciem* narrat, ita in *genus* transit ut transitus non statim liquido appareat: sed talia transiens ponit verba, quæ in *utrumque* convenient, donec paulatim *speciei* modum excedat, et transitus dilucidat.” (p. 115.) As we shall have occasion again to allude to this same book “De septem regulis,” we may just notice what S. Augustine says of it; that it ought to be perused “à studiosis, quia *plurimum adjuvat* ad Scripturas intelligendas.” (De doct. Chr. lib. iii.; Gallandi, viii. 741.)

² The same explanation will also account for the elaborateness of the detail, and magnitude of the images in which the Prophets foretell the destruction of Babylon of the Chaldeans. Although in her case, as though for the very purpose of guarding against the confounding her peculiar sins with those of her Apocalyptic antitype, *no* allusion to fornication occurs; she has no chastity of religious faith to violate; she is invariably the *virgin* daughter of Babylon.

3. Or at S. John's pregnant remark that when he saw the *woman* "drunken with the blood of the Saints," he "*wondered, with great amazement.*" Now surely the Apostle had seen enough of old Heathen Rome to render it a subject of no *very* great astonishment to see her drunk with the blood of the Saints. But to behold the once faithful city, the *Church of Christ*, inspired with the same ruthless and persecuting spirit, this might well confound him; might well move him; even as of old our Lord had been moved to think that it was Jerusalem, *His own* "*Jerusalem that killed the Prophets.*" "When He beheld *the city*, He wept over it."

4. And with regard to the Lamb-like Beast, or False Prophet, with whom the Harlot seems so mysteriously connected, and whose representative she appears for a time to be, we have already shown how its features are all of a spiritual¹ character.

We will however in further illustration of this subject quote one or two passages from an Exposition of Rev. xiii., written by a Christian Bishop about the year 780 a.d.²

He has been quoting the whole passage concerning the Second Beast, and then adds—

"Hoc totum, quanquam *corporaliter* Antichristi tempore factum erit, tamen in Ecclesia *spiritualiter* hodie fit. . . . Ipsa quæ una videtur Ecclesia tres partes sunt; una pars *ipsa* Ecclesia quæ imitatur Christum. Cæteræ duæ partes sunt quæ contra ipsam Ecclesiam pugnant, i.e. hæretici et Christiani mali (Lib. ii. ch. 16.) Hos habet Diabolus prophetas suos quos constituit in Ecclesiâ de corpore suo; hos habet [501] sub nomine Christi qui Christum prædicare simulent, et corpus Diaboli fiant *Intus* Ecclesiâ est hæretica pravitas a quâ vastatur Ecclesia. Sicut de eâ Dominus in hoc libro dicit: 'Scio ubi habitas, ubi sedes est Satanæ.' 'Sedes Satanæ ipsi pseudo-apostoli sunt in quibus sedet in Ecclesiâ Christi. Apostolos Christi se dicunt esse, et Apostoli non sunt sed deceptores Ecclesiæ quia non imitantur Apostolos Christi.'" (c. 17.) And he goes on to add that these false teachers would not be described under the symbol of *another, second* Beast "si *aperte* mala fuissent, aut *intra Ecclesiam* non fuissent, et *Sanctitatem Religionis* simulassent." And in further corroboration of this he notices that whereas the first Beast rises from the *sea*, this second rises from the *land*. "Nam mare fluctuat; terra vero quieta est. *Mare* enim intelligitur populus *aperte malus*. *Terra* vero *Religio est falsa*, et hæretica pravitas. Proinde Bestia 'duo cornua Agni similia' habet, i.e. duo Testamenta Legis et Evangelii. . . . Agnum se profert quo Draconis venena latenter inserat. Agni enim similis non esset si *aperte* ut Draco loqueretur." (c. 19, 20.)³

And shortly afterwards he likens the Church to Paradise; and adduces Satan's temptation of the woman, as a type of his present temptation of the Church, and especially of his insidious promptings to doctrinal developments. "Cur præcepit vobis Dominus ut non comederetis *ex omni ligno* Paradisi? Quare fugitis *scientiam habere latentem*? *Novam superexquirite*, et boni et mali scientiam penetrate." (c. 28.)

5. But it is when we refer to the supposed fulfilment of the judgments denounced against the Great Harlot that we feel most strongly how Bossuet's and Hengstenberg's theory falls

¹ Bossuet however thinks not. He says (in loc.) "cette bête, c'est la philosophie, et en particulier la philosophic Pythagoricienne." And one of his suggestions for the interpretation of the two Lamb-like horns is that they represent "Plotin et son disciple Porphyre". Corn. à Lap. on the contrary says, "videtur quod hic pseudo propheta erit *episcopus quispiam apostata*, et simulator Religionis, Ecclesiastici honoris proditor, qui Draconis venenum sermonibus populo propinabit." (Comm. in Rev. xiii.)

² This treatise, the joint production of a Bishop and a Presbyter, (Etherius, and Beatus) is entitled "De Christo et ejus corpore quod est Ecclesia; et de Diabolo et ejus corpore quod est Anti-Christus." (Gallandi, xiii. 328—351.)

³ So Primasius in loc. "Agno enim similis non esset si *aspertè* ut Draco loqueretur. Nunc autem Agnum fingit ut *Agnum* invadat, i.e. *Christi Corpus.*" (Mag. Bi. Pat. vol. vi. 2nd part, p. 179.)

to pieces. We are assured by the Angel that the Harlot shall be “*utterly burnt with fire,*” and that the fire shall “*never be quenched*”: and these assurances are reiterated. To indicate the universality of her destruction, her plagues are spoken of as four-fold, *Death, Mourning, Famine, and Burning*; and they are described, partly as the work of the “Kings of the earth” who have hitherto dallied with her, and in a sudden phrenzy of revenge shall fall upon her, and partly as the result of judgments from Heaven.

Her destruction is to come upon her “*in one day,*” nay, “*in one hour.*” And she is henceforth to become the “habitation of Devils and the hold of all unclean birds.” She is to be “cast as a millstone into the sea,” and to be found “*no more at all.*”

Now it seems well nigh incredible to think, that we should be assured by a whole array of learned Expositors that all these tremendous predictions *have* been accomplished, that the “burning” means merely the “fire of war”—that the “shall never be quenched” means nothing—that Rome has entirely disappeared, that she has [505] been cast as a millstone into the sea and has been found *no more at all*. That “her smoke rises up for ever and ever,” that she has become the habitation of Devils, that in that one heathen city was “found the blood of *all* who were slain on the earth;” that the expressions “in one day” and “in one hour” are merely the gathering into a focus all the calamities which in various ways and at different periods have lighted upon her; that the fulness of the description is, according to Bossuet, merely “the manner of speech drawn from common discourse,” (*Œuvres*, iii. 436,) and according to Hengstenberg, to give reality to the predictions, it being extremely difficult *not* to see, and yet to believe.” (*Hengst.* ii. 212—237; 246.)¹

But we need not enlarge upon these difficulties. We wonder however that the following obvious consideration has not struck this class of interpreters.

6. Two women are introduced into the Apocalypse,—one faithful, the other faithless—[Greek] and [Greek]. Two cities are also introduced, with which the two women are severally identified. The one, Jerusalem from above, the Holy city—the other, the carnal Jerusalem, “where also our LORD was crucified,” called also Babylon, Sodom, Egypt—“the great city.” Now the obvious parallelism which appears to be drawn between these two, compels us to adopt a uniform system of interpretation in explaining them. We cannot take one woman to be a type of the whole company of the faithful, and the other to be merely one heathen city. No. The [Greek] has a spiritual meaning, so has the [Greek]. The one city is mystical, so also must be the other. So that the two pairs form striking illustrations of Tichonius’ Second Rule “*De Domini corpore bipertito.*”² The Harlot and the Bride, Babylon and Jerusalem being but different *sides* of the *same body*; the former corresponding to the *left*, the latter to the *right*. For “CHRIST’S Body” he says, “has two sides”; which accounts for the Church being able thus to speak of herself “*Fusca sum et*

¹ Corn. à Lap. says of this interpretation, “Non esse *probabile*, hoc caput et sequens (17th and 18th,) *posse* accipi de cladibus et excidiis illatis Romæ ab Alarico &c. Illa enim non fuere tanta quantum hoc erit, nimirum *extremum* et *inauditum*. Rursum, tunc Roma fuit Christiana ac consequenter non fuit tunc infidelis nec ita superba et dives ut Babylon vocari possit.” (*Comm. in Cap. 17.*) His own opinion is that Babylon is “Roma non Christiana ut nunc est, sed infidelis et pagana qualis fuit tempore S. Johannis qualisque rursum erit tempore Antichrists.” The opinion, it will be remembered, advocated by the learned writer of the four Sermons on Antichrist. *Oxf. Tr.* 83.

² S. Augustine excepts to this peculiar expressions of Tichonius, inasmuch as, “*that,*” says he, “non re verâ Domini Corpus est quod cum illo non erit in æternum.” And instead of corpus bipertitum he would substitute corpus verum atque permixtum; or verum atque simulatum; or ecclesia permixta. The church being able to call herself both *black* and yet *comely*, “propter temporalem unitatem intra una retia piscium bonorum et malorum.”—*Gallandi*, viii. 741.

decora,—"I am both *black* and *comely*. "Absit enim ut ecclesia quæ non habet maculam aut rugam, quam Dominus suo sanguine mundavit, *aliqua* ex [506] parte fusca sit *nisi in parte sinistrâ*, per *quam* nomen Dei *blasphematur*."¹ (Gallandi viii. 109.) And among other illustrations of this rule he adduces the case of the "Septiformis Ecclesia" of the Apocalypse, part of which, he says, is holy and mindful of God's law, part stained with many crimes. And he gives also that striking example in the Gospel, wherein we find, as he expresses it, "unum corpus," and yet a "diversum meritum." We see the Church under two aspects. We first have that "*blessed servant*" whom his Lord at His coming shall find faithful; and then, with reference to the very same, we have that "*wicked servant*" whom his Lord will "cut asunder and appoint him his portion with the hypocrites." So that according to the terminology of this writer the [Greek] and [Greek], Jerusalem and Babylon will respectively typify the *pars dextra*, and *pars sinistra Christi Corporis*.

7. But we must not omit to notice one important fact connected with the doom of the Harlot which further strengthens the evidence for her being no mere pagan city, but in very truth God's apostate Israel. For her fate is none other than that of the faithless priest's daughter under the Law. She "is burned with fire." For "the daughter of any priest, if she profane herself by playing the harlot, she profaneth her father, *she shall be burnt with fire*." (Lev. xxi. 9.)²

And many awful foreshadowings of this her fate do we meet with in the Old Testament. Take for instance the following:

"Wherefore, O *Harlot*, (Jerusalem,) hear the word of the Lord . . . I Will gather all thy lovers with whom thou has taken pleasure And I will give thee into their hand, and they shall break down thy high places and leave thee naked and bare and shall *burn thy houses with fire*."—Zech. xvi. 35—41.

And again,—“Behold, I raise up thy lovers against thee and they shall deal furiously with thee. They shall take thy sons and thy daughters; and thy residue *shall be devoured by the fire*.”—ib. xxiii. 22—25.”

“The punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom that was overthrown as in a moment*. The Lord hath accomplished His fury, and *hath kindled a fire in Zion*. It hath *devoured the foundations thereof* for the sins of her prophets, and the iniquities of her priests.” Lam. iv. 6—13.

“I will *kindle a fire* in the gates” of Jerusalem, “and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and *it shall not be quenched*.” Jer. xvii. 27.

And listen to the lamentable cry of the faithful remnant who during this sad desolation of the Church visible shall yet maintain their integrity.

[507]

“O GOD, wherefore art Thou absent from us so long, why is *Thy wrath so hot* against the sheep of Thy pasture? Thine adversaries roar in the midst of thy congregations. . . . They have *set fire* upon Thy holy places, and defiled the dwelling place of Thy Name even unto the ground. . . . *They have burnt up all the houses of GOD in the land*. We see not our tokens, there is not one prophet more.”—Psalm lxxiv.

¹ Just as the Jerusalem of the Old Testament is both the “holy city” and the “bloody city,” the “joy of the whole earth,” and yet “worse than Sodom.”

² Quoted by Williams, p. 352.

“Turn Thee again, Thou GOD of Hosts, look down from Heaven, behold, and visit this vine, and the place of the vineyard that Thy right hand hath planted. . . . *It is burnt with fire and cut down.*”—Psalm lxxx.¹

Now in these and other kindred passages we cannot but feel that “Novum Testamentum in vetere latet,” and that we may here discern awful forecastings of some tremendous judgment awaiting the Church visible.² Would to GOD we could read them otherwise, but we cannot, and therefore must not, and dare not close our eyes to them. We see the doom of “that servant who knew his LORD’S will, and yet did it not.” We see “judgment *beginning* at the *house of GOD*.”³

8. But the most mysterious and awful statement concerning the mystical Babylon is this, that “in *her* is found the blood of all who are slain on the earth.” But this again, only the more firmly and [508] indissolubly connects the prophecy with the carnal Jerusalem, or apostate church. Listen to our LORD’S emphatic words, “It *cannot* be that a prophet perish *out of Jerusalem.*” And “Upon *her* shall come *all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel.*”

It is a tremendous thought that as the Christian Church has inherited the blessings, so has she terribly *inherited the curses* of the elder Jerusalem. Our LORD’S public ministry commenced with an eight-fold *blessing*, it terminated with an *eight-fold woe*. Solomon, the peculiar type of the Christian Church, began his reign most hopefully, with the brightest prospects and most glorious promises, but ended it, alas! we hardly know how. Like his great Antitype he was allured and overcome by the seductions of the seven-headed Beast, by worldly pomp and prosperity. And here we may, perhaps, notice the strange coincidence (quoted by Mr. Williams from Bede) that just at the crisis of Solomon’s prosperity we are arrested by the mention of the very *number of the Beast*, 666. The

¹ Compare also the following description of the Harlot of the Old with that of the Harlot of the New Dispensation. “All that pass by clap their hands at thee, they hiss and wag their head at the daughter of Jerusalem, saying, Is this the city that men call the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth? . . . The Lord hath fulfilled His word, He hath thrown down and hath not pitied.”

Compare also the detailed account of the *merchandize* of the mystic Babylon with our Lord’s stern and fearfully significant rebuke, “Ye have made *My Father’s house* a house of *merchandize.*”

Let the expression “The Light of a candle,” also be noted—that spiritual Light which the Church as a candlestick has to hold, or as the mystical woman, to carry in her hand. “She lighteth *her candle* and sweepeth her house diligently.” “Ye *shine as lights* in the world *holding forth the Word of Life.*” “She girdeth her loins with strength, and her candle *goeth not out by night.*” But both Jerusalem of the Old, and Babylon of the New Testament are judicially deprived of this Sacred Light, this “Candle of the Lord.” Of the former it is solemnly affirmed “I will take from Jerusalem the voice of the *Bridegroom* and the voice of the *Bride* . . . and the *Light of the candle*” (Jer. xxv. 10 ;Cf. vii. 34; xvi. 9.) And of the latter we read in that most pathetic lament in the Revelation: “And the *Light of a candle* shall shine no more at all in thee: and the voice of the *Bridegroom* and of the *Bride* shall be heard no more at all in thee . . . for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived. (Rev. xviii. 23.)

² Or rather the great bulk of the Church visible. For we must never forget that there is a distinct assurance of preservation vouchsafed, during these sad times, to one faithful section, prefigured by the Church of Philadelphia. “Thou hast a little strength and *hast kept My word* . . . Because *thou hast kept the word of My patience*, I also *will keep thee* from the hour of temptation which shall come upon all the world . . . Behold I come quickly, *Hold fast that which thou hast.*” (Cap. iii. 10, 11.)

But we shall have to allude to this again.

³ For the Harlot, or faithless Church, is destroyed *before* the Beast, or infidel worldly power. Even as Jehovah predicted by His Prophet, “Lo I *begin* to bring evil on the *City which is called by My Name*, and shall ye (addressing the ungodly world) be utterly unpunished? Ye shall *not* be unpunished, for I will call for a sword upon *all the inhabitants of the earth.*” (Jer. xxv. 29.)

worldly wealth of this monarch has this ominous title inscribed upon it. For “the weight of gold,” we read, “which came to Solomon in one year was 666 talents of gold.” (1 Kings x. 14.)

II. But leaving this painful subject for the present, we must proceed to say a few words on the mysterious question whether or not the Apocalypse furnishes any intimations respecting the dread Personal Adversary, [Greek]. Is such a Being yet to appear? If so, what is to be his nature? What will give rise to him? And what now “withholds” his revelation? What connection has he with the Beast? What with Babylon?

It is with no small sense of the difficulty attaching to these and kindred questions, and with an earnest disclaimer of the remotest intention on our part to dogmatize upon them, but yet with a deep conviction of their momentous importance, that we venture to offer a few suggestions on some of them.

And 1st. Is such a Being to appear? Assuredly *not*, says Hengstenberg. Antichrist is but an “*ideal person*,” (ii. 87,) and the belief in the future manifestation of such an *individuals* is but the result of a “vicious realism” applied to the prophetic Scriptures.

But in answer to this we have simply to say, To whom are we to give credence, the German Professor or the Catholic Church? For, leaving out of consideration matters of faith, we believe there are few points with regaled to which the “semper, ubique, et ab omnibus” may be more truly predicated than that a personal Antichrist is yet to appear.

But what is to be his nature? He is unquestionably to be a *man*. But, “though a man by nature,” says Theodoret (in 2 Thess. ii.) “yet being endued with all the working of Satan, ([Greek]) he is therefore called the ‘man [509] of sin.’” Bede speaks of him as “*unus de hominibus in quo totus Satan habitaturus est corporaliter*,” (in Rev. xiii. 18.) Corn. à Lapide, as “*organum Diaboli*,” et “*quasi Diabolus incarnatus*.”¹

In truth, so mysterious is our nature, so “fearful and wonderful” a being is man, that it would seem even Satan himself must enlist the services of one of our flesh and blood, some wretched son of Adam in order successfully to carry out his grand final assault.

Mr. Williams truly says that the advent of a personal Antichrist is “rendered probable by what we know of the *wonderful, as it were magical power of personal influence*; the universal tendency to what is vulgarly called hero-worship,” (p. 424.) And so it is. Man, created originally in the image of GOD, is so framed that nothing *less than* GOD can satisfy him. And if the Almighty’s seat in the heart be unoccupied by *Him*, there is a void which it will ever be the restless endeavour of the soul to fill up with the creature. Hence the instinctive yearning and craving of the ungodly world for some one on whom to rest, to whom to “yield themselves servants to obey,” which, when this Demon-Man shall appear

¹ S. Jerome alludes to him (in 2 Thess. ii.) simply as “*Diabolus*.” S. Chrysostom however ever says (ibid.) “Who is this? Is it Satan? *By no means*. But some *man* endued with all the working of Satan” (the words quoted by Theodoret, as mentioned above—quoted also by Theophylact and (Ecumenius). Pope Gregory speaks of him as “*Damnatus ille homo quem in fine mundi Apostata Angelus assumet*” (Vol. i. p. 422. B.) “*In illo, humana quidem forma cernitur, sed verbis suis ultra homines elevatur*.” “*Purus homo generatur: sed immaniter crescit, quia useque ad conjunctam sibi vim Angelicæ fortitudinis proficit*.” “*In uno illo damnato homine tota Diaboli virtus congesta densatur*.” (ibid. p. 1062.) Berengaudus says of him that he will be a *man*, but that “the Devil will take up his abode within him,” ‘et per eum, quicquid nequitia Diaboli excogitare potest, operabitur. (S. Ambrose, vol. ii. p. 550.)

Aquinas says that he is called “the man of sin,” “*quia sicut in Christo abundavit plenitudo virtutis, ita in Anti-Christo, multitudo omnium peccatorum. . . . Et propter hoc homo peccati dicitur quod totaliter erit peccatis deditus*.” (in 2 Thess. ii.)

with all his irresistible personal influence and superhuman powers of fascination, will cause them, by the retributive permission of an offended GOD, to fly like the filings round the magnet, to his standard—so as to justify the simple statement of S. John, that “*all the world wondered* after the Beast,” followed him in blind infatuated admiration.

But have we any intimation afforded by S. John as to the particular stage of the world’s history which is to witness the revelation of this wondrous being?

The world’s history is briefly capitulated by the Apostle in his account of the seven-headed Beast. And without entering into any discussion as to the identification of these several heads, we will simply say that we entirely coincide with what appears to be the general patristic opinion, maintained also by Mr. Williams, that *the seventh head* which the angel affirmed was yet to come, and at coming to continue only *for a short space*, is the head which will develop the personal Antichrist—that it is still future—that its [510] rise, or rather, perhaps, full development, coincides with the loosing of Satan out of his strong hold, who, in fact, appears loosed for this special purpose, to be permitted to organize his grand final confederation of iniquity and apostacy, to inspire the human leader of this confederation, to gather together to one centre, to concentrate as it were into one focus all the powers of the earth and Hell for one tremendous and open attack upon CHRIST and the faithful remnant of His Church—symbolized, in our LORD’S career, by Satan’s terrific onset in Gethsemane, the intense energy of resistance to which wrung from Him a sweat of blood—and then to be gloriously and terribly, and eternally crushed. Satan, we must remember, is to be loosed only for “a little season,” and this “little season,” and the “short space” of the seventh head’s dominion would appear obviously identical.

As for the six other heads,¹ we will satisfy ourselves with what Bede says: (in Rev. xvii.) “Cum in *septenario* numero *plenitudinem mundani* descripsisset *imperii*, cujus ultima pars, i.e., Antichristi nondum venerat regnum; consequenter *quinque* reges præterisse, *sextum* adesse, *septimum* venturum esse testatur.”

But now comes the *crux commentatorum*.

What are we to understand by that strange assertion which the Angel apparently makes, viz., that the Beast itself is *one of its own heads*, i.e., its own seventh head? “The seven heads [of the Beast] . . . are seven kings . . . and the Beast . . . is one of the seven.”—(xvii. 9—11.) Mr. Williams says that the Angel cannot mean this (p. 341); and he endeavours to solve the enigma by a reference, we think unsatisfactory, to Daniel. Hengstenberg explains “he is of the seven,” as meaning he is like the seven in that he goes to perdition. In fact, we are not aware of any expositor (and we have referred to many,) who fairly meets these words in their plain and literal acceptation. Assuming that they *cannot* mean what they *appear* to mean, they *first* modify the statement itself, and *then* endeavour to explain it.² For ourselves we [511] firmly believe that, paradoxical as the

¹ Hengstenberg gives forcible reasons for supposing the Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Medo-Persian, and Grecian to be the five fallen world-monarchs or heads of the Beast, and the Roman to be the sixth which existed in S. John’s time. (ii. 10—12; 201.) Thus far we might perhaps agree with him—further we cannot.

² We may here just notice the strange mistake into which Dr. Wordsworth, Mr. Elliot, and so many others fall in giving the Beast and *eighth* head, though we are distinctly told that he has only *seven*. In order to settle the position of this apocryphal head—i.e. the Papacy which succeeds the seven successive forms of government of Rome—Dr. Wordsworth translates the words [Greek] “He rises without interruption *after* the seventh” (vide ‘Essay on Babylon’ pp. 40—1; also ‘Lecture’ ix.) But Dr. W. does not translate these same words so when they occur {in} Acts xxi. 8. “We entered into the house of Philip the Evangelist, [Greek] who was one of the seven.” Therefore, until it can be shown where this new head comes from,
{cont.}

statement may appear, this is just what the Angel does say, and not only so, but that the statement itself is of the greatest exegetical importance, as furnishing the proper clue to the interpretation of this tangled and complicated prophecy. For it simply indicates this, that the expression “the Beast,” has a two-fold reference, and consequently that the prophecy itself has two distinct and parallel lines of interpretation corresponding with the two meanings of its subject, the Beast. And such, we feel convinced, is really the case. The whole seven-beaded monster is the *Beast, general*; the seventh head is the *Beast, special*. The self-same title is indiscriminately attached to the whole “corpus” and to the seventh head, inasmuch as, in the extraordinary career of the latter, there would appear to be a marvellous summary and recapitulation, as it were, of all the previous history of the former, together with a concentration of all its power and wickedness.

In fact, as *each* successive *head* has in its turn appeared upon the stage, that head has, for the time being, been in a manner identified with the Beast itself—the only monster having one “active” head at a time. For instance, during the period of the Assyrian dynasty the “Beast” would represent, specially, the empire of Assyria; during the ascendancy of Rome it would represent the Roman; and so, though in a more full and peculiar manner, during the times of Antichrist will it represent that new world-monarchy which Antichrist shall head.

Now, in its *sixth* head, the whole Beast received a mortal stroke by the death of CHRIST. As Hengstenberg truly remarks, that event “is the *one* event in the world’s history in which the whole Beast was smitten in the one head,” (ii. 21);¹ and the Beast’s [512] mortal stroke and gradual death in its sixth phase, or head, obviously coincides with the gradual disappearance and death of the Dragon, and that again with the binding of Satan. So that, on the other hand, the loosing of Satan for a short season, the resuscitation of the Beast in its seventh phase, and the reappearance of the Dragon, will be all equally coincident, and will synchronize as we have before intimated, or perhaps be consummated by the development of the personal Satan-inspired Antichrist.

and until the present reading [Greek] is changed for [Greek] we must beg to translate the words [Greek] here also “He is *one of the seven*.”

And surely a comparison of the anarthrous [Greek] with the [Greek] (xvii. 10, 11,) would of itself indicate that the parenthetic statement that the Beast “is himself *an eighth*” has no reference to any of his seven heads. What then does the expression refer to?

We have one Scripture example which appears exactly to explain it. It is said of Noah (2 S. Pet. ii. 5) that he was [Greek], “an eighth,” an expression which has, as well a *mystical* as a *literal* meaning. The former we have already hinted at in a previous paper when speaking of the No. 8. The latter *includes a reference to the Old Testament* from which we discover that Noah was *one of eight* who were saved.

Now the meaning of [Greek] appears precisely the same in this other case. We have first a *mystical* meaning, already explained; we have also a *literal* meaning *including a reference to the Old Testament*, from which we discover that the Beast in like manner is *one of eight*. The expression seems merely a slight, though sufficiently significant note of identification of the *Beast, special*, with the “Little horn” of Daniel, (or rather, with the *monarchy* headed by him) who, it will be remembered, finds ten kings, subdues three, and reigns along with the seven, as *the eighth*, the dominion of his seven confederates however being more nominal than real—“they reign *as* kings.”

In the Beast reigning supreme with his seven subordinates, some of the fathers hint a possible allusion to the “unclean spirit,” who on his return to his deserted tenement takes with him seven other spirits—himself therefore *an eighth*.

¹ “I have overcome *the world*,” says our LORD. “Now is the judgment of *this world*.” “Now shall the *Prince of this world* be cast out.” Here we see the *Beast itself*; the world, in the fullest significance of that term, about to receive a death blow.

But here another *crux* occurs. S. John says of the Beast, in his time, that he both “*is*” in his sixth head, and yet that he “*is not*.” How can both statements be true?

One¹ solution of the difficulty is plainly this, that inasmuch as its death-blow had been *given*, the Beast even *then*, in the Prophet’s eye, *was not*; but inasmuch as the effect of the death-blow was not actually *complete*—for the expiring struggle was lingering and violent, and the death itself to be only gradually effected by the gradual extension and influence of CHRIST’S Church, therefore the Apostle could as truly say that, in one sense, the Beast still *existed*.

III. But now a very interesting and important question arises. Is there anything to fill up the long interregnum between the death of the Beast in its sixth, or Roman head, and its awful revival in its seventh, or Antichristian head? During the whole period of the Beast’s torpor, during the long season of the Dragon’s disappearance, and Satan’s incarceration, in fact, during the whole period from the firm establishment of CHRIST’S Church² upon earth to the Apocalypse of Antichrist, is there no world-monarchy of any kind in existence?

[513]

Now it seems to be here where the fake prophet, or lamb-like Beast intervenes. In his extraordinary history (not but that it will have a more full and *literal* fulfilment hereafter corresponding with the *special*, as the present supposed fulfilment corresponds with the *general* signification of “the Beast,” we seem to have an intimation of what took place during that period. The old “Beast” is now, in a manner, torpid, inactive, and harmless, for he has lost his animating principle—the Dragon. He continues, it is true, a sort of fitful life in his ten horns. But there is no head to unite the disintegrated fragments of the old world-power, no centre round which for them to rally. Hitherto “from the time of Pharaoh downwards, one vast world-monarchy has always supplanted another,” (Hengst. ii. 73.) But it is so no longer.

A new head *shall* arise, the Dragon again animate it, and a tremendous final centralization yet take place. But this head has not come yet. His coming is withheld. There is a restraining power—of which we must speak anon. And the Beast lies prostrate. But his place is supplied by *another*, and what he cannot effect himself is done for him. Like the Divine Person, of Whom he is the special opponent and counterpart, though in a manner

¹ Another solution would merely be this, that although, as a representative of any definite world-monarchy, the Beast had ceased to exist—as is the case in this present time—yet that, as a personification of the abstract principle of *worldliness*, it still held unabated sway, still continued as a rival to Christ, as a powerful godless *principle*, (the light in which we exclusively regarded it in our last paper,) and as that formidable entity of which S. John says in one place, that “*all shall worship him* whose names are not written in the Book of Life,” and in another, that “*all that is not of the Father is of the world*.”

² For we must remember that it was through the instrumentality of His Church that our Lord gradually consummated those great events, (the destruction of the Draconic power of the Beast; the binding of Satan, &c.); and through the same instrumentality was it to be that the subjugation was to be continued. For the Church had supernatural aids at her disposal whereby she would ever, if faithful, be enabled to “trample the Lion and the Dragon under her feet.” It has been remarked that no mention is ever made of *Dæmoniacs* appearing at Jerusalem where the public worship of God was openly maintained. And so, in like manner, as the Church of Christ began to make her voice *openly* heard, the Dragon and Satan *openly* disappeared; so that, in course of time, throughout the length and breadth of Christendom, the old Dragon-inspired, God-hating, persecuting world-power *openly* vanished.

But what if the Church instead of fulfilling her commission of trampling upon the Lion and the Dragon begins to trifle with them? will not her powers of resisting them be gradually withdrawn, her dread foes regain their vitality, and, it may be, at last turn round upon her, and terribly *trample* upon *her*? The death of the old Adam in Holy Baptism and its subsequent revival if not kept under, may serve forcibly to illustrate this mysterious subject.

removed from sight, yet is he not the less really, spiritually, and efficiently present. Like *Him* too, he has a vicegerent who mysteriously “worketh” for him. And what does this lamb-like vicegerent “work?” Not only does he exercise “all the power” of the first Beast before him, but he is further enabled to give life to an “image,”¹ or representation of the Beast itself. So that again is to be witnessed, though not the old world-monarchy itself, yet its very image and picture.

But, strange to say, instead of being leagued *against* the Lamb, as its *original* had always been, this new provisional world-sovereignty is ostensibly energized and actuated by the Lamb Himself. And this, in fact, is the great mark which distinguishes it from its original; that though claiming as world-wide a dominion, or even more so, than any preceding phase of the latter, yet, instead of being opposed to Christ, it grounds its peculiar and relentless title to *universal* allegiance² on the very fact that its power is derived *from* Christ. It is no longer Dragon-inspired, like the old [514] Egypt, and Assyria, and Rome of ancient times, the avowed persecutors of GOD’S people, but it is Lamb-inspired, and professes to exercise its sway by virtue of, and under immediate commission from Him Whom it was ever the custom of its original to oppose.³

But we must hasten on.

The expression, “*the Beast*,” we have shown to have as well a generic as a specific meaning, generically, to designate the world power as a whole, specifically, to designate the seventh, or Antichristian phase of this power.

¹ If in this place we appear to refer peculiarly to the world-monarchy, temporal as well as spiritual, claimed by the Roman Pontiff, it is not because we by any means *confine* these predictions to that, but mainly because we there see exhibited in a concrete form, and in so striking and palpable a way, that which exists in a subtler, and not less dangerous because less perceptible a manner, throughout the length and breadth of Christendom. The marvellous union of the Church and the world which the Primatial See of Christendom exhibits is at once a convenient illustration, and striking type of that same secret union elsewhere; and of that worldliness which, whether in the form of secularity of erastianism, has, under the guise of Christianity so defaced the fair proportions of the “temple of God.”

² The *theoretical* extent of its claim is best given in the words (extracted from the Canon Law) of the Power itself. “Porro, subesse Romano Pontifici, *omni humanæ creaturæ* declaramus, dicimus, definimus, et pro-nunciamus, *omnino esse de necessitate salutis.*”

How very wonderful do the predictions of Pope Gregory appear with regard to the assumption of this ecclesiastical sovereignty, and how noticeable the fact of his regarding it as a prefiguration in the Church of the very dominion of Antichrist—in short, as an “image of the Beast.” And *he* wrote much and thought deeply on this subject of Antichrist, as his “Magna Moralia” so fully attest. (Vide on the subject of this note, his *Moral*. P. 924. B. [op t. i. Bened. ed.] also quotations from his epistles &c. in *Allies’ Ch. of Eng. cleared &c.* pp. 344—368, especially 355—6)

³ It must be observed that the picture of the Lamb-like Beast, or Spiritual Power giving life and energy to the “image” of *the Beast*, i.e., to some revived phase of the old world-power, has a counterpart, or complement, in the other picture of “the Beast” itself with the harlot on its back, itself apparently harmless and powerless, and merely employed as the beast of burden of the mystical woman who directs and controls it.

In both cases we see a “Babylon,” or “confusion; an illicit combination between Christ and the world. In the former we see the spiritual energising and vivifying the worldly power. In the latter, the worldly power *supporting* the spiritual. The two pictures certainly look not unlike two aspects of some complex power, one while employing its *temporal* sway for the propagation of a corrupted faith, at another, its *spiritual* pretensions for the subserving its secular aggrandizement. Such, verily, is a picture of the monarchy which Antichrist shall head; who will rise out of an apostacy, and propagate an apostacy. But may we not add in the words of Etherius, already quoted, “Hoc totum quanquam corporaliter Antichristi tempore factum erit, tamen *in Ecclesiâ* spiritualiter, *hodie fit*”?

The “*Image of the Beast*” must necessarily have, in like manner, a two-fold signification corresponding with these two aspects of its original.

As answering to the *Beast general*, we have considered it chiefly to refer to that representation or copy of the old world-dominion, which for many centuries held sway in Christendom, (it being peculiarly with Christendom that the Apocalypse has to do,) and which has ever put forth *claims* to allegiance, which at least have never been *exceeded* by the most extravagant which any phase of the real world-power has ever yet advanced.

But what will the “image of the Beast” refer to, as answering to the *Beast special*? We have considered this latter to be an impersonation of the last great world-monarchy, of the political organization of the world during the time of Antichrist. What then will the “image,” or representative of this gigantic, though short-lived dominion be? Plainly its *individual Head*, that one human being who, first of all his race, will have offered to him and will *accept* (what was once offered to Another and rejected,) in [515] the fullest comprehension of the vast expressions, “All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them,” and who, awful to add, will agree to, and fulfil the conditions to which the bestowal of this grant is attached, “*If thou wilt fill down and worship ME!*”

So that we thus arrive at a point suggested, and we believe most truly, by Mr. Williams, (p. 425,) that in this expression, the “image” of the Beast, we appear to have the *one* notice with which the Apocalypse furnishes us of that extraordinary *individual* whom Prophet Daniel (nay, nearly all the Prophets), whom the Apostle Paul, and S. John in his epistles, describe in such dreadful terms—the “Apostate,”—the “Man of Sin,” the “Son of Perdition.” If this suggestion be true, it will appear that the word [Greek] is used in the New Testament as a *personal* designation of two Beings only, “The Image of the invisible GOD,” and “the Image of the Beast;” the Incarnate JEHOVAH, and that miserable son of Adam, “in quo totus Satanus habiturus est corporaliter,” (Bede); who shall be set up for *adoration* in “the holy place” by the Lamb-like Beast or spiritual apostacy out of which he shall spring, (“quem creant adorant,”) and who shall lay absolute and literal claim to universal spiritual as well as temporal authority—authority over [Greek].¹

And once more.—As the Beast has a general as well as a special meaning—as his “Image” has the same—such will be the case also with his other concomitants, as e.g. the “two witnesses” against whom he wages war, and the *numbers* which indicate their respective terms of continuance; which latter, although as viewed in connection with the *Beast general* they are doubtless to be considered as symbolical and merely exponents of certain ideas, yet as connected with the *Beast special*, must in all probability be interpreted literally.

And lastly.—These considerations certainly seem to explain the cause of the difficulty and obscurity which hand over so much of the symbolic history of the Beasts. For it can hardly be doubted that, even as the symbolic history of CHRIST’S Body, the Church, is in this book described in language borrowed from the personal history of our LORD Himself, so the career and developments of the *Beast general*, or great Body of Antichrist are described in

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 4. ([Greek], Augustus.)

We confess it is no source of wonder to us that the power which we have in some measure identified with the “image” of the *Beast general*, should have been so frequently confounded with the “image” of the *Beast special*, viz., Antichrist himself. The broad features of resemblance between the *supremacy* respectively laid claim to by each are too striking not to render such a mistake more than probable.

language borrowed from the personal history of Antichrist himself.¹ Whence it will be evident that with our present knowledge we can only [516] arrive at the full import of these latter prophecies approximately and uncertainly. Until the rays reach the focus, the image will necessarily appear distorted and confused. Marvellous therefore and inexplicable as many of these Apocalyptic sayings at present appear, they will be plain and clear when the time of their *special* accomplishment arrives. And then, doubtless, to “the wise” who “understand,” they will in that gloomy season, in that dim twilight and black night of the Church’s and the world’s history, “shine as a light” in a very “*dark place*.”

We had hoped to have completed the subject in our present number, but as we have as yet said nothing with regard to the [Greek], or restraining power which now keeps back the coming of that wicked one; or the practical conclusions which the subject forces upon ourselves, we must yet once again beg to trespass upon our reader’s patience.

¹ There are few passages, perhaps throughout the whole of Scripture which afford better illustration of Tichonius’ fourth rule, “*De specie et genere*,” alluded to above.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol 15 (Joseph Masters: London, 1853)
 [529] **THE APOCALYPSE: MESSIAS AND ANTIMESSIAS**
 (Concluded from page 516.)

Messias and Antimessias. A Prophetical Exposition, to which are added Two Homilies on the Body of CHRIST. By the Rev. CHARLES INGHAM BLACK. Masters.

I. BEFORE proceeding to the subjects which we proposed to consider in the present paper, we must beg to draw our reader's attention to the short but valuable treatise of Mr. Black, the title of which we have given above, which bears closely on the matters which have recently been engaging us, and of which we shall have occasion to avail ourselves in our present number.

It is a work of unusual ability. And although not adopting several of the writer's conclusions, we yet cordially recommend it to our readers, as a work, at least most suggestive and interesting, forcible in style, catholic in spirit, and giving evidence of careful reading and much original thought.¹ Its main object is to trace out the several developments and manifestations of the great Anti-christian Principle as it has been seen to come to a head at different crises of the world's history; and thus to deduce, as well from the prophecies of the future, as from the history of the past, what may be safely conjectured respecting the grand final Antichristian outbreak. Subordinate to this is an attempt to classify the historical prophecies of Scripture; such, at least, as are left *unexplained* by the sacred writers themselves; Mr. Black's theory being, that the predictions contained in the Inspired Records respecting the destiny of the several branches of Adam's posterity, are uniformly to be interpreted in that wider scope which relates to, not tribes, nor nations, but *races*; that, as the human family may be regarded as comprising *three* great races, sprung from the three sons of the Patriarch Noah,—so in fact *is* it regarded in Holy Writ: insomuch that, wherever the contrary is not distinctly specified, the historical prophecies are to be considered as contemplating, primarily, some one or other of these three great Parent branches.

“The power of the world-King,” writes Mr. Black, “was first appropriated by the family of Ham . . . Afterwards, however, dominion was granted to the families of Japhet and Shem successively. Shem, the first named, for his spiritual greatness, is the last to have temporal power. The earthly power thus granted to the family of each son appears to have furnished a nucleus for the future develop[530] ment of the kingdom of Antimessias. Each family, moreover, has been found to evolve a religious element. All, combined in their religious and political phases, compose the force and power of the great enemy. These powers are the subject of *uninterpreted* prophecy.

“Those outlying clans which never formed component parts of these empires, and thus have never been arrayed against the Redeemer, will remain exempt from the conflicts of the *Antichristian world*, and will compose the GOG and MAGOG of a later dispensation.”—Pp. 33, 34.

Our author proceeds, with some ingenuity, to apply his theory to the explanation of the Dream Image of Nebuchadnezzar; to Daniel's vision of the four wild beasts from the great sea (Dan. vii.); to S. John's vision of the going forth of the four riders at the opening of the first four seals (Rev. vi.); and to his complex wild-beast in Rev. xiii.

¹ The two homilies which close the book are admirable. We know few things more impressive and beautiful than the last; “*the Body of CHRIST invisible*” or “*the Church requiescent*.”

But although the theory appears, at first sight, plausible and attractive, yet we are constrained to think that the application of it to the prophecies selected by Mr. Black is by no means satisfactory enough to carry with it the conviction that it is sound. In fact, in following our author in these applications, we are driven to the conviction, that he has by no means been led to frame his theory by any legitimate process of induction from the exigencies of the prophecies themselves; but rather, that he has first conceived it in his own mind, been pleased with its simplicity and completeness, and *then* tried to fit it on to various portions of the prophetic Scriptures. Take, for instance, the Dream-Image of Nebuchadnezzar.

Doubtless there are difficulties attending the ordinary solution of it, which connects its successive parts with the Assyrian, Medo-Persian, Grecian, and Roman Empires—as Dr. Maitland (following Lacunza) has shown in his essay on Antichrist.¹ (pp. 5—9.) But surely Mr. Black’s theory only removes these difficulties to supplant them with greater. How the empire of Mohammed which he identifies with his *third*, or Shemitic dynasty, could be described by the Angel as the *third kingdom, which was to bear rule over all the earth*, we are at a loss to conceive.

Dr. Maitland and Mr. Black agree thus far; that the Babylonian and Medo-Persian are to be regarded as one continuous empire, and that they *conjointly* constitute the golden head of the Image. They likewise agree in identifying the *fourth* empire with the future kingdom of Antichrist. But here they part company; the former contending that the *second* and *third* empires are the Grecian and Roman respectively; the latter, that (the Grecian empire being passed over without notice,) the Roman, or great Japhetic empire, is the *second*, and the Mahometan, or Shemitic, the *third*.

[531]

Now without stopping to discuss this question here, we can merely say that whereas, ever since the time of Hippolytus, (not to mention a long catena of Jewish interpreters before his time) the common explanation of the several parts of this Image has been universally and unhesitatingly received, we must see more forcible reasons urged against it, than are offered by either of these writers, before we can consent to reject it in favour of any modern rival.² We may merely add that, omitting every other consideration, the statement made by the Angel that *the kingdom of CHRIST was to be set up in the time of, and on the ruins of, the fourth world-kingdom* (which the learned Doctor, by the way, strangely deems conclusive *against* the “Roman” interpretation) is quite sufficient to demonstrate that this *fourth, must be the Roman*. So that the mysterious stroke of the “stone” upon the “iron feet,” which overthrew and scattered the *whole Image*, will precisely correspond to the mortal stroke which S. John saw inflicted on his great complex Beast in its sixth, or Roman, head, by the death of CHRIST and the setting up of His kingdom.

With regard, however, to the subsequent vision of Daniel, wherein at the striving together of the four winds of heaven on the great sea, he beheld four wild Beasts emerge therefrom (Dan. vii. 2, 3); notwithstanding there is wellnigh the very same *consensus patrum* for connecting these also with the same four empires, we quite agree with Dr. Maitland and Mr. Black that the reasons urged in behalf of this explanation are most unsatisfactory and

¹ “An attempt to elucidate the prophecies concerning Antichrist.” By the Rev. S.R. Maitland, D.D. 2nd edit. 1853. Rivington.

² The answers to Dr. Maitland’s objections against the current interpretation are very well indicated by Mr. Elliott. (*Hor. Ap.* iii. 996, n. 3. edit. 1.)

inconclusive. As the fourth kingdom of the *Dream-Image* seems undoubtedly to be the *Roman*—being the one in which, according to the prophet, the kingdoms of the world crumbled before the setting up of the kingdom of CHRIST (corresponding thus with the *sixth* head of S. John’s Beast), so the fourth kingdom of the *wild Beasts* seems, most unquestionably, to be none other than the kingdom of *Antichrist* (corresponding thus with the *seventh* head of the Apocalyptic Beast), that terrible and world-wide Monarchy which the “Little Horn “ or “Image of the Beast” or “Son of Perdition” shall head.

The fourth kingdom of the *first* set, received its death blow at the *first* advent of CHRIST and the establishment of His kingdom. The fourth kingdom of the *second* set is destroyed at the *second* advent of CHRIST to Judgment, and at the consummation of His kingdom. The description too of the former well corresponds with the Power of Rome. “It shall be strong as iron . . . and forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth . . . so shall it break in pieces and bruise.” (Dan. ii. 40.)

But the description of the latter is too dreadful for any kingdom that has yet appeared. The monster is beheld in the “*night-[532]visions*” (the *night* being a peculiar and *constant* Scripture symbol for the times of Antichrist—the “thick darkness” which shall close the “*day of grace*”), and he is described as a *wild Beast, dreadful, terrible, strong exceedingly, with great iron teeth, devouring and breaking in pieces, and stamping* the residue with his feet, and *diverse from all the Beasts which were before it.* (!) (Dan. vii. 7.) Now surely the Prophet must here have seen something supernaturally fearful to account for the expressions of terror in which he endeavours to describe the monster. One noticeable feature about it, however, must not be overlooked, that it appears somehow connected with the old heathen empire of Rome; in both we have the iron, in both the number *ten* (ten toes, ten horns); as if the seventh head of S. John’s Beast was some dreadful resuscitation, not merely of the whole Beast generally (as it *is*) but in a peculiar way of the sixth head; as though Rome were to form the nucleus and head quarters of that dread Antichristian confederation.

“Who does not believe” in the “political resurrection of Rome?” writes Mr. Black. “It is one of the instincts of European life, that the day of Rome is yet to come; that the city so often presumptuously named Eternal, shall bear a conspicuous part in the final tragedy of the nations. That political development is checked and impeded by the circumstances under which the territory of Rome is placed. It is now subjected to a Prince who is a great spiritual ruler; and so long as the truth and the HOLY SPIRIT in the Church he presides over, prevails at Rome, so long shall the final splendour of Rome be delayed.”—pp. 43, 44.

As for the other three Beasts seen by Daniel, we are unable to offer an opinion, save thus much; that the first certainly seems like the Assyrian dynasty revived. The Eagle-winged Lion, which recent research has discovered to be the symbol of that empire, undoubtedly appears to point in that direction, and may be supposed so to do with less show of improbability, inasmuch as there is distinct Scripture ground for believing in the future restoration of that empire, though humbled and humanized. (Isaiah xix. 23—25.) The same is foretold of Egypt (*ib.*); the same of Elam or Persia (Jer. xlix. 39); the same of many other kingdoms. Now it is quite open to consideration whether these four wild Beasts, *which all appear to rise contemporaneously* or nearly so, and in the latter days, may not represent certain of the great kingdoms of the earth which shall be revived in the “times of the end,” prior to being absorbed in the all-embracing empire of Antichrist. Such a general resurrection of the old nations appears intimated in Scripture in many places. The *whole Beast* of S. John (composed we must remember out of these four Beasts of Daniel) shall be

resuscitated in its seventh head, to be finally crushed. “My determination is,” saith the LORD, “to *gather the nations*, that I may *assemble the kingdoms*, [533] to pour upon them Mine indignation, even all My fierce anger.” (Zeph. iii. 8.) However, we must not press this point. It is dangerous to swim against the full tide of ecclesiastical tradition.

And this is what Mr. Black, in his prophetic investigations too little fears to do; though a most thoroughly right-minded and Catholic writer, he yet appears to entertain no misgivings at finding himself *quite alone* in his Scriptural expositions.

Take, for instance, his explanations of the first four seals—the going forth of the SON of GOD, with His three great judgments, war, famine, and pestilence in his Train—where we cannot but think that nothing but the intellectual gratification of fitting on a new theory can have persuaded him to refer them to the empires of Assyria, Rome, Mahomet, and Antichrist.

The first Rider on the *white Horse* ([Greek], the colour appropriated *in every instance* in this book to CHRIST) is so manifestly GOD the Word, the Solitary Rider, “travelling in the greatness of His strength,” His “arrows very sharp” and the people about to be subdued unto Him—“going forth conquering and to conquer” (for this is the interpretation that the Church has ever put upon this vision)—that we feel rather shocked at being informed that He is verily *Satan*. (p. 47.)

Or take Mr. Black’s explanation of S. Jude’s expression “the way of Cain” which appears to us not a little strained and far-fetched.¹

[534]

Or his, still more objectionable, reference of the “us” in the passage “Let *us* make man,” to the Holy Angels. Surely the ALMIGHTY did not call upon His *Creatures* to aid Him in *Creation*. Nor was man made in the Image of the *Angels*. The “Let us make man in *our*

¹ Mr. Black says “we are fully justified (?) in believing that *length of days even to the flood* was granted to Cain” (p. 22); and further, gathers from the words “Then began men to call upon (or ‘to call themselves by’) the Name of JEHOVAH,” (Gen. iv. 26), that Cain appropriated to himself the Incommunicable Name, and set himself up as a God upon earth, and thus remained even till the time, of the Deluge, as the manifested Deity of the GOD-less world, as “the great Antichrist named by the name of JEHOVAH,” (p. 29). But the first statement—concerning Cain’s marvellous longevity—appears simply a naked, gratuitous assertion (the reference made to Bp. Patrick we are unable to find). And with regard to the passage “Then began men to call,” &c., the context unquestionably refers it to the posterity of *Seth*, *in plain contradistinction to that of Cain*. Here are two families introduced, whose histories run parallel; the one prefiguring the world, the other the Church—the families of Cain and that of Seth. When *Cain’s* first son is born we merely read of Cain *building a city*, and calling it by his son’s name, (Gen. iv.) When *Seth’s* son is born, however, the only consequence recorded by the inspired writer is, “*Then began men to call upon the Name of the Lord;*” not that the voice of prayer had not been heard before, but that this “multiplication of the family necessitated some more formal establishment of the Divine Service.” (Wilberforce’s *Five Empires*, p. 4.) “Then *began men to worship*,” says C. à Lapidè,—“*scilicet publicè et per cœtus.*”

As for S. Jude’s expression, the “*way of Cain*,” taken in connection with the two other phases of iniquity with which he associates, to wit, “*the error of Balaam*,” and “*the gainsaying of Core*,” (Jude 11,)—they seem merely, particular manifestations or examples of the spirits of the *Dragon*, the *Beast*, and the *False Prophet* respectively (to which we have already referred at some length). There is the spirit of the *Dragon* exhibited in the persecuting hatred of the first murderer—the “*Carnal mind at enmity with GOD.*” The spirit of the *Beast*, exhibited in Balaam’s love of the *world*, his feverish thirst after secular distinctions and the “wages of unrighteousness,” terminating, as the friendship of the world will ever terminate, [534] in open hostility to the ALMIGHTY. And the spirit of the *False Prophet*, exhibited in Core’s *spiritual arrogance* and presumption, in that despite of the Powers that be, and the rebellion against GOD and His Church, which, of old, issued in the expulsion of the first ‘gainsayer’ from the shining courts of Heaven.

image” is too clearly explained in the Inspired Narrative itself to need a word of further comment. “So GOD created Man in *His own* image” “in the Image of GOD created He him.”

This same chapter, on the “War in Heaven,” a chapter of singular interest, and perhaps one of the most important in Mr. Black’s volume, contains also other expressions to which we must except. Take one further example.

Our Lord did *not* say that the knowledge of the Angels was limited with respect to “*one event only*” (p. 4). Rather, our LORD *mentions one* event whereof the Angels are ignorant, never intimating, however, that this is the *only* one. Mr. Black’s words would suggest that the knowledge of the Angels is coextensive with that of the SON” (S. Mark xiii. 32); forgetting how many things there are which they “*desire to look into,*”¹ and that it is only *through the Church* that many of the Divine Mysteries are made known to them (Eph. iii. 10).

But our space warns us to leave this portion of Mr. Black’s work, to pass over also his most ingenious delineations of the particular developments of the Anti-Christian idea, which have appeared in former dispensations, and also at the period of our LORD’S Crucifixion; and to hasten to the question we proposed to consider, and to which he refers several times, viz., what is the *restraining* power, alluded to by S. Paul, which “withholds” the great *final* Anti-Christian Manifestation, and the Apocalypse of the “Man of Sin”?

II. We have already noticed more than once that Holy Scripture speaks both of a [Greek], and [Greek], as well as of [Greek] and [Greek]; i.e. of a great ‘Corpus Antichristi’ or multiform Anti-Christian Principle variously developed and embodied ‘according to the diversity of countries and times,’ and taking its peculiar shape and colour from that particular manifestation of the ‘Mystery of Godliness’ wherewith it may chance to be confronted and opposed—as well as of a Personal *Head*² in whom all this wickedness will

¹ Mr. Black’s limitation of the word ‘*Angels*’ in this passage (1 S. Pet. i. 12) to the *Angel Prisoners* reserved in chains of darkness, appears to us as unwarrantable as it is novel; as may also be said of his similar limitation of the “*things in Heaven*” (Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 20;) [p. 24]. Bede thus beautifully paraphrases the first of these passages (1 S. Pet. i. 12), “*Contemplatio Divinæ Præsentia ita Angelos beatificat, ut ejus semper visâ Gloriâ satientur, et semper ejus dulcedinem quasi novam, insatiabiliter esuriunt.*”

With regard to our author’s remarks respecting the Angels being like man in person, and, like man, sustained by food (p. 2); being capable of the marriage union (p. 26); as also, the hint thrown out (p. 27)—“Scripture speaks of Angel’s *food*, and the physiological suggestion is irresistible.” We would merely remind him of such passages as the following: Who maketh his Angels *Spirits*?” “Are they not ministering *Spirits*?” and beg to refer him to the “*Summa*” of S. Thomas, P. i. Q. 50, Art. 1, 2; also Q. 51, Art. 1, 3; where he will find his statements fully answered by anticipation.

We may just add perhaps, respecting the ancient interpretation of the ‘Sons of GOD,’ the ‘daughters of men,’ and the ‘giants,’ (Gen. vi.) which Dr. Maitland has revived among us, and which Mr. Black advocates with some earnestness; that it is as well to bear in mind that it has been *deliberately rejected* by S. Augustine, S. Cyril, S. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Bede, S. Th. Aquinas, Corn. à Lapide, and other great Church writers, as false and untenable. *Vide* the learned note of L. Coquæus on the Civ. Dei of S. Aug. xv. 23. Paris, 1613, pp. 950—2. *Vide* also Philastrius de Hær. (c. lxxx.) who thus writes (A.D. 380): “*Alia est Hæresis, quæ de Gigantibus adserit, quod Angeli miscuerint se cum feminis ante diluvium, et inde esse natos Gigantes suspicatur,*” &c. Gallandi, vii. 500.

² With regard to the propriety of giving this title of “*Head*” to Antichrist, which would appear exclusively to belong to *Satan*, vide the “*Summa*,” P. 3. Q. viii., art. 8; Aquinas objects (ib. 2) “*Antichristus est membrum Diaboli, sed caput distinguitur a membris, ergo Antichristus non est caput malorum.*” He answers however, that “*sicut caput Christi est Deus, et tamen Ipse est Caput Ecclesiæ, ita Antichristus est membrum Diaboli, et tamen est caput malorum.*”

culminate and concentrate; in like manner we read, concerning “that which withholdeth,” both of a [Greek], or restraining principle or entity, as well as of [Greek] or Personal Restrainer. What are these two?

We may here say at once that Mr. Black, Mr. Williams, and Professor Hengstenberg, all agree, in the main, in their answers to this question. They each alike reject the current solution (a solution of very high authority, and well-nigh contemporaneous with the Apostolic age) that they are Rome and the Roman Empire, and maintain that they are none other than the Church, or the HOLY SPIRIT, or the LORD JESUS. Our own conviction is, that this latter is the true solution. But they shall speak for themselves. “He that letteth, ([Greek]) writes Mr. Williams, “must be the Good Spirit of GOD; . . . That which letteth ([Greek]) His Church” (p. 424). But he adds, in another place, “It is impossible not to connect the *Babylon*, the woman sitting on the Beast, with the *Power that letteth*; for it is on her being overthrown that the wicked One is revealed” (p. 422)—thus identifying the visible Church with Babylon, and *it* again with the restraining Power. In another place he writes:

“Although it was the early opinion of the Church that Rome was this power that letteth, yet it was not such as to be beyond question or discussion. It was an indefinite apprehension. Thus Tertullian . . . Lactantius, &c. But S. Chrysostom says ‘what is that which withholdeth? . . . Some indeed say the Grace of the Spirit, but others the Roman empire, to whom I most of all accede. Because if he meant to say the Spirit, he would not have spoken obscurely but plainly.’ But what, if the mystery be explained by its being a strange complication [536] of power combined of these two? . . . A Church, however adulterous and corrupt, yet may keep down the open breaking forth of the floodgates and of Antichrist. The Babylon—the commingling—the Church leagued with the world—like the iron mixed with the clay—the strength of GOD with man’s corruption, this may be the mystery that holdeth under and restraineth till she is overthrown, then shall this ‘Wicked One’ who so long and so extensively hath worked secretly, ‘be revealed.’

“The long continuance of an empire implies the existence of some good thing in it . . . and the long continuance of any Christian Church indicates its holding in preservation some holy deposit of truth; but this may be the case with extensive corruption; the mystery of truth therein preserving life, the mystery of evil working death. Such a state of things is implied in the very term. Babylon and that of Mystery, and the wonder of the Apostle that witnessed it” (pp. 349—351.)

Mr. Black thus writes,

“The restraining or letting power in 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7, is evidently a good power, as in Rom. i. 18, the power is evil which ‘holds (it is the same word) the truth in unrighteousness.’ In the latter case the good is kept back, in the former the evil. This would appear to prove that the letting power of S. Paul is not the Roman Empire and emperor; but CHRIST and the HOLY GHOST” (note p. 187).¹

Hengstenberg takes, in the main, the same view.

¹ Again. “The familiar custom with S. Paul of suppressing the name of the LORD or His Spirit, while engaged, it may be, in the more earnest mental contemplation of Him—as in such passages, ‘I know in whom I have believed’ (2 Tim. i. 12, and compare Acts xxii. 17—21) clears away any doubt that the LORD and His Spirit are subjects of the Apostle’s allusion” (p. 120).

“It is an ideal person,” he writes, “who withholds—the personification of the noble powers that then watched and prayed for the Church; or the ideal Person of the Good Shepherd.” (Vol. ii. p. 88.)

Now we would have our readers bear in mind that this interpretation of the Letting Power, by no means involves the unsettling of any real Church tradition to any such extent as at first sight it may *appear* to do. For this connection of it with the Roman Empire, though constantly referred to by ancient writers, appears nothing more than an oft-repeated *conjecture*, offered, merely in default of a better, by way of meeting a great and acknowledged difficulty.

S. Augustine, we must remember, professes himself *utterly ignorant* of the meaning of ‘that which letteth’—“ego *prorsus* me fateor *ignorare*.” (C. D. xx. 19.) And although he alludes to the Roman Empire, in common with other solutions which he has heard or read, yet he regards it as nothing better than a *bare supposition*. There is no question however that the *other* interpre[537]tation, referred to above, is the one *next* in traditional authority to the ‘Roman.’

S. Chrysostom, already noticed, mentions “the grace of the Spirit” as *one* ordinary explanation of the [Greek].

Theodoret (in loc.) asks “which is it which restrains? Some say the Roman Empire, some, the *Grace of the Spirit*.” For himself he rather inclines to the belief that it is the universal preaching of the Gospel. “After which, the end shall come.”

Theophylact, in like manner, copies S. Chrysostom, mentioning both “the Grace of the Spirit” and the Roman Empire, although inclining to the latter.

So also Œcumenius, who says that “There are *many* who consider the restraining power to be the HOLY GHOST.” “For,” he adds, “as soon as He shall be removed out of the midst, in consequence of the sins of men, and shall take His departure, then will that Wicked One soon be revealed, there being no one any longer to prevent him.”

Tichonius speaks once or twice of the *Church*¹ as being the restraining power, and alludes to the case of Sodom (a city to which the carnal Jerusalem is likened, as well in the Old as in the New Testament, both for her guilt and her punishment) and to the departure of Lot from out of it. The ALMIGHTY could not punish Sodom till Lot was taken out of the way: after which He rained down fire and brimstone.² So till the HOLY SPIRIT takes His departure, and GOD’S people have “come out of her,” judgment cannot be executed upon the Harlot and the ungodly world, after which it will take its course—*beginning* at the *Household* of GOD.³

¹ Hoc enim geritur a passione Domini quoadusque de medio ejusdem mysterii facinoris discedat *Ecclesia*, quæ detineat ut in tempore suo detegatur impietas, sicut dicit Apostolus ‘et nunc quid detineat scitis,’ &c. (Reg. 7, Galland. viii. 128.)

² “Cum discesserit [sc. *Ecclesia*] è medio mysterii facinoris, tunc pluet ignem Dominus a Domino,” &c. (ib. 129.)

³ The only objection urged by the Fathers against this interpretation is the following:—Had S. Paul meant the HOLY SPIRIT or the Church, why not say so? We cannot tell. Possibly the infant Church may not have been in a condition to bear the sad truth. That she, who was so faithfully and fearlessly struggling against the world, should one day basely succumb to the world, that the HOLY SPIRIT would ever desert His earthly temple, and the visible Church be removed for her iniquity—this doubtless would be a truth which if communicated at all, would necessarily have to be communicated most gently and perhaps obscurely. Moreover it is the custom of the HOLY GHOST not so much to dwell, *overtly*, on the contingencies in case of disobedience, as on the glorious and unspeakable promises in case of obedience.

[538]

The common tradition which makes *Rome* the ‘Power which letteth,’ would seem partly to arise from the fact of the Apostle appearing to identify that Power with *Babylon*, and then, from its being generally assumed that *that mystic city*, “which reigneth over the kings of the earth,” is none other than Rome. And it must be full conceded that, inasmuch as the expressions employed in the Harlot’s description are obviously and undisguisedly borrowed from Rome, we are not only justified, but in a manner compelled to regard the prophecy as containing, *besides* its proper and comprehensive application, some special reference to the crimes and fate of that doomed city. Without doubt the early Christians saw, and were intended to see, in the fate of the Harlot, the downfall of that Empire under whose iron wheels they were being so terribly ground and crushed. Without doubt too, under the same mystic history is strikingly indicated the haughty, ambitious, and tyrannical spirit, that corrupted Faith and Practice, which have so strangely marred the beauty of that once fair Branch of CHRIST’S Church, “whose faith was spoken of throughout the whole world.” Without doubt, whatever fuller scope we assign to these prophecies, it is idle to disguise the fact that they do, as Mr. Williams expresses it, “*in some awful manner, hover as with boding raven wing over Rome.*”

All this must be fully granted—still we must take care that the minor does not put out of sight the major fulfilment. That the Church of Rome is, in *some peculiar way*, pointed at in this description of the Harlot, the language undoubtedly appears to indicate, but that she is exclusively designated, it absolutely forbids us to imagine; nor can the language, we feel convinced, be satisfied by any interpretation less circumscribed than that advocated above.¹

The following would seem to be the sequence of, events connected with the removal of the [Greek] and [Greek]² respectively.

The former long strives with the latter. But alas in vain. She whose function it had been, like the salt, to keep the earth from corruption, herself loses her savour, till she “is henceforth good for nothing but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.” The Church carnal, gradually deteriorating, becomes in the end so corrupt—her spiritual eye so dim, that she *loses the* [539] faculty of “discerning between good and evil.” The seducing spirits are at work preparing the way for the Man of Sin, and the Great Day of GOD

Here is the charter given to the Church Catholic—the city of the Living GOD—Jerusalem which is above. “It shall come to pass, saith the LORD, if ye hearken unto Me . . . *this City shall remain for ever* . . . and they shall come from the cities, . . . and the plain . . . and the mountains . . . bringing sacrifices of Praise unto the house of the LORD.” But then there is a sad alternative; therefore it is added: “But if ye will *not* hearken unto Me . . . I will *kindle a fire* in the gates [of Jerusalem] and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem; *and it shall not be quenched.*” Jer. xvii. 24—7.

The Church, in the person of the chief Apostle, boldly confesses the faith of CHRIST, and receives such gracious promises as heart cannot conceive. But the Church begins to *temporize*: and the tremendous rebuke ensues. ‘Get thee behind Me, Satan; thou art an offence unto Me.’

¹ Mr. Williams’ suggestion is doubtless the true one, that even “as the seven Churches in Asia did really exist,” and yet “their state and local character are given to express, in addition to their particular intention, universal principles of CHRIST’S governing His Church by his Spirit; so the local Church of Rome may be designated, and given as a type and instance of the corruption of the Christian Church throughout the whole world, which is at the same time mainly intended.”—p. 339.

² It need hardly be mentioned perhaps that the Church can only be regarded as [Greek] in virtue of her being the organ, and depository, so to speak, of the [Greek]; and that so soon as He is taken out of the midst of her, that moment does she cease to be, in any real and objective sense, [Greek].

ALMIGHTY. Strong delusions are abroad which she is impotent to resist; still at last her corruption waxes so flagrant that the HOLY SPIRIT can abide no longer in His defiled temple.

Alas! she knoweth not that “the LORD hath departed from her”—but it is so. HE that withholdeth has been removed. Meanwhile the “vile person,” the future World-King whom the Apostate Church has nurtured, has been gradually gaining strength—“coming in peaceably and obtaining the kingdom by flatteries” (Dan. xi. 21). He makes friendly overtures to the Harlot, pledging himself to support her claims and supremacy, while she, in return, to further his political aggrandizement. “The words of his mouth are softer than butter, having war in his heart.” All seems to favour him. He is waxing “mighty,” though “*not by his own power.*” For the Dragon is being unloosed, and affording him supernatural aid; the false Church too energetically befriends him. But all is as nothing while Mordecai refuses his obeisance, while the faithful few (impressed with an overpowering presentiment as to who this Mighty One is) withstand his ominously increasing claims. They *must* worship the Image of the Beast, or be cast into the ‘burning fiery furnace.’ True to their LORD—and sternly prepared to resist unto blood—they joyfully choose the latter. The fiery trial commences. And the Harlot *openly* joins with the Adversary. Irrevocably pledged to the support of the rapidly-consolidating world-dominion, she now appears, in the face of High Heaven, leagued with the Beast in the rabid persecution of CHRIST and His Saints; “drunken with the blood of the Martyrs of the LORD JESUS.” While the “little flock” has to find herself not only hounded to the death by the Godless world—by the “*open enemy*”—but (oh! aggravation of woe!) even by members of the same fold, of the same family and household with herself—her “guide”—her “own familiar friend”—with whom in bonds of amity she once “took sweet counsel and walked in the House of God;” but for whom, having now committed the unpardonable sin—having openly sided with the Adversary, and thus committed the “sin unto death”—she is no longer permitted even to pray, and has but to utter the dread imprecations, “Let death come hastily upon them, and let them go down quick into Hell, for wickedness is in their dwelling, and among them” (Ps. lv. 12—16)—imprecations which shall be fearfully answered in the pouring out of the *seven vials* of JEHOVAH’S burning indignation (Rev. xvi.)

But a change now conies. The Beast, anon, finds himself independent of the Harlot. He has used her so long as it served his purpose. And now “in that wherein she has sinned in the same [540] is she” fearfully “punished.” She has “trusted in the strength of Pharaoh: the strength of Pharaoh shall be her ruin.” The wild monster throws his careless rider and tramples upon her, tears her to pieces, and devours her flesh. The pent-up hatred of centuries bursts forth with maddened energy, and great Babylon is made a heap, a desolation, a hissing. “The city of confusion is broken down—all joy is darkened—the gate is smitten with destruction” (Isa. xxiv. 10—12). Heaven is deaf to her cries for aid. The deep roll of the fiery wheels of JEHOVAH’S Chariot of Judgment but commingles with the tumultuous “roar of the Adversaries” (Ps. lxxiv. 4). “Sion is a wilderness”—“Jerusalem, desolate and void.” The temple of JEHOVAH is burnt with fire. The enemy run riot in the sanctuary. They “set fire upon the Holy Places.” They “defile the dwelling-place of the Most High even to the ground.” Yea, they say; “Let us make havoc of them altogether, “and so burn up “all the houses of GOD in the land” (*ibid.* 6—9).

And now, the last vestige of the restraining power ([Greek]) being removed, the dread three and a half years fairly set in. The “overflowings of ungodliness” burst furiously in on all sides. The Sun of Righteousness is veiled. The blood-red moon is hidden in eclipse. The stars have fallen from heaven. “The whole earth is full of darkness and cruel habitations.” The world-king, set up as an object of adoration, magnifies himself above every god, and,

“his mouth stretching forth to Heaven,” dares to utter “marvellous things against the GOD of Gods.” The daily sacrifice is taken away, all public worship of JEHOVAH suspended, and the faithful followers of the LAMB driven into deserts and mountains, into dens and caves of the earth, where yet they are miraculously sustained by GOD, till the tribulation be overpast, when they shall come forth as “gold purified seven times in the fire.” For the “ungodly” shall not always triumph. For the elect’s sake, that dread time shall be shortened, and the son of wickedness “shall not live out half his days.” While the Godless world and their Idol King (the image of the Beast)¹ are saying “Peace and safety, [541] then sudden destruction shall come upon them as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape;” for GOD shall suddenly shoot at them with a swift arrow.” “Oh, how suddenly shall they consume, perish and come to a *fearful end!* Yea, like as a dream when one awaketh, so shalt Thou make their *image* to vanish out of the city.”

III. But we must not forget that Professor Hengstenberg claims to have solved the enigma of the “*name and number of the Beast*”; and tells us that the name can be discovered with *perfect certainty*. This is gratifying intelligence. What then, is this mysterious piece of information?

“In the whole of the Old Testament,” writes the Professor, “*there is but one instance in which the number 666 occurs in connection with a name* [sic]. It is said in Ezra ii. 13, ‘The sons of Adonikam 666.’ The name *Adonikam* must therefore be the name of the Beast. It was admirably adapted for being so. It means ‘the LORD arises,’ &c.—(vol. ii. p. 52).

Unfortunately however this most stupid and unmeaning solution, in examining the corresponding enumeration of names and families in the parallel passage in Nehemiah we meet with this most disastrous variation, “the sons of Adonikam 667”! (Neh. vii. 18.)

More worthy of notice is the suggestion which he throws out (though-alluded to by others before him) that there may perhaps be something intentionally significant in the very writing of the number itself, [Greek].² Where the first and last letters [Greek] form the common abbreviation of the name of CHRIST; while the middle letter [Greek] is the ordinary symbol of the crooked serpent. The idea is ingenious and striking. The numerical monogram certainly appears to bear on its face a silent hint of the illicit concourse of “CHRIST with Belial:” of the temple of GOD, and the Idol Image: of the abomination in the Holy Place: of the Lamb giving support on either side, by means of its “two horns,” to “the Wicked One.”

¹ On further consideration we feel ourselves unable to entertain any doubt that under this title, the Personal Antichrist is ultimately designated by S. John. Man was created in the “Image of GOD”; which Image was defaced by the fall. CHRIST took flesh, died and rose again to restore that Image. So that while the great work of CHRIST and the Blessed SPIRIT is to renew the Image of GOD within the soul, the great work of Satan is still further to mar and deface that Image and replace it with the “Image of the *Beast*” (for “all that is not of the FATHER is of the *world*”). Hence, as the Image of GOD becomes obliterated in any man, the Image of the Beast becomes more and more complete. In *two only Individuals* of the Human race do these two Images become *perfected*. CHRIST and Antichrist. The All Holy One, and the Man of Sin (“*quia totaliter peccatis deditus*,” Aquinas.) As then they alone perfectly exhibit these two opposite Images, they are severally designated as the [Greek] (2 Cor. iv. 4) and the [Greek] (Rev. xiii. 15, &c.) Of the latter of whom we have a strange symbolical prefiguration in the haughty king of Babylon, who, raised to the summit of worldly ambition, for a time lost the Image of GOD, and was reduced to the *Image of a beast*. Even as we may [541] see the same wretched being ultimately indicated in the Psalmist’s allusion to the “Man raised to *Honour*, who hath no understanding,” (who loses that higher part of his nature which is distinctively human) and is compared unto the Beasts that perish.”

² S. Irenæus, he tells us, testifies to the fact of this being the original manner of writing the number.

Mr. Black, for no apparent cause whatever, rejects the ordinary reading 666, in favour of the far less supported 616. He should at least remember that S. Irenæus (Adv. Hær. v. 30) *distinctly rejects the latter reading as spurious*; maintaining that the former is not only adopted by those who have conversed with S. John himself, not only is found in all the best copies of the Apocalypse, but also contains some mystery involved in the *three-fold six* which [542] the other entirely misses. Let us see, however, what use Mr. Black makes of his preferred number. He writes:—

“The number of Antichrist is 11 . . . His number is also 8 . . . The number of completeness is 7. These multiplied together $11 \times 8 \times 7 = 616$.” (p. 50.)

But this solution is even more pointless and unmeaning than Hengstenberg’s. One might as well adopt the suggestion of the late learned Cambridge Professor of Arabic, Dr. Lee, who on arriving at this verse quietly says, with regard to the number of the Beast, “my opinion is that we *need not trouble ourselves concerning it*. I am not without my doubts whether it has not *been introduced by some early copyist*”!—(Dissertations on Prophecy, p. 329.)

Mr. Black, we see, states that, “the number of Antichrist is 11,” and that “his number is also 8.” To a certain extent he is correct; as both these numbers are considered to symbolize *particular aspects*¹ of the Son of Perdition. But he has omitted that number which is *peculiarly* appropriated to him, and his times, in the Apocalypse—to wit the number 6.

“The number six,” writes Mr. Williams, “is ever of Antichrist, the sixth epistle, the sixth seal, the sixth trumpet, the sixth vial, in ever extending cycles, as if 6—and 60—and 600. At the sixth hour on the sixth day is the power of Antichrist, the ‘power of darkness’ of being forsaken of GOD—the great tribulation.—”(p. 251.)

Man was created on the sixth day, “therefore,” writes C. à Lapide, “the number 6 is called the *number of man*.” But man has fallen. His number therefore has fallen with him; and now the number is “*symbolum hominis imperfecti, corruptibilis, et peccatoris*”: and therefore, in a peculiar way, of the Man of Sin whose number is expressed (if we may thus employ so sacred a word) by a *Trinity* of sixes.

It is interesting to observe that the sins into which the godless world are represented as falling in respect of the first Beast, and at the instigation of the second, are *three-fold*. There is (1.) the worshipping of the Beast; in violation of the first commandment, and in despite of the First Person of the Blessed TRINITY. There [543] is (2.) the worshipping his Image; in violation of the second commandment, and despite of the Second Person, the Image of the Invisible GOD. And (3.) the receiving his *mark*,² i.e. “his name or the number

¹ For Antichrist rises as the *eleventh*, i.e., the little horn from amongst, and after, the ten, but plucking up three, becomes the *eighth*. But these two numbers are also supposed to belong to him mystically; the 8, in virtue of his death and apparent *resurrection*, as we have already shown; the 11, in consideration of his being the “*lawless one*,” [Greek]. For the Fathers, singularly enough, regard the No. 11 in that light, as one *beyond* the *ten* and so *transgressing* the *ten* (commandments.) Whence also Antichrist is called the Man of *Sin* (sin being the *transgression of the law*.) So S. Gregory: *omne peccatum undenarium est; quia dum perversa agit præcepta Decalogi transit* (Moral. xxxii. 27; Op. t. 1, p. 1061, Ed. Bened.). So also S. Augustin (Civ. D. xv. 20.) “*Quoniam ergo Lex denario numero prædicatur; profectò numerus undenarius, quoniam transgreditur denarium transgressionem Legis, ac per hoc, peccatum significat.*” S. Gregory, fancifully, accounts for the haste with which the Apostles elected Matthias into the place of Judas, by their fearing to remain at the number *eleven*.

² Mr. Williams seems in error (p. 253) in separating the Beast’s mark *from* his number; his mark *is* his number. For the [Greek] is distinctly explained as being either “*his name, or the number of his name*,” c. {cont.}

of his Name,” instead of the Name of GOD: in violation of the third commandment, and in despite of the Third Person, by whom we have been named with the Name of JEHOVAH, and signed with the sign of the Cross. Now S. Paul connects the coming of the “Man of Sin,” with some great Apostacy—some falling away from the faith of the HOLY TRINITY—out of which he is to rise, and which doubtless he will head. The Apostle further connects this [Greek] (1 Tim. iv. 1) with some spiritual brand or mark. Men are to apostatize and have their consciences branded as with a hot iron. Now inasmuch as the letters of the word [Greek] make up the mystic 666; one obvious interpretation of Rev. xiii. 16—18, would be, that men shall not only secretly apostatize from GOD through the influence of the “seducing spirits,” but that they shall be compelled—yes, and by the false church, by the Lamb-like Beast—to make open profession of their Apostacy, and to pledge themselves heart and hand to its support; to receive the [Greek], the name or number of the Beast, in their right hand and in their forehead. But as to the *real* solution of this enigma of the Beast’s name and number—as to that *specific* purpose which the HOLY GHOST *peculiarly* designed it to serve—we can, of course, but guess in the dark. Many ingenious suggestions have been made.¹ But prophecy has been given to us not merely as an exercise of our intellect and imagination, but as a light to guide us in a dark place. When CHRIST’S faithful servants shall arrive at this dark place in the world’s career, *then* shall this Scripture gleam with its proper light; then shall the meaning of this enigma be discovered by the *wise*: for “the wicked shall not understand, but the wise shall understand,” and “they that have understanding” shall be able to “count the number of the Beast.” And doubtless when the dread enemy appears, there will be abundant cause for some such distinct *note of identification* to point out who he is. For so plausible and gentle will he be in his first ap[544]proaches, when “by peace he shall destroy many”; so energetic a reformer of abuses; so submissive and obedient to the fawning church whom with “words smoother than oil” he will cajole to her destruction—*ostensibly* seek naught so much as her honour and advancement—in reality, using her but as a contemptible stepping-stone to his ambition, to be cast loathingly away as soon as his ends are answered; so miraculous also will be his successes, as though under the manifest control of the Almighty; so dazzling the supernatural halo which shall surround him, and overpowering the delusions which shall seem to point to his Divine mission, delusions not only permitted, but even (dreadful thought!) *sent* in judgment by God Himself—for then doubtless the carnal Church will indeed appear “*hung with miracles*” in support of the claims of the false one; so bewildering will all this be, even “to deceive if it were possible God’s own elect,” that there will be terrible need of some unmistakeable cypher, some distinct token, to warn the elect, and prop up the staggering faith of the small remnant who shall then remain true to their Lord.

IV. Ah! then who shall compose that small remnant? Who shall share in the great coming Apostacy? who succumb to the great tribulation which shall succeed it? What portion of

xiii. 17, (the [Greek], after [Greek] in this passage is spurious.) The only passage which appears to disconnect the *mark* from the *name or number*, is xv. 2; but here the words [Greek] are an interpolation. Vide Hengst. ii. 144; also Scholz and Lachmann in loc.

¹ Perhaps one of the best solutions hitherto offered is the [Greek]. Another suggestion is [Greek] (the Doric, Latinized termination). But this is not so satisfactory as the former, inasmuch as (to mention no other objections), the Beast itself is *not* a Spiritual Power but the personification of the power of the *world* generally, or, specially, of some particular world-power, or kingdom. This same is the great objection to [Greek]. Now without for a moment supposing that the HOLY SPIRIT really pointed to one or other of these words; we should yet feel some little hesitation in maintaining that the fact of their severally containing the mystic number was *nothing but* accident.

Christ's Body shall, through all, remain true to their Lord and Head? For our Lord's hint is most dreadful, that when He cometh faith shall hardly be found. This then is our great question. This it is which gives such a solemn practical interest to the portions of Holy Scripture we are considering. And this too it is, we must add, which invests with so intense and momentous importance our present Church revival. For doubtless, upon the course it takes, upon its healthy and steady continuance, depends the question whether *our* candlestick shall be removed, whether, as a church, we shall basely yield to the Apostacy, or boldly resist even unto death. One of the twelve was found standing lovingly near the Cross of Christ. Some portion of the Church will so *stand*. The *sixth* epistle tells us that.¹ The very epistle which is marked by Antichrist's number, and points to his times, tells us that; tells us of a small section of the Church which though having but "a little strength," has yet faithfully kept God's Word, and not denied His Name; which, though held in ruthless scorn by certain which claim the *exclusive* privilege of being *the* church, "which say they" alone "are Jews," God's true Israel ("and are not, but do lie,") is yet not despised by God, for He has regarded her; and receives this blessed assurance:—"Because *thou* hast kept *My* word, *I* also will keep *thee* from the hour [545] of temptation ([Greek]) which shall come upon *all the world*." The great *temptation* to which we cannot doubt that the *sixth* petition of our LORD'S Prayer has some secret and ultimate reference—to which, therefore, the Church should constantly be looking—against which she should be daily earnestly and intensely preparing herself.

Is it presumptuous to indulge a trembling hope that it is against this day of trial that our branch of CHRIST'S Holy Church is instinctively beginning to arm herself? Had the enemy come a century ago—aye much less than that—as a Church, there would have been no hope for her. Branded with the mark of the Beast, secularized, and crippled by the heavy incubus of the monster Erastrianism whom she so fondly and lovingly hugged; palsied by secret, and wide-spread, and deeply ingrained heresy; the Blessed Sacraments neglected or profaned, and her spiritual life therefore gradually ebbing away from sheer lack of support, and for want of the infused virtue of the Divine Redeemer Himself; what could she have done? But, GOD be thanked, a little respite is vouchsafed her. "Space is given her to repent of her fornication." O that she may earnestly repent! There is a moving amongst the dry bones. Through more frequent and loving communion with the Source of Life, a new life is breathing into the dying mass. The revival proceeds, slowly it may be, but surely, hopefully, progressively. At home and abroad the whole body seems instinct with a new and vigorous energy. We must not say more. It ill becomes us to be "highminded," there is yet much cause for "fear." But let us fear with hope, hope with fear; love, pray, and work. The reward of Philadelphia is yet within *our* reach.

V. It is impossible, however, to cast our eyes without alarm, on that mighty section of the visible Church under the dominion of the Bishop of Rome. For one *cannot* either look at her past history and present state by the light of these Apocalyptic prophecies, or look at these prophecies by the strange light cast upon them by her history, and not entertain most sad and gloomy forebodings respecting her future destiny. She is *not preparing herself* against the day of calamity; "she saith in her heart, I sit as a queen, and am no widow, (not mourning her absent LORD, and longing for His appearing,) and shall see no sorrow." "Her prophets have seen vain and foolish things for her, and have not discovered her iniquity to

¹ To the Church of *Philadelphia*. It is the Loving Apostle alone, who stands by the Cross. So is it the Church of Love, alone, which endures the fiery trial; the church which is impressed with that mark which the same Apostle pronounces to be the mark of Spiritual Life, "The Love of the Brethren." (1 S. John iii. 14.)

turn away her captivity.”—(Lam, ii. 4—17.). Nay, not only is she not preparing herself against “the hour of temptation,” but rather does she appear to be gradually and systematically disciplining her children for yielding to it. What is the unhallowed sanction openly given to the ever-increasing mass of false miracles; the moving eyes, and bleeding forms of consecrated pictures, the bowing heads and animated limbs of idol images, and the like; but a positive *training* for the acceptance of [546] those lying wonders and strong delusions, before which the well-exercised faith of the very elect shall totter? What is the fable of the “Immaculate conception” of the Blessed Virgin, and the awfully developing doctrine of her “Deification,” doctrines tending to the implied denial of her being really *woman*, and therefore of her Son being really *man*;¹ what those perpetual exhibitions of our Risen LORD as an impotent baby, helplessly dependent on His mother; and the shocking, though allowed, devotions addressed to Him as such, but a subtle and effectual preparation for the reception of the great Antichristian denial of the proper *humanity*, and present mediation of the *Man* CHRIST JESUS? What are the popular supplications and invocations addressed to “JESUS, Joseph, and Mary,” but secret preparations for some new trinity which Satan shall set up for the worship of the ungodly world? What the [Greek] of the “creature *alongside* of the Creator,” but the natural antecedent to the worship of the “creature *instead of* the Creator?” But we need not continue. There is one further point, however, which we must yet notice, and it is this:—How significant are the indications in that Church, of a malignant *endeavour* on the part of Satan to close up the channels of grace, and so cut off communion with the Source of Life, and thus *drive away* “*Him that withholdeth*,” shutting up the public worship of GOD in a dead language, and thus debarring the mass of the people from their “reasonable service” to the Eternal FATHER; mutilating the adorable Sacrament, and thus depriving them of the Life-giving Blood of the Blessed SON; interdicting, practically, the study of the sacred Scriptures, and thus shutting them out, in thus far, from the illuminating, guiding, and comforting influences of the HOLY SPIRIT. How mysterious too, the infatuation which contentedly acquiesces in these devices of the enemy, and which checks the slightest endeavour to open out to the great body of the Church these Divine Media of communication with the Blessed Trinity.

It is from no want of Charity, no lack of love or respect towards that important Branch of CHRIST’S Holy Church, to whom we ourselves, to whom the Church Universal owes so much (even though it must be added, by whom we have both been so grievously wronged) that we thus write concerning her; that Branch, which can boast of so many Saints and Martyrs of the LORD JESUS, so many holy souls of whom it may in truth be said “the world was not worthy”; that Branch which contains even now, so many, whom we of the Church of England have such cause to love and venerate—it may be with some of us, even our “brethren after the flesh”; No, but from a sad conviction, which the Apocalypse seems to press [547] with overwhelming force upon us, that *she* will be the foremost in, the nucleus, and headquarters of, the Great coming Apostacy. How large a portion of the Church Universal will be then comprehended with her in the Mystic Babylon we cannot say. Even the great Romish expositors intimate as much. Bellarmine, Ribera, Corn à Lapide, Viegas, Lacunza,² and we know not how many more of the learned Jesuit commentators tell us, with more or less variety, that Rome shall apostatize and be consumed; “that,” in the words

¹ “The Blessed Virgin has been received as a Deity, as one conceived and born immaculate; and *how then capable of imparting to her Child the genuine humanity of our race?*”—Messias and Anti-Messias, p. 150; vide also 90—92.

² Vide *Apostolical* {recte *Apostolic*} *School of Prophetic Interpretation* (pp. 387—315) [*sic*] by C. Maitland. Longman. A most able and useful work.

of Ribera, “she will equal her old sins with new crimes and horrible wickednesses, and so will be burnt with a great burning;” all which, he adds, “we learn so plainly from the Apocalypse that the greatest fool cannot deny it.”

These learned writers generally maintain that Rome must once again become *heathen*, before she can be called Babylon. The Jesuit Lacunza, however, thinks *not*.

“Rome,” he writes, “not idolatrous but Christian, not the head of the Roman Empire, but the *Head of Christendom*, may very well, without ceasing from this dignity [i.e., becoming again heathen, as urged by Bellarmine] . . . be guilty of harlotry with the kings of the earth. . . . and receive upon herself the horrible chastisement spoken of in the Prophecy. . . . O that it were possible to speak in her ear . . . those words which GOD spake to His ancient Spouse, . . . O My people, they which call thee Blessed, cause thee to err, and destroy the way of thy path.’ And again, ‘Our priesthood it is, and nothing else, which is announced for the last times under the metaphor of a beast with two horns like a Lamb. Our priesthood, which, like the Good Shepherd, should defend the flock of CHRIST, shall prove in those times its greatest scandal and most perilous snare.’”¹

It seems a most dreadful thought, but yet one that should be fairly recognized, as explaining the particular ground for the tremendous chastisements with which the Harlot shall be visited, that it will be through *her*, mainly, that the Son of Perdition will owe his rise, and ascendancy in the world. In the garden of Eden Satan *Himself* did not entice man to sin, but employed the woman to administer the temptation; so, in the latter days, the Dragon himself does not seduce the world, but he employs the Lamb-like Beast or false Prophet, and the *Mystic Woman*, to execute this dread commission. It was the Hebrew Priesthood, says Lacunza, which, of old, utterly undid the Jews and opened the mouths of the people to reject CHRIST, and so will it be with the Christian Priesthood who in the latter days shall be “*the stumbling-block*, and most perilous snare.”

“Until the Apostacy,” writes Mr. Black, (who by the way falls into the Common error of *limiting* the title of Harlot, to the Church of Rome, [548] instead of comprehending within it the whole state of carnal Christendom) “until the Apostacy takes place, which will be preceded by the universal preaching of the Gospel, and the home gathering of the tribes,—the Incarnate Demon² will not be revealed. Then the apostate Prophet or Church will be to him what the Baptist was to JESUS; what Elias will be to the returning SAVIOUR; commissioned to proclaim and make Him known to the world. The Church of Rome, indeed, is now a harlot, guilty of spiritual uncleanness; but not until some eminent political personage shall arise, whom she shall address and . . . religiously regard, can she be considered guilty of blasphemy. When she will thus act, she will herself take out of the way the impediment (that which letteth,) to the manifestation of Antichrist. The proceedings on her part will doubtless be attended with a violation of all social, religious, and political order, over the whole world; and thus she will indicate the beginning of the 1260 days, and the moment of her own visitation.”—pp. 125—6.

But we must bring this paper to a conclusion, apologizing sincerely for the length to which it has extended. It is a hopeful sign to see the Apocalypse becoming, amongst ourselves, so

¹ *Ibid.* p. 392; 409.

² As this expression of Mr. Black’s is calculated to suggest a wrong impression concerning the *nature* of the Son of Perdition, it may be as well to add the following caution from the ‘*Summa*.’ “In Antichristo inhabitabit plenitudo omnis malitiæ: *non* quidem ita quod *humanitas ejus sit assumpta a Diabolo in unitatem personæ*, sicut *humanitas Christi a Filio Dei*; sed quia Diabolus suam malitiam eminentius ei influet suggerendo, quàm omnibus aliis.” P. 3. Q. viii. 8. c.

much more generally a subject of reverent study; remembering that it is the *one* book in the whole Canon, to the diligent reading of which there is a *distinctive* “*Blessing*” attached. And so long as it is approached in the earnest and devotional spirit which so engagingly characterizes the whole of Mr. Williams’ admirable work, and is hardly less discernible in the writings of the other two authors before us,—many of its dark sayings will doubtless, by little and little, open out to the Church; and she will thus be furnished with new weapons of defence against the day of calamity. Manifold and important were the lessons of wisdom which this Book contained for the early Church: Infinitely weighty and significant are the instructions which it contains for us at the present day: and when the world’s evening shall set in, the twilight shadows of which seem even now lengthening upon us, and men’s hearts begin to fail them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming,—then shall its Divine sayings gleam with an intensity of light and meaning of which we can as yet perhaps form no idea.

At all seasons, and surely not the least in these times of change and uncertainty, should that warning knell of the HOLY SPIRIT—those ten solemn words which arrest us at the very threshold of the Apocalypse—that unearthly refrain *seven times* mysteriously repeated—be silently ringing in our souls, [Greek].

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 16 (Joseph Masters: London, 1854
[197] **THE LORD'S PRAYER AND THE BEATITUDES.**

Everything tending to illustrate the Divine prayer which our LORD bequeathed to His Church, and throw light into the profound abyss of meaning contained in its few simple clauses, must be acceptable to the Christian.

Believing that, inasmuch as the words are those of Eternal Wisdom Himself, and are given by Him as the expression of the innermost feelings and wants of His Church in all ages and circumstances, they may therefore be viewed in an infinite variety of aspects, and will, under all, reflect some beautiful phase of heavenly light; he will ever seek to deepen his acquaintance with them, nor deem anything unworthy his regard which tends, in however slight a degree, to assist him therein.

Among the different views of our LORD'S Prayer, which the multitudinous paraphrases made by holy men in all ages afford us; there is one, which we are surprised has not been more frequently noticed, and which, as it appears to ourselves not a little interesting and suggestive, we will endeavour, to the best of our ability, to trace out for our readers.

There are two occasions referred to in the Gospels in which our LORD delivered this Prayer. It is in connection with the first of these, that we desire now to treat of it; viewing it in relation to the peculiar position in which it stands, viz., as a part of a particular and connected discourse, the Sermon on the Mount.

The discourse opens, we remember, with a heptad of Beatitudes (the eighth benediction being but a repetition of the first.) And the whole of the succeeding discourse appears to be but an amplification and development of those few pregnant introductory sentences. They constitute the key-note of the whole succeeding strain.

And so writes S. Augustine (Enar. in Ps. xi.); referring the Psalmist's expression: "The words of the LORD purified seven times in the fire," to the seven Beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount, "from which seven," he adds, "*totum illum sermonem prolixum dictum esse animadverti potest.*"

So again, in his exposition of the sermon; on arriving at the LORD'S Prayer, and noticing its seven petitions, he adds, "*Videtur mihi septenarius iste numerus harum petitionum congruere illi septenario numero ex quo totus iste sermo manavit.*" And this introduces the point to which we are anxious to advert.

We have in this Divine discourse, first, a brief delineation of the several features of the children of God; a sketch of the perfect Christian's character. Shortly after, we have the prayer of the children of GOD; that is, we have the living utterance and expres[198]sion of that very character whose several features have just been described. And what we wish to notice, is this (which is also briefly intimated by S. Augustine, De Serm. Dom. in Mon. 1. ii., c. 11:) that there is a beautiful and continuous parallel running throughout, between the heptad of Beatitudes and the heptad of petitions; each several petition appearing to be, merely, the peculiar expressions of that particular phase of character indicated and "blessed" in the corresponding Beatitude.

Before tracing out this parallel, however, we may just call attention to the fact (alluded to in a previous number,¹) of the striking example which our Lord's Prayer furnishes us, of

¹ Vide Ecclesiastic, vol. xv. p. 369, &c.

the frequent division observable in Holy Scripture of the number seven into its two components three and four: of which S. Augustine has noticed “*quaternarium numerum ad corpus pertinere; ternarium, vero, ad animum:*” the *three*, plainly deriving its symbolical meaning from the perfection of the Eternal Godhead, the “Holy, Blessed, and Glorious Trinity;” the *four*, from its being the ordinary exponent of the perfection of earthly things.¹

So that while the last four petitions refer mainly to ourselves; our daily bread; our forgiveness; our freedom from temptation; our deliverance from evil;—the three first as evidently refer to the honour, the kingdom, the will of the Eternal Trinity.

Nor can it be unnoticed how without ill any way *limiting* the meaning of any petition, yet that each of the first three appears to contain some peculiar reference to the three several Persons.

1. “Hallowed be Thy Name.” These words would appear specially addressed to the Everlasting Creator, the infinite source of all being, “glorious in holiness fearful, in praises,” Whom the Holy Church doth “day by day acknowledge,” “The Father of an Infinite Majesty:” and in them the Church but adopts the language employed by the co-eternal Son, at that period of transcendent interest, the crisis of man’s salvation; “Now is my soul [199] troubled, and what shall I say? FATHER, save me from this hour? FATHER glorify Thy Name.”

2. “*Thy kingdom come.*” But whose kingdom is it for the advent of which we thus pray? “I saw in the night visions,” says the prophetic Seer, “and behold one like the *Son of Man* came; and there was given to *Him* dominion, and glory, and a *kingdom.*” “Unto the SON He saith: Thy throne, O GOD, is for ever and ever, a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of Thy kingdom.” This it is, to which the Church is ever looking forward and hastening; the glorious appearing of our great GOD and SAVIOUR, when the “kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdom of our LORD and His CHRIST, and He shall reign for ever and ever. KING of Kings.”

3. “*Thy will be done.*” What do we pray for here? For the moral renovation of mankind. We pray that man’s will, our own included, may be brought into conformity with GOD’S will; may be again bent parallel with it. And whose office is it thus to renew and sanctify, thus to “order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men?” Plainly that of the Eternal Spirit. “This is the *will* of GOD, even your *sanctification.*” And GOD’S Will must ultimately triumph. Nor shall the Omnipotent Spirit cease from His regenerating work, till this prayer is answered, and God’s will is done on earth as it is done in heaven.

But let us now retrace our steps, and follow out the parallel which we have already referred to; showing how that each several petition of our LORD’S Prayer, is but the natural

¹ “*Ternarius* numerus, Conditorem, Patrem et Filium set Spiritum-Sanctum, insinuat. In *quaternario* numero, est insigne temporalium. Et annus *quadrifariè* variatur, verno, æstate, autumno, et hieme. Et maximè apparet in tempore, quaternaria quædam vicissitudo. Quatuor etiam ventos Scriptura commemorat. Per quator enim cardines perrexit evangelium, quod obtinuit.”—S. Aug. Ser. 252.

Anastadius of Sinai descants with great prolixity on the number four. We may just add a specimen. After alluding to the four Evangelists, &c. he adds: “Ex quator elementis fecit omnia Deus; nempe igne, terrâ, et aquâ et aere. Propterea et ipsa quatuor, in singulis eorum, in quatuor considerantur; *ignis* quidem, in luce, et stellis, et luna, et sole: *Aqua* autem, in firmamento, et alia aqua supra firmamentum, et terrestri, et abyssina: *Aerem*, in quatuor ventos, et quatuor anni tempora divisit: *Terram*, partitus est in quatuor fines; quomodo etiam in quatuor generationes; herbarum inquam, et fructuum, et animantium, et hominum. Similiter etiam *animantia* in quatuor genera—pecora, animalia, feras, et reptilia. &c.” and much more to the same purpose.—(Contempl. in Hexaem. b. iv.; Bibl. Pat. t. vi. p. 641.)

utterance and expression of that particular phase of character to which the corresponding Beatitude is attached.

I. And first; who are they to whom the *hallowing of GOD'S Name* will ever be an object of the deepest concern? "Thus saith the High and Lofty One Who inhabiteth Eternity, whose *Name* is *Holy*, I dwell with him that is of an *humble spirit*." This then is the first Beatitude, "Blessed are the *poor in spirit*, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." Humility, and reverence for the Great Name, are necessary correlatives. "Man fell by pride; his restoration begins by humility." "Initium peccati, superbia; initium sapientiæ, timor Domini." There is a deep and eternal truth conveyed in the connection of these two clauses. Man must be emptied of self, before he can be filled with GOD; poor in his own spirit, ere he can be rich in the Divine Spirit. We must debase ourselves before ever we can glorify GOD For "His dwelling is with the humble, but the proud He beholdeth afar off." Thus, the first condition of acceptable prayer, is profound adoration for the Almighty Jehovah, and the indissoluble accompaniment to that, is unfeigned abasement of ourselves. Assuredly, none but the "poor in spirit" will ever utter as they ought, the first petition, "*Hallowed be Thy Name.*"

[200]

II. But we now come to the second petition. "*Thy kingdom come.*" Who then are they to whom the *kingdom* of CHRIST particularly belongs? What is the distinguishing mark of *royalty* in the Gospel? On one occasion, while on earth, and on one only, our Blessed LORD appeared as *King*; viz. in his triumphant entry into Jerusalem. What then was the peculiar attribute in Him to which our attention is there, especially, drawn? "Tell ye the daughter of Zion, behold Thy *King* cometh unto the, *meek.*"

This then is the mark we must look for in all candidates for His kingdom. The very feature of character which is *most* opposed to our ideas of earthly royalty, is the very distinguishing characteristic of heavenly royalty. It is the *Lamb* that becomes the everlasting Conqueror over death and hell. It is the *meek* who possess the kingdom. In beautiful harmony with which we find the second¹ Beatitude, "Blessed are the *meek*, for they shall inherit the earth;" the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." True, the petition includes a reference to the present setting up in the hearts of men, of CHRIST'S kingdom of grace, yet, undoubtedly, it seems to refer chiefly, to the advent of CHRIST'S kingdom of glory, when they who have shared His lowliness, shall share His triumph, when He shall "put down the mighty from their seat, and exalt the humble and meek." S. Paul tells us that the "habitable earth" shall yet one day, be visibly placed under the dominion of CHRIST and His Saints; "Man, and the Son of Man." For CHRIST is the "Heir of the world;" and His people are to be assessors with Him in His kingdom. "Thou hast made us kings—and we shall reign *on the earth.*" ("In the

¹ This is the order of the Beatitudes to which Lachmann gives the preference, and which he has inserted into the text, (reversing, viz. the position of, "Blessed are they that mourn," and "Blessed are the meek," as they stand in our Bibles.) It is the order of S. Augustine, which he has in common with the Vulgate, and the Latin fathers. The Greek fathers generally follow the less logical order of the textus receptus. Origen however does not; but places, "Blessed are the meek," *second*, as we have done; drawing also an inference from its particular position. [Comm. in Mat. t. xvi. 16; Op. t. iii. p. 740, ed. Bened.]

And indeed, according to this arrangement, there seems a natural sequence and connection between the first and second Beatitudes, between the "kingdom of *heaven*," and "the inheritance of the *earth*," which is quite lost where the common order is adopted. To ourselves, the internal reasons for this arrangement, *added* to the purely external ones, appear quite conclusive for its adoption; a conclusion which is not a little strengthened by the perfectness it gives to the interesting parallel we are endeavouring to draw out.

regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory, ye also shall sit on thrones.”) Then shall be fulfilled the glad words of the Psalmist, “The meek shall inherit the earth, and be refreshed in the multitude of peace.”¹

[201]

One important remark here arises. The kingdoms of this world *shall* one day visibly belong to CHRIST; and Himself shall put down all rule, and authority, and power. “But we see not *yet* all things put under Him.” CHRIST has been visibly manifested as a Prophet and a Priest. As a *King*, He yet awaits His glorious manifestation. (*Nondum se Regem appellat Christus, quai in primâ Apparitione nondum Regiâ fungebatur Potestate.*” *Euseb. ap. Corn. à. Lap. in Luc. xix. 12.*) The prophetic and priestly offices, then, are those which CHRIST’S Church has now chiefly to discharge. And if, because the kingdoms of this world are solemnly promised to CHRIST she therefore attempts to lay hold of them for herself; to antedate the judgment of God; and to strive, in a carnal way, to bring about the fulfilment of prophecies which GOD in His good time will bring about in His Own way; she grievously errs. Her duty is not now to grasp at worldly dominion, but to “learn of Him Who is *meek* and lowly in heart.” The Nobleman has gone into the far country to receive solemn investiture of His kingdom. And it is only after the “long time” has elapsed, that he will return and visibly enter upon it; *not till when* does He give those who have quietly “waited,” and diligently worked for Him, authority over five cities, or ten cities, as they have severally shown themselves fitted for the exercise of authority. “The patient abiding of the meek shall not perish for ever.” They shall yet hear the glad words, “Come, ye blessed of My FATHER, inherit the kingdom.”

III. And as the second petition, as we have already shown, relates peculiarly to CHRIST so does the third bear special reference to the work of the HOLY Ghost. Nor can we fail at once to see allusion to one of the great offices of the same Divine Person, the [202] Blessed Comforter, in the third Beatitude. “*Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted.*” But why is the petition, “*Thy will be done*” peculiarly the petition of the *mourners*? S. Paul answers the question. Because “*tribulation worketh patience*” It is in seasons of sorrow especially that the grace of holy resignation is developed. It is under the chastening and hallowing influence of affliction that the sufferer learns to say from the

¹ Corn à Lapide, in his commentary on this second Beatitude, thus interprets the word “*earth*” “*Per terram, accipe orbem terræ futuram quam Apostolus (Heb. ii. 5) ait, post judicium generale, subjiciendum Christo, quasi heredi, ac sonsequenter, mansuetis ejus coheredibus. Post judicium euim, mundus totus, putâ coelum et terra, innovabuntur, et glorificabuntur, subjicientur Christo, ejusque sanctis.*”

We feel convinced that the interpretations which make this word “*earth*” here, mean either heaven, or nothing, or merely the earth in this present [Greek] (Cf Matt. xiv. 39, 40) are alike erroneous. We believe that the popular notions, that, at the second Advent and the overthrow of Anti-Christ, this earth, which has apparently for a long series of ages undergone a slow and gradual preparation for the abode of man, is to be utterly destroyed; that there is to be a literal *day* after this, in which all the tremendous concerns of judgment are to be crowded up, after which day, the good are all to be transported to heaven;—“is founded upon no warranty of Holy Scripture,” but absolutely and hopelessly “repugnant to the Word of GOD.”

Without entering here upon a question involving points of great obscurity and difficulty; or insisting on the plain and obvious deduction from S. Peter’s language, (2 S. Pet. iii. 5—13,) that the earth is to emerge, *as substantially the same* out of the purgatorial deluge of fire, as of old it did out of the deluge of water; we would yet just ask: Is any adequate meaning (any meaning in fact at all) usually given to passages of this character? “The earth *abideth for ever.*” “He hath made the round world co sure that it shall *never be moved at any time.*” “The posterity of His servants shall inherit it, and they that love His Name shall dwell therein.” “The earth hath He *given to the children of men*” “Those that patiently abide the Lord, *they shall inherit the earth.*” “The righteous shall inherit the earth, and *shall dwell for ever and ever upon it.*” ([Greek] —Ps. xxxvii. 29.)

heart, "Father, Thy will be done." And how strikingly is this connection seen in the History of our Lord. It was just at the time of His most intense suffering; just when His awful agony was wringing from Him a sweat of blood, that He Himself uttered this petition, which He has here taught us. "Not My will, but Thine be done."

But this is not the only parallel between these two clauses.

What is the chief, nay, what is the only legitimate source of Christian *mourning*? Nay, what is the secret source of all present sorrow? It is the disharmony which exists between man's will and God's will. The Christian grieves for himself because he so very imperfectly keeps God's will. "His eyes run down with water, because men keep" it not. But they who thus mourn shall be one day abundantly comforted. The Spirit of truth must one day triumph over the Spirit of evil. God's will must yet be victorious. For the distinguishing mark of the "New heaven and new earth" shall be this, that therein shall dwell "*righteousness*." Sorrow and mourning will then have ceased; for the source of sorrow will be removed. God's will shall then "be done on earth as it is done in heaven."¹

IV. The fourth petition, the petition for "*Bread*," is plainly the language of those who *hunger*. For it is only they who need, who ask. The request, then, necessarily implies a feeling of *want* on the part of the petitioner. So, in exact harmony, we find the [203] fourth Beatitude attached to those who "hunger and thirst after "*righteousness*." For it is the "hungry" alone whom Christ "fillet with good things." Moreover, in the word "Righteousness" we see somewhat of the hidden meaning of the parallel expression "Bread." It is "Christ our Righteousness" for Whom we sue; Christ "who of God is made unto us—Righteousness." He is the super-substantial Bread for Whom we are to hunger. While then we exclude not from the petition "all things needful for our bodies," yet we rob it of its peculiar significance, if we see not in it that "Living bread, which cometh down from heaven;" that Sacred Flesh, which is "meat indeed," that Blood which is "drink indeed." And those who now thus hunger and thirst "shall be filled spiritually and sacramentally here; in blessed and glorious fruition hereafter, when "they shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more." For "they shall be satisfied with the plenteousness of Thy House, and Thou shalt give them drink out of Thy pleasures as out of the river."

V. The petition is, "*Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors*." But, who are they who alone can offer up in faith the former part of this prayer? Plainly, those only who fulfil the condition imposed on them by the latter part. Those alone who are merciful and forgiving, can ever hope to receive mercy and forgiveness from God. And so, in perfect

¹ We must not shut our eyes to the important considerations which this petition forces upon us, viz.:—

1. The petition *must* ultimately be answered. It were infidelity of the deepest dye to doubt it. GOD'S will, then, *must* yet be done *on earth, as it is done in heaven*. But
2. When shall this be? Certainly not *before* the Second Advent of our LORD and SAVIOUR. For at that time, we have His own assurance that "Iniquity shall abound;" that the love of the many shall have waxed cold; that faith will be hard to find: that wars, and discords, and heresy, and impiety, that every kind of evil will prevail; that matters will have come to their very worst; the earth shrouded in a thick "darkness which may be felt;" creation groaning for deliverance.
3. The fulfilment of this prophetic prayer *must* then *follow* the destruction of Anti-Christ, and have reference to some future period, when creation shall throw off her garment of corruption; when the heavy incubus of the primæval curse shall be removed; when the floods, the fields, the woods, the hills, the hoarse ocean, shall join in one triumphant song of praise "before the LORD, for He cometh, He cometh to judge the folk righteously, and to govern *the nations upon earth*." "And righteousness shall be the girdle of His loins, and faithfulness the girdle of his reins;" when "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb;" when "wars shall cease;" and "the knowledge of the LORD shall cover *the earth as the waters cover the sea*."

harmony with this do we find the filth Beatitude, “*Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.*” The exactness of the connection between these two passages is best seen by a reference to S. Matt. xviii. 23—25, where our Lord is illustrating the lesson of the Beatitude, viz.: that the “merciful” alone “shall obtain mercy;” and He does it by means of this very illustration employed in the petition before us viz.: the forgiveness of a *debt*; in the case of a servant who did not, forgive his own debtor as he himself had been forgiven. “Thou wicked servant, shouldest thou not have had mercy ([Greek]) on thy fellow-servant, even as I had mercy on thee?”

The quasi-sacramental character of forgiveness is here much to be noticed. It is, indeed “twice blessed:” and being the great gift which we receive by becoming Christians, is the great duty which, as Christians, is laid upon us. For Christ has now so hallowed this duty, by the stupendous price at which Himself has purchased our forgiveness, that it is ever since consecrated to be the sacred channel through which forgiveness is to be obtained for ourselves. “*Si vis impetrare misericordiam Dei, esto misericors. Si tu negas homini humanitatem; negabit tibi et Deus Divinitatem (h.e. incorruptionem immortalitatis, qua nos facit Deos) . . . Miserere hominis, homo; et tui miserebitur Deus.*” (S. Aug. Ser. 259.) But we must hasten on.

VI. *Lead us not into temptation.* Of what class of suppliants is [204] this petition, in a peculiar way, the language? Who are they who will ever evince the most shrinking dread of temptation? Evidently the “pure in heart,” the simple-minded, guileless, and earnest Christians, who dread the contact of any thing which may sully their purity, and stain the robes of their innocence. We have a striking example of the connection of the pure, guileless heart, and the dread of temptation, in the case of Agur. “Two things have I required of Thee; deny me not. Give me neither poverty nor riches, lest I be full, and deny Thee; or lest I be poor and steal.” He shrunk from poverty and riches alike, as being circumstances of temptation; and he shrunk from temptation because he dreaded sin; and he dreaded sin because he loved GOD with pure, guileless love. “Lest I take the Name of my GOD in vain.”

But there is a still deeper connection between these two clauses, than this. For no less true is it that the pure-hearted will shrink from temptation, than it is, that sanctified temptation will, assuredly, produce purity. It frequently pleases the Most High to permit His servants to pass through the fiery ordeal of temptation. And for what purpose? Simply, to *purify* them; to test them; and by means of the furnace of trial, to purge away their dross. He sits over them, like the refiner of silver, tempering the heat of the furnace to what they are “able to bear;” watching them till He sees His Own Image reflected, by degrees, in their purified hearts; and then, blessed retribution! as He gradually sees Himself in them, so shall they be gradually permitted to *see Him*, until at last they wake up “*after His likeness*,” when they shall “*see Him as He is.*”

On the sixth day it was that man was first created in the “Image of GOD;” so here, in the sixth Beatitude have we an intimation of his gradual restoration to that Image.

But the number six is also the number of Anti-Christ [vide *Ecclesiastic*, XV. 542—5,] and we can hardly doubt, but that in this sixth petition, we have some secret allusion to the dread season of “fiery trial,” through which the Church has yet to pass during the times of Anti-Christ; referred to in the *sixth epistle* (Rev. iii. 10) as that “hour of *temptation* which shall come upon all the world to *try* them that dwell upon the earth;”¹ alluded to also by

¹ The particular *subjects* of this “temptation” must be carefully noticed. The season of tribulation, we are told, is to fall upon *all the world*, ([Greek]) but its peculiar mission is to *try* “them” only “who dwell on
{cont.}

Daniel, as the time when “many shall be *purified*, and made white, and *tried*, but the wicked shall do wickedly.” (xii. 10.) The evil which for ages has secretly existed in the Church, paralyzing her energies and crippling her strength, shall then be revealed and brought to a [205] head. “This fire shall try every man’s work of what sort it is.” The issue shall be the everlasting destruction of CHRIST’S enemies, and the “manifestation of the sons of GOD.”

VII. But we now come to the seventh and last Petition. “*Deliver us from evil.*” As the seventh day was that wherein the Almighty rested from His work, and “was refreshed,” so has this petition ultimate reference to that sabbath of peace, that time of deliverance from evil alluded to by S. Paul as the [Greek] (Heb. iv.), by S. Peter as the “time of refreshing” and “restitution,” (Acts iii. 19—21,) when “evil” shall be put under, when the effects of the Incarnation are allowed uninterrupted sway, viz., “*Peace on earth* and good will to man,” and when the oath which GOD swore to our forefathers is accomplished, “that we being *delivered* from all our enemies, should serve Him without fear, in holiness and righteousness” for ever.

But we have in this petition and the corresponding Beatitude, allusion to two great personal Antagonists. On one hand, *the evil one*, ([Greek]), the mighty Adversary of GOD and man, the restless “accuser,” whose one object it is to put variance between the creature and the Creator, and keep them at enmity; and on the other hand, the SON of GOD, the Deliverer, ([Greek], cf. Rom. xi. 26; 1 Thess. i. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 18, &c.) the Prince of Peace, Whose peculiar office it is to *reconcile* GOD and man, “having *made peace* by the Blood of His Cross,” to keep them at one, (cf. Eph. ii. 14—17; Col i. 20.)

And not only do we here see allusion to the Great Peace Maker, the SON of GOD Himself; but also to those His members, who, exhibiting in themselves this His great characteristic feature, are therefore honoured with His own august title, “Sons of GOD,” (“Blessed are the peace makers, for they shall be called the sons of God.”) And who will so earnestly pray for deliverance from the great adversary and enemy of peace as they? Who, with so great a chance of being heard? The SON Himself having in discharge of His office of Peace Maker, vanquished the evil one; they, fellow-workers with Him in this blessed office, and sharers with Him in His peculiar title, share also the right to deliverance from the same “evil one.”

It has ever been their business to “eschew evil and do good, to seek peace and ensue it,” and as they have sown also shall they reap. They shall be eternally freed from *evil*, eternal partakers of that *peace* which is “sown for them that make peace,” (Isa. iii. [206] 18.). Being sons of GOD, the SON of GOD Himself shall deliver them, and “if the SON make them free, they shall be free indeed,”¹ and being “delivered from every evil work,” shall be “preserved to His heavenly kingdom.”

the *earth*,” ([Greek]). In other words, the passage seems to intimate that, though the times of trouble which shall usher in the revelation of the Anti-Christ, shall extend over the whole world; yet that, as a *purgatorial judgment*, as a “fiery *trial*,” the tribulation will fall chiefly on the *visible Church*, “Judgment shall begin at the House of GOD.” For although [Greek] frequently signifies, in this hook, the earth generally; yet, when contrasted with [Greek], or with [Greek] (which as a general expression, comprehends the two,) it signifies the *dry land of GOD* reclaimed from the waste of waters, or mass of the unregenerate. But the [Greek], and the [Greek] shall ultimately be coincident, for all the earth shall be finally reclaimed. In the new heavens and new earth (morally as well as physically) there shall be “*no more sea*.” “All shall know Me from the least to the greatest.”

¹ So Augustine, “Si beati sunt pacifici, quoniam ipsi filii Dei vocabuntur; oremus ut liberemur à malo; ipsa enim liberatio liberos nos faciet, id est filios Dei, ut Spiritu adoptionis clamemus Abba Pater.”

VIII. And here the petitions of our LORD'S Prayer terminate. One Beatitude however yet remains, the eighth, or octave. The seven-fold cycle has now completed its revolution, and a *new commencement* ensues. For this is the common symbolic meaning of the number eight, as the *eighth day* exactly explains. The number supposes a fresh beginning, a repetition of the first in some new phase.¹ Hence we find the eighth Beatitude but a repetition of the first; to the "poor in spirit," and to the "persecuted," the same blessing attached, "for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

One or two observations here arise. And

1. First. The *eighth* never signifies merely a bare, unuttered repetition of the first, but always some higher or more exalted phase of the first. Hence, the two meanings of the expression "the kingdom of Heaven," must be never lost sight of. The one expresses a state

manifested in the present [Greek], the other, a state not to be manifested till this [Greek] has passed away, and till the SON of GOD now seated on His FATHER'S throne assumes His own throne, and His Saints reign with Him. But the "saints are hidden" now. The "manifestation of the sons of GOD" is yet future. Therefore we pray as though for something yet future, "Thy kingdom *come*."

2. The difference between the *seventh* and the *eighth* also is not without important significance: The former number would appear rather negative, the latter positive. The former, to indicate chiefly deliverance from evil, and rest from toil; the latter, the positive enjoyment of new and glorious felicity.² Evil reaches its climax on the evening of the sixth day. "Heaviness endureth for that night, but joy cometh in the morning." For deliverance comes on the seventh day, a day which has no evening,³ but which [207] gradually unfolds itself into the eighth or everlasting day, wherein the words "Behold, I make all things new," which began to be accomplished at the Incarnation, and which receive a still further, and beatific fulfilment at the opening of the seventh day, shall have their full and, eternal consummation. Creation was pronounced "very good" at the morning of the first day. At the Everlasting Octave of that day it shall again be pronounced, though with still deeper meaning, "*very good*." During the seventh day redemption is not fully achieved. For Satan, though perfectly harmless, is not yet destroyed. The eternal bliss of the Saints has commenced, and the number of the elect filled up. But the curse is not fully removed from "the nations;" or the renovation of all things yet complete, (as may be seen by the *Old Testament* descriptions of the new heavens and the new earth, which apparently do not

¹ Vide *Ecclesiastic*, XV. 370, &c. φ Dykes's review 'Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse (1853). See pp. 72ff *supra*.

² Augustine thus speaks of the seven days of the world:— "*Primus* dies—tempus ab Adam usque ad Noe; *secundus*, a Noe usque ad Abraham; *tertius*, ab Abraham usque ad David; *quartus*, a David usque ad transmigracionem in Babyloniam [S. Matt. i. 17]; *Quintus*, a transmigracione usque ad Adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Ab adventu Domini *sextus* agiture: in sexto di sumus. Et ideo, quomodo formatus est homo sexto die ad imaginem Dei, sic et in isto tempore, quasi sexto die totius sæculi, renovamur in baptismo, ut recipiamus imaginem Conditoris nostri. Sextus autem dies iste cum transierit, veniet *requies*, post illam vitam de qua dictum, 'quia oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit,' &c. Tunc, *velut ad caput* reditur. Quomodo enim cum peracti fuerint isti septem sæculi transeuntis, ad illam immortalitatem beatitudinemque rediemus de quâ lapsus est homo." [Serm. 259.]

³ "Quære septem dies, Genesim legens, invenies *septimum* sine vesperâ, quia requiem sine fine significat. Requies ultima sempiterna est, ac per hoc, et *octavus* sempiternam beatitudinem habebit, quia requies illa quæ sempiterna est excipitur ab octavo, non extinguitur. Ita ergo erit octavus qui primus, ut prima vita non tollatur sed reddatur æterna." [Ep. lib. ii. 55. t.ii. p. 101.]

carry us beyond the seventh day.) But at the ushering in of the eighth day all shall be fulfilled, every vestige of the curse eternally removed, and “the mystery of GOD shall be finished,”

3. But another question may arise. We have traced out the parallel between the seven Beatitudes and the seven petitions. But there is an eighth Beatitude. Why then is there not an eighth petition to correspond with it? For this simple and beautiful reason. Our Lord’s Prayer, we know, is the universal prayer of His members, His blessed and elect people. But, for them, after the dawn of the eighth or everlasting day, though “Blessing” shall continue, (for they shall be blessed for ever,) yet prayer shall have ceased, “For in that day ye shall ask Me nothing.” Faith shall then be swallowed up in sight, hope in fruition, and prayer in praise. Hence the eighth clause¹ of the prayer is prayer no longer, but an ascription of praise to the “Holy, Blessed and Glorious TRINITY,”—to the Eternal SON for that glorious *kingdom*, on the full enjoyment of which they shall then have entered; to the Blessed SPIRIT, through Whose *power*² they were first admitted into it, and preserved therein “through faith unto salvation;” to the GOD of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the FATHER of *Glory*, of Whom it is declared that “every tongue shall confess that JESUS CHRIST is LORD, to the glory of GOD the FATHER.”

4. Another important consideration also here presents itself. How peculiar and signal is the honour of suffering *persecution* for CHRIST’S sake. For it is this privilege, and this alone, which is mentioned by our LORD in connection with the future and glorious phase of His kingdom. The present “kingdom” is entered [208] through the lowly gate of humility and poverty of spirit. But the octave or future kingdom, the glorious distinction of *reigning with CHRIST*, appears destined in an especial way, (though not exclusively,) for those who suffer persecution for Him. “If we *suffer* we shall also *reign* with Him.” In exact accordance with which, we find it stated that those who after the destruction of the beast and the false prophet reign with CHRIST during the thousand years and thenceforward for ever, are those who have “overcome the beast and his image,” and have “been *beheaded* for the witness of Jesus and the Word of GOD.” (Rev. xx. 4.)

5. And here we feel bound to take this opportunity of expressing our conviction, that in alluding to this passage (Rev. xx. 4, &c.) on a former occasion,³ and enforcing the admirable exposition of it which the Church has inherited from S. Augustine, we were in error in so far as we advocated that interpretation to *the exclusion* of any more glorious one still future. That the passage refers to the inestimable privileges of the regenerate state in the present phase of the kingdom of heaven, this we still earnestly maintain; but that it relates to nothing further, this we find ourselves, after a careful consideration of the passage, *absolutely* unable to believe.

And let one simple question suffice to show this.

Of whom are we expressly told that the enthroned victors who reign with Christ the thousand years consist? We have distinct and special reference made amongst them, to those who have *encountered and overcome the persecutions of Anti-christ*, (for however we may truly interpret the “beast and his image” to designate *generally* “the world, and the things of the world,” yet we must never do so to the exclusion of their obvious *special*

¹ i.e., assuming, what yet appears most questionable, that the concluding ascription is genuine.

² Cf. S. Luke i. 35; iv. 14; Acts i. 8; x. 38; Rom. xv. 13, 19; 1 Cor. ii. 4; &c.

³ *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xv. 356—360. φ pp. 61ff *supra*.

reference to Anti-Christ himself); hence it follows that the full accomplishment of this prophecy *must* take place at a period *posterior* to the destruction of Anti-Christ, and *therefore posterior to our LORD'S second advent*.

And still further, how are the victors employed? They are "reigning with CHRIST," "*seated on thrones, judging*." And this still more conclusively, refers the passage to a yet future period. For when does our LORD Himself declare that this enthronization and judgment shall take place? "In the *regeneration*, when the Aon of Man shall sit on the throne of His glory," *then* "shall ye *sit on thrones, judging*." So again, it is when the nobleman, after the "long time," returns, having received solemn investiture of His kingdom, that *then*, and not till then, He makes His servants *sharers in His dominion*, setting one over five, another over ten cities.¹

[209]

6. Nor must another consideration on this latter subject be omitted.

S. Peter, we remember, speaking in particular reference to the *day of judgment*,² (2 S. Pet. iii. 7, 8,) uses this expression, that "one day is with the LORD as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." Again, S. John alluding also to the *day of judgment* ("judgment was given unto them,") speaks of it in like manner as extending over a period of a thousand years, (i.e. either a literal millennium or some perfect period known to GOD). Now may not S. Peter's thousand years and day of judgment, be identical with S. John's thousand years and season of judgment, and both comprise the *seventh day* of the earth's duration (as S. Augustine and the earlier fathers seem to have held)? And may not this seventh day (as we have already suggested) be the period obscurely shadowed perhaps in the seventh petition, and the corresponding Beatitude? For the one speaks of "deliverance from the evil one," and the other, of the "manifestation of the sons of GOD;" and both of these are prophetically connected with this period. "Deliverance from the evil one;" for during this day, says S. John, Satan is "bound with a great chain that he should

¹ Let it here be carefully borne in mind what view S. Augustine himself *inherited from the earlier Fathers of the Church*.

We learn this from his 259th Sermon, wherein he thus writes:

"*Octavus ergo iste dies in fine sæculi novam vitam significat: septimus, quietem futuram sanctorum in hâc terra. Regnabit enim Dominus in terrâ cum sanctis suis, sicut dicunt Scripturæ, et habebit hîc ecelesiam quo nullus malus intrabit, separatam atque purgatam . . . Nam Ecelesia hîc primo apparebit in magnâ claritate, et dignitate, et justitiâ.*" Now it is much to be considered that the only reason he assigns for his subsequent change of opinion on this subject, is the abuse made of the doctrine by carnal-minded men. (Civ. D. xx. 7.) As we considered at length, on a former occasion, the exposition of Rev. xx. 4, &c. which he afterwards substituted for the one given above, and which the great authority of his name caused to be received in the Church for above a thousand years, to the exclusion of any other; we need not again refer to it, or say more than this, that our firm persuasion is, that both interpretations are correct; that neither one must be held to the exclusion of the other; that the prophecy evidently admits of a double interpretation, and of progressive fulfilments; and that the earlier fathers must not be thrown in opposition to the later, but their interpretations harmonized and combined.

² The prevalent idea that this expression "*day of judgment*," or "*last day*," or "*day of the LORD*," refers to a literal day of twenty-four hours, instead of to a dispensational era, is, we are persuaded, a most erroneous and misleading one. The [Greek] is not a literal day; neither is the [Greek]. "The *night* is far spent, the *day* is at hand." Here again, the night is not a literal night, nor the day a literal day. Let the expression, moreover, "In that *day*," which occurs so continually in the Old Testament prophecies, be noticed, and the idea that it refers to a literal day will soon be dissipated. "In that *day*, Judah shall be saved, and Israel dwell safely." "In that *day* the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones, and the kings of the earth." "The LORD alone shall be exalted in that *day*." "In that *day* will I cause the horn of Israel to bud forth." "And many nations shall be joined unto the Lord in that *day*." "In that *day*. . . shall the house of David look on Me whom they have pierced and mourn," &c. &c.

deceive the nations no more.” “Manifestation of the sons of GOD;” for as soon as Christ their life shall *appear*, then shall they also, His members, *appear* with Him in glory. They shall be “gathered” at once from the four winds of heaven “to meet their LORD in the air.” The day, then, would appear to open with the “*resurrection [210] of the just,*”¹ accompanied perhaps by some purgatorial judgment on the living, and to terminate or issue in the eighth or everlasting day, with the general resurrection and final judgment; in which it must be remembered that CHRIST’S saints are not to be judged, but “to sit on thrones” with Him “*judging.*”

The Bride is made ready by the morning of the seventh day. The mystic number of the elect is made up. But the marriage is not immediately consummated. The guests are seated at the supper, and the KING appears. The judicial sentence of exclusion and consignment to the “outer darkness” of the unrobed guests takes place, and the sabbatism of the saints commences; a time typified by the transitional abode of our LORD on earth *after* His resurrection, and before His full exaltation, when His elect alone had visible communion with Him, “eating and drinking with [211] Him, and “speaking of the things pertaining to the” coming “kingdom.” Even as the saints in incorruptible, though perhaps not yet *fully* glorified bodies, shall *then* enjoy a visible communion with their Lord, and a beatific antepast of bliss and glory yet to be revealed; learning of Him also of the “things pertaining to the kingdom;” undergoing a preliminary training for their part in the coming

¹ Let it be remembered that this is an expression of our Blessed LORD Himself. He speaks of the “resurrection of the *just,*” as though of some *distinct* occurrence. And many intimations do we appear to have that such will indeed be the case. We read of the “resurrection *of* the dead,” (i.e. the general resurrection,) and the “resurrection *from* the dead,” (i.e. of a particular elect number; of the saints); of the [Greek], and the [Greek], (Phil. iii. 11); of the general company of the dead whom the FATHER raiseth, and the limited chosen company whom the SON quickeneth, (S. John v. 21); of those who rise to undergo a *judgment*, and those who “shall not enter into judgment,” having been *ipso facto* judged, by being gathered to CHRIST at His coming, (Cf. Ps. 1. 5; S. Matt. xxiv. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 1; i. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 16), who shall awake to the “resurrection of *life,*” and shall themselves take part in *judging*, yea, shall “judge angels;” of the [Greek] who shall be admitted to share in the kingdom of CHRIST as happy *subjects* (S. Matt. xxv. 34), and the [Greek] (S. Matt. v. 3—11; Rev. xiv. 13; xix. 9; xx.6, &c.), who shall share with their LORD the *government* of the kingdom, “seated on His throne,” “reigning with Him.” Again, S. Paul in 1 Thess. iv. 13—18, as also in 1. Cor. xv. 49, &c. is plainly speaking not of the general resurrection, but of the [Greek], of the resurrection of the sleeping, and rapture and change of the living *saints*. And in the same xvth chapter he states unequivocally, that there is to be a threefold order observed in the resurrection; “every man,” he says, “in his own order,” (1) “CHRIST the first fruits;” (2) “*afterward* they who are CHRIST’S at His Parousia;” (3) “*afterwards,*” he adds, “cometh the *end,*” (i.e., the period of general resurrection, when the sevenfold cycle of time shall complete its revolution, and the everlasting day commence,) “when He shall deliver up the kingdom,” (not *resign*, for “of His kingdom there shall be no end;” nor, till then, indeed may the kingdom be said *fully* to have “come,” but) present it, faultless and entire to the FATHER, to be henceforth the perfected kingdom of GOD and CHRIST, “the throne of GOD and of the Lamb.” Now S. John does no more than state plainly what has thus been frequently intimated before; viz. that at the dawn of the seventh day, or day of judgment, all CHRIST’S saints and martyrs, all who “have been thought worthy to suffer shame for His name,” shall be raised to enjoy a sabbatism with Him *before* the mass of the dead are raised, (prefigured by the partial resurrection of the saints which took place on the Easter-morn,) that they shall “reign with CHRIST” over an untempted and partially renewed earth; that at the close of this day, the general resurrection of the countless myriads of the dead, and the final judgment shall take place when CHRIST and His saints shall “judge the world in righteousness,” shall “judge angels” also, and shall execute the eternal and awful sentence upon Satan himself, (who for the purpose of undergoing it shall have been loosed “for a little season,” which he shall have employed in organizing a desperate but unavailing attack upon the “camp of the saints and the beloved city;”)—and that after this and the succeeding judgment, the renovation will be *fully* complete; every vestige of the curse everlastingly removed; death, sorrow, tears, and pain for ever at an end; and the unknown ages of eternity begin their ceaseless course.

“judgment” of [Greek] (S. Matt. xxv. 32,) as well as for their share in the government of the *whole created universe* (Heb. ii. 8,) which is to be eternally given to them. And now, all things being made ready, the Bride, girt with celestial radiance, makes her public appearance; the Holy City descendeth “having the glory of God;” and the everlasting and ineffable union takes place; the eighth day commences; the “Perpetua quies, sempiterna lætitia, indeficiens Beatitudo;” and the Bride shares in the “ Kingdom, the Power, and the Glory, for ever and ever.”

7. But a concluding observation yet presents itself.

S. John, we have seen, describing the eternal state, speaks of the Holy City, the Tabernacle of the Saints, as descending from Heaven to *earth*; and of the Tabernacle of God being with men. But our Lord in His final benediction of “the persecuted,” bids them “rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is their reward in *Heaven*.” Now an apparent difficulty here presents itself as to the locality of this reward. But it is no *real* difficulty. Our Lord never says “great *will be* your reward in Heaven.” The language of Holy Scripture is most consistent on this point. It never speaks of the Saints going, after their Resurrection, to their reward in Heaven: but, rather, of their reward *coming down from Heaven to them*. It represents it as now in safe keeping with Christ, but as about to be brought to them at His Appearing. “The gift is to *be brought* at the Revelation of Jesus Christ.” “The crown of righteousness” is to be *given* by our Lord when He comes. The prize is *laid up* in Heaven, but *ready to be revealed*, at the Parousia of Christ. So the saints do not *go up* to inherit the New Jerusalem. It descends to them. It overshadows and illuminates the renewed earth. Moreover, this “Tabernacle of God,” or Blessed Company of the Glorified, must on no account be considered as merely identical with the “new earth,” and the nations of saved men. The distinction between the two is most marked and important, as indicating conditions of felicity differing not only in degree but in kind. On the one hand, we have the holy city itself, radiant with the Glory of God; and on the other, “the nations¹ of them which are saved,” (Rev. xxi. 24,) who “walk in the [212] Light of It,” and the “kings of the earth who bring their glory and honour into it,” (ib.) On one hand, the King and Queen; and on the other, the happy subjects over whom they reign. On the one hand, the Divine Bridegroom, and the Bride “all glorious;” on the other, her “honourable women, “the virgins that bear her company (Ps. xlv.). On one hand, the husband and Spouse; on the other the spiritual “children” whom they shall have, and “make princes in all lands,” (ib.) Our LORD, we remember, prayed for “*the world*,” that “it might *believe*.” The world therefore itself, *must* ultimately believe in Him. The whole world. But He prayed something further for His *elect*. He prayed that they might be “*glorified with His own Glory*.” And this, too, shall be fulfilled. For as S. Paul says, our LORD shall be “*glorified in His saints*,” while He shall be “admired in them that believe.” And Simeon: that, when He shall be “a Light to lighten the nations,” (i. e. the “nations of the saved” who “shall walk in His Light”) He shall be “the *Glory* of His peculiar people,” His elect “Israel.”

¹ Amongst whom (if, indeed, one half of the Old Testament prophecies are not to mean absolutely nothing) the children of Israel, restored to their own land, shall occupy a conspicuous and peculiar position as the Metropolitan Nation. The Spiritual Israel, it is true “the Seed,” Christ and His Members, will occupy the highest position of Glory, and inherit those unspeakable promises of Blessedness which the other might have held, but forfeited. But this does not, in the least degree, make void those reiterated assurances, those solemn oaths of Jehovah, that the land of Canaan (“the land which I swear to your fathers to give them,” yea, *the land wherein your fathers dwelt*” (!) (Ezek. xxxvii 25,) shall belong to the literal descendants of Abraham for an “everlasting possession.”

But we must bring these remarks to a conclusion, not without the consciousness that to some of our readers they may appear, at first sight, fanciful, if not presumptuous. We can only trust that a candid examination of them may show them to be (at least in the main) neither the one nor the other.

Circumstances having recently drawn our attention to a more close consideration of the particular subjects on which we have been writing; we have been struck, not only with the vagueness of some of our traditional notions, but also with their manifest divergence from the express declarations of Holy Scripture.

It is with no vain desire of pressing our opinions upon others, that we have ventured to offer the suggestions above made: but with the simple hope, if so it may be, of drawing the attention of some of our brother Churchmen to considerations of intense interest, which perhaps hardly meet with the measure of regard which their importance demands. And if any thing we have written be the means of opening out some new train of thought to our readers, or of directing them to Scripture Harmonies which they may have hitherto overlooked; whatever be the deficiencies or errors with which this paper may be justly chargeable, it will not have been written in vain.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 16. (Joseph Masters: London, 1854)
[535] **LEE ON THE INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE**

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture, its Nature and Proof. Eight Discourses preached before the University of Dublin. By WILLIAM LEE, MA., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College. London: Rivingtons. Dublin: McGlashan. 1854.

This is an important work, and supplies a real want in our English Theological Literature. The subject on which it treats is one, the importance of which can hardly be over-estimated; on which opinions the most vague, unsatisfactory, and contradictory are widely spread; and which has long stood in need of a careful and systematic treatment. This treatment it has here met with. The writer appears well qualified for the task he has undertaken. His work, too, has been written not without great care. It bears traces of much honest labour, diligent reading, and independent thought. It is replete with matter: and perhaps it is in this respect (*viz.*, the copiousness of its material), that the only drawback to its general utility will be likely to be met with. So many collateral topics are introduced by way of illustration, counter theories examined, rationalistic objections refuted, difficulties, real or apparent, grappled with, that the leading argument of the work seems too frequently arrested, its unity interfered with and perhaps the general effect of the whole, in a measure, impaired.

The form of ‘Discourses’ in which the treatise appears, and the necessity that each Discourse should be complete in itself, has contributed to this defect, a defect which the absence of any index, and the very slender character of the analysis prefixed to each chapter, tends to enhance. But to turn to the subject itself.

No feature is more apparent in the structure of Holy Scripture, or more universally recognized, than this, of the co-existence of two distinct elements,—a Divine, and a human; the former, now appearing to predominate, now the latter.

Now from this obvious fact, two opposite Theories (as is well known) have arisen as to the Authorship and Inspiration of Holy Scripture, based respectively on the undue prominence given to one or other of these elements.

On the one hand we hear it said, The Bible, doubtless, contains the Word of GOD; still many portions of it bear evident indications of being but the word of man. For we see every mark of human authorship—imperfect knowledge, misquotations, occasional contradictions; and the like. The writers doubtless received a *germ* of Truth from GOD, but they developed it according as they severally thought fit; so that, though unquestionably infallible in essentials, [536] yet, in unimportant matters, their writings partake of the imperfections which characterize, more or less, everything which has to flow through a human channel. Thus, according to theory (which appears in infinite variety of forms, though all radically identical), part of the Bible is infallible, part fallible; part Divine, part merely human; and, as it rests with each individual to determine exactly how much is from God, and how much from man, it, follows, that regarded as an unerring guide, the Holy Scripture is simply useless.

Here then comes in the opposite school, the writers of which maintain what is commonly called the ‘*Mechanical*’ (sometimes the ‘*Organic*’ or ‘*Objective*’) Theory of Inspiration; the theory which, practically ignoring the human element in the Bible, asserts that the sacred penmen were mere *machines*, unintelligent *organs*, as it were, through which the message of the Holy Ghost was communicated to men; that everything, therefore, contained in Scripture, whether history, personal narrative, or doctrine, was, whether as to form, matter, or manner, directly and immediately dictated by God.

But it is needless to add that this theory cannot stand for a moment, the test of any candid and intelligent examination; that it is opposed by the whole form and structure of the sacred Writings; and that, in consequence, it is being gradually, and deservedly abandoned.

The only consistent Theory of Inspiration is that—ably advocated in the volume before us—commonly designated as the “*Dynamical Theory*,” the theory which, fully recognizing both the Divine and the human element in the structure of the Bible, gives to neither an undue prominence; which combines the two according to their several laws of operation, considering each equally necessary in the resultant organism; which regards the human instrument, not as the soul-less “*pen*,” but as the intelligent. “*pen man*” of the Holy Spirit; which supposes not the suppression, but the due employment and exaltation of the natural faculties of the human instruments.

The Revelation, of which the Bible is the vehicle, is from God; therefore it is Divine: but it is *for man*; therefore it is clothed in human language, for (as has been truly said) “the Divine can only be grasped by man, when embodied and moulded according to the laws of nature.”¹

Nor does the fact of the human medium, through which it is transmitted, and from which it derives its peculiar *form*, in the least degree detract from the supreme Divinity of the Revelation itself; since “when addressed to *man*, the human element becomes an essential *part of the message from Heaven*.”²

[537]

To adopt a sacred illustration: is CHRIST the less GOD because He has inseparably united Himself to our nature? No, His Godhead is not compromised, nor converted into flesh, by the marvelous act of Incarnation, but manhood has, rather, been taken up into GOD. Even so has GOD’S Revelation not become deteriorated by the human form which it has assumed: rather, the earthly language which has been employed for its conveyance has become Divine.

And again, Truth, we know, is many-sided. Human characters are various. One character has a natural affinity for one aspect of Truth; one, for another. The Divine Revelation is for all; and has therefore, been so presented, that it may find a response in all: for “unless the peculiarities of each writer were chosen to exhibit a special aspect of truth, they must in some degree distort it.”³

“What just reason,” asks Mr. Lee, “can possibly be assigned for supposing that the Divine Power should have obliterated the peculiar characteristics of each (writer) before it qualified him for his task? Must we not rather assume that, when the individual was chosen, there were certain grounds existing in his nature, in *consequence of which* the lot fell upon him? Such peculiarities of character, therefore, are rather to be regarded as the *condition* of the particular form under which the Divine Influence willed to exhibit itself in operation. And thus the actuation of the Spirit will not consist in the exclusion of the Human element, but rather in illuminating and exalting it according to its several varieties, for the attainment of the end proposed.”—Pp. 24, 25.

But does Scripture contain nothing else save Revelations? Have not the Sacred Writers recorded many things which were personally known to them without any Divine

¹ Westcott’s Gospel Harmony, p. 9.

² Ibid. p. 8.

³ Westcott, p. 13.

interposition whatever; and many, too, which they may have easily derived from ordinary human sources? undoubtedly. But ere we bring this important consideration to bear upon the general Theory of Inspiration, let us clear the ground by asking the following elementary questions.

What do we mean by Revelation? What by Holy Scripture? What by Inspiration?

First, then, by Revelation we ordinarily understand, any information or communication imparted from GOD to man,¹ for, [538] although the word signifies the act of unveiling, as well as the matter unveiled, the latter is the sense in which we more commonly employ it. Revelation, then, is the *foundation* of Revealed Religion. Now there have been several epochs of Revelation—progressive stages in that system of self-communication, whereby the ALMIGHTY has been pleased to make known His Being and Will to man—all culminating in the Great Revelation in the Person of CHRIST, the development and complement of all former Revelations, the bond which unites them in one connected and indissoluble whole.

But secondly: what do we mean by Holy Scripture? We mean that series of writings which record these progressive Revelations on the part of GOD; consisting, as well of the Divine Revelation itself, as of the Historic groundwork to which it is attached, whereby it is illustrated, on which it rests. Holy Scripture is the “*Record* of Revelation.”

But why do we call it *Holy* Scripture? Simply because it deals with sacred subjects? because it *does* record Revelation? because it is the most Holy of all books? No, but because it is the *Inspired* Record of Revelation; which brings us to our third question, What do we mean by Inspiration?

“By Inspiration,” writes our Author, “I understand that actuating energy of the HOLY SPIRIT, in whatever degree or manner it may have been exercised, guided by which the human agents chosen by GOD have officially proclaimed His will by word of mouth, or have committed to writing the several portions of the Bible.”—P. 28.

And this introduces us to the important distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, the systematic and able discussion of which forms the characteristic feature of the present volume, distinguishing it from all other treatises on the subject, with which we have hitherto met. The difference between the two is shown to be one, not of degree, but intrinsic and specific: Revelation being the peculiar work of the Second Person,

¹ A communication, that is “either of such knowledge as man could not of himself attain to, because its subject matters transcends human sagacity or human reason. . . . or which (although it might have been attained in the ordinary way) was not in point of fact, known to the person who received the Revelation.”—Lee, p. 27.

“Revelation, in Scripture, is distinguished into Revelation by Word, and Revelation by Act—the Act, or Miracle, representing and expressing in the world of sense, what the Word, or Knowledge communicated, expresses in the world of thought. . . . In one point of time, and in one form of life, both these elements have found their perfect union. Both have united in Him Who is the subject of all Revelation—the Logos, God’s eternal, personal, Self-Revelation.”—*Ibid.*

P.S. Hence “in the Christian Faith matters of *fact* exhibit and convey *doctrines*; while doctrines are presented to us as matters of fact. Christ’s Birth, Death, and Resurrection are the most sublime of *doctrines*. That He is co-essential and co-equal with the Father; His atonement, and His bestowal of spiritual gifts, we receive as matters of *fact*. . . . The record of Christ’s acts too, is as important as that of His *words*. He taught by the former, not less than by the latter. . . . Each of His miraculous acts being but the *natural expression* of the Higher reality concealed beneath His human form.”—*Ibid.* Pp. 364, 365.

Inspiration, of the Third Person of the Ever-Blessed Trinity. It is GOD the Word Who *reveals*, GOD the HOLY GHOST Who *inspires*.

But, to understand this distinction, let us examine a little more closely what we mean by *Inspiration*. And here we shall find, that there are comprehended under the term two distinct, though kindred operations of the Blessed Spirit: the first, having its sphere in the Revelations of GOD; the second, in the ordinarily acquired knowledge of man.

[539]

Now the peculiar office of Inspiration—regarded in its connection with the objective Revelations of GOD—is simply this:—to enable the recipients thereof “correctly to *apprehend* and faithfully to *express*” the Revelations imparted to them; to “bring to their remembrance” also, the communications of the eternal Word (S. John xiv 26) and unveil their hidden meaning; to “take of the things of CHRIST) and *show* them to men” (S. John xvi. 14); in fact, to bring Divine Revelation into the field of human knowledge. Hence, Revelation and Inspiration far from being identical, not only *may* be separated, but actually are seen to *have been*, in many instances.

For instance: the Patriarchs, of old, received divine *revelations*; but they were not *inspired* to record them, and put mankind in possession of them. Again: the author of the “Acts of the Apostles” received no personal *revelation* whatever; and yet he is universally acknowledged to have been *inspired*. Mr. Lee quotes also the case of the Tyrian prophets (Acts xxi.) to whom it had been *revealed*, that bonds and afflictions awaited Paul in Jerusalem, but who, enjoying no *inspiration*, adulterated and misinterpreted this Revelation, warning the Apostle *not* to go up to Jerusalem—an injunction which S. Paul’s inspired insight into the meaning of their communication led him to disregard. (Cf. Acts xxi. 4; xx. 22—4.)

In so far then as Holy Scripture consists of direct Revelation from GOD, the Inspiration of the sacred writers would merely ensure the correct apprehension and faithful transmission of what was imparted to them; and the “Dynamical Theory,” already referred to, will account for all the phenomena, whether of form, style, language, imagery, or the like, which its pages exhibit.

But Inspiration has a further office to perform, in connection with the different field whereon it is exercised.

In respect of this its second function, Inspiration may be described as that moulding, guiding, energizing Influence which pervaded the whole activity of the sacred writers, assimilating into the one body of Scripture, not only the Revelations imparted to them, but even such of their *ordinarily acquired* knowledge as suited the all-wise purposes of the Author of Scripture. For the sacred penmen unquestionably employed such material for their work as their own personal knowledge or ordinary labour placed at their disposal;—the inspiring Spirit, meanwhile, secretly co-operating with them; prompting and directing them in the selection of such as was calculated to subserve His gracious designs; breathing into their very language a supernatural power, penetrating it with His quickening influence; infusing into their earthly facts a divine significance; and so pervading the whole sphere of the thought and diction of the writers as to ennoble their entire work, and render, by His omnipotent energy, what would otherwise be but the word of man, strictly and essentially the Word of GOD.

[540]

Such then is Inspiration;—not only, that supernatural Influence which enabled the holy men of old to express in human language what was suggested to their mind by GOD, but that further agency also, whereby they were “moved to embody divine communications,

history, and doctrine, in one organic whole, of which each member transmits its own heavenly message to every age.”—P. 196.

For the Bible is no fortuitous collection of scattered documents:

“The several books which make up the Old and New Testaments conspire to form one organized whole; and each member of the inspired volume performs its own part in completing the Record of Revelation. In short, the completion of this assemblage of writings may be compared to that of a pre-arranged structure, to which many labourers contribute their toil, of whom none, perhaps, have any adequate notion of the Architect’s design—some being occupied upon that portion of the building committed to their own workmanship; others overseeing sections of the plan, and perfecting its various parts as the work proceeds—the Master-builder alone overlooking the whole, distributing His orders to one immediately, to another mediately, and rejecting every addition inconsistent with His original conception. And so the structure grows to completion according to the original idea, but, in no part, without the Master-builder’s care.”—Pp. 41, 42.

Into the nature of the *proof* offered for these positions and for the general theory of Inspiration connected therewith (which we have briefly sketched above), our limited space obviously prevents our entering. We will merely say that the whole line of proof appears most ably and carefully drawn out. Antecedent reasoning is brought to bear; and the theory maintained, shown to offer a satisfactory solution to a series of phenomena otherwise inexplicable: The immemorial doctrine of the Church of GOD, both in Jewish and Christian times, is appealed to; and a most valuable and exhaustive Patristic Catena on the subject of Inspiration supplied: and lastly, Holy Scripture itself is introduced; the credentials of the sacred writers being assumed, and their veracity ascertained, they themselves are interrogated, and made to give their own copious and conclusive testimony as to the *nature* of their powers and the source of their instructions.

Very interesting and ingenious is some of the Scripture analysis which this investigation involves.

The direct Scripture proof, to which chaps. vi. and vii. are mainly devoted, is preceded by its indirect testimony (chaps. iii.—v.) And this again is introduced by an examination of the peculiar form and *structure* of the Old and New Testaments severally, with a view of establishing their essential and indissoluble connection. Not only is their coequal authority demonstrated, and the fact that the latter is but the development of the former; the former, the basis whereon the latter reposes;—but a striking *external* unity is shown also to [541] pervade them, and, in particular, in respect of those Supernatural Agencies seen to have been employed by GOD in each, in communicating His will.

The divine Logos is shown to have been the Revealer under both Dispensations, presented to our view in the one as “the Angel of Jehovah;”¹ in the other, as “The Apostle and High Priest of our profession, JESUS CHRIST.”

¹ That the Angel of Jehovah is God the Word is manifest; for
 (a.) He identifies Himself with the Divine Nature. “The Angel said to Hagar—*I will multiply thy seed*” . . . And . . . “She called the Name of Jehovah that spake to her, ‘Thou God seest me.’” Again, “The Angel of the Lord said unto Moses . . . *I am the God of thy fathers.*”
 (b.) But, though partaker of the Divine nature, there is a Personal distinction between Him and the Eternal Father. Jehovah says, “*I send an Angel . . . obey Him; provoke Him not; He will not pardon—for My Name is in Him.*” In this uncreated Angel, says Mr. Lee, “the essence of Deity became *manifest* and *operative.*”

But the Personal Presence of the Logos is, in both cases, after a time withdrawn; and His subsequent Presence vouchsafed only in a veiled and mysterious way, through the agency of the third Person of the Blessed TRINITY. Revelations are henceforward imparted (except in one or two very particular instances) by means of some mysterious and supernatural Influence, variously designated as the “Spirit of the LORD,” or “The Word of the LORD,” or “The Hand of the LORD,” which is represented as “falling on” the Prophets. These expressions, indicative as they are of some actual objective agency from without, are examined by Mr. Lee, as are also the several correlative expressions which describe the subjective conditions of the recipients of this Influence. And this introduces us to some interesting remarks on the subject of Angelic appearances, dreams, visions, prophetic ecstasy, symbols, symbolic actions,—all which we must reluctantly pass by; as we are anxious to add a word or two on a question, incidentally adverted to by our author, and, we believe, of considerable exegetical importance in the study of Holy Scripture—we mean the distinction between the two expressions [Greek] and [Greek].

There are few phrases, in the New Testament, of more frequent occurrence than this, “The Word of GOD;” and yet, most of our thoughtful readers will admit that its precise meaning is, in many cases, by no means easy to ascertain, and is occasionally much misconceived.

It is certainly to be regretted that our English version translates both [Greek] and [Greek] alike, giving both the [542] same uniform rendering, “The Word of GOD;”¹ for, however the distinction between the two may be, at times, difficult to trace, we cannot doubt but some specific difference does still exist between them.

Mr. Lee connects the two expressions with the two stages of Revelation already adverted to, considering [Greek] as pointing to that divine Influence which was exercised in the communication of supernatural information subsequently to the withdrawal of the personal Presence of the Logos. His words are as follows:—

“It results from an examination of the texts in which the phrase [Greek] occurs, that it invariably implies the divine spiritual Influence.”—P. 132.

Now fully admitting that this statement, as far as it goes, is substantially correct, yet we cannot but regret that Mr. Lee, notwithstanding his copious notes, should have dismissed this interesting question with so scanty notice, and without affording us more *practical* help towards the understanding these two expressions in some of the numerous passages wherein they occur; especially as the question is one which seems to have been entirely overlooked by commentators; and our author himself animadvert on Mr. Westcott for passing it by undiscussed.

Without attempting to go any depth into this important verbal distinction, we will yet venture a few simple remarks towards its elucidation.

After the transgression in the matter of the calf in Horeb, however, the Presence of the uncreated Angel was withdrawn, and a created Angel substituted. For “there arose no prophet like unto Moses whom God saw face to face,” i.e., communicated with, immediately. The sentence, moreover, had now gone forth against Israel, “I will not go with thee,” (Jehovah withdraws His Personal Presence) “because thou art stiff necked; lest I consume thee: I will send an Angel.” Most probably, as Dr. Mill suggests, Michael, the Archangel.

¹ The Vulgate is equally unsatisfactory, translating both uniformly by “Verbum.” Beza, however, has marked the distinction, and renders [Greek] invariably by “Sermo,” confining “verbum” to [Greek].

I. In the first place, it is evident that the expression [Greek], which is of very constant occurrence in the New Testament, admits of a far greater latitude of interpretation than the much less frequent [G.]

The ordinary acceptance of this latter, appears simply to be GOD'S *word*, objectively, i.e., in the sense of a *saying* or "*utterance*" of GOD. As *contrasted* with [Greek], it signifies rather the letter of the word; the other denoting its import, or subject-matter: the [Greek] is rather the verbal covering or outward exponent of the [Greek].

1. Now the most common signification of the [Greek] in the New Testament is pretty much what we understand by 'the Gospel,' i.e., the general complex of the Christian Faith, whether regarded in its own objective existence, or its subjective influence on the heart; it is that system of truths whereof the Eternal Word. is the Sun and Centre, e.g., "The sower soweth the *word*." So mightily grew the *word* of GOD and prevailed." "The people pressed upon Him to hear the *word* of GOD." "I have given unto them Thy [543] *word*." It is not meet to leave the *word* of God and to serve tables." "We will give ourselves to prayer, and the ministry of the *word*." "The *word* of God increased." "The Gentiles had received the *word* of God" "Samaria received the *word*." Forbidden to speak the *word* in Asia." "The *word* of reconciliation." "Corrupting the *word* of God." "Let the *word* of Christ dwell in you." "The *word* of God is not bound." "Receive the engrafted *word*." "The *word* spoken by *angels*," (i.e., the *law*, as contrasted with the Gospel, or "*word* spoken by the Lord." Heb. ii.) So, S. John was an exile for the "*word* of God," &c. &c. Now in all these, and many similar cases, [Greek] is used; and an examination of the several passages at once suggests a second remark, viz. :

2. That, by the [Greek] or word of God, the Holy Scriptures are *never*, primarily, designated. Scripture is the *written* vehicle, or Record of the [Greek], but not the [Greek] Itself. But,

3. The *full* idea of the [Greek] is, of course, only satisfied, when we discern in it Him Who is the Author and subject of the Gospel, the great Revealer and Revelation of God—our Lord Jesus Christ. And in many instances (as every student of Scripture will attest) a vast deal of force and depth is communicated to a passage, by giving it this its ultimate signification, and referring the expression to the [Greek], (Ignat. ad Magnes.) e.g. "The *Word* of God is quick and powerful, and is a *discerner* of the thoughts of the heart." We are "born again by the *Word* of God" (1 S. Pet. 1. 23.)¹ Again, "So mightily *grew* the *Word* of God"—what signifies this latter, save that the mystical Body of the "Word made Flesh," His Complement or [Greek], was being gradually enlarged and edified; the number of His elect increased; and a stage of growth towards the "perfect Manhood" of the Body, rapidly effected? Again, is not the "indwelling of the *Word* of God in the heart, only fully explained by S. Paul's words, "Know ye not that *Christ Jesus* is in you." "The mystery hid for ages, which is *Christ in you*?" He alone is "the engrafted *Word* which is able to save our *souls*." (S. James i. 21.) And what else is the "Ministry of the *Word*" save the mystical and sacramental communication to the Faithful, of the God-Man, through the sacred ordinances of His Church ?

II. But let us turn to [Greek].

1. Now the ordinary significance of [Greek] is (as we have already noticed) simply a *saying*, i.e., some particular, and definite saying or utterance; e.g., Jesus said "Launch out

¹ In this passage, the [Greek] (v. 23) *through Whom* we are "born again," must be carefully distinguished from the "[Greek] of the Lord" (v. 25) which is "preached to us."

into the deep;” Peter answered, “Master at Thy *word* [[Greek], this saying, or command of Thine] I will let down the net.” Jesus said, “The Son of Man [544] shall be betrayed, &c. . . . And they understood not [Greek]. “He said, Render unto Cæsar, &c. . . . and they were not able to lay hold of His [Greek]” Again “Then remembered I the *word* ([Greek]) of the LORD, how He said, John indeed baptized with water” &c. “Man shall not live by bread alone, but [Greek]” “He said, Wist ye not that I must be about My FATHER’S business? and they understood not [Greek] which He spake.” So “The *word* of God came upon John the Baptist;” i. e., he received some definite commission from above; he was charged with a proclamation, which he had to herald forth: “Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.” Here was the [Greek] preparing the way for the [Greek]; the “Voice” preceding the “Word.” Again, we bear the aged Symeon exclaiming, “LORD, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, [Greek];” for he had received a specific promise that he should “not see death until he had seen the CHRIST.” In the difficult passage, Rom. x. 8, &c., [Greek] is plainly, not, E. V. “The word of faith,” but “the Confession of *the* Faith,” some specific formulary or enunciation of the Faith;¹ even as [Greek] (Eph. v. 26,) is the Baptismal Formulary, or Sacred Invocation; and [Greek] (Heb. vi.

5,) is doubtless the same—the context in this latter passage assuming that the subjects of the Sacrament of Initiation had here been, not merely recipients, but *conscious* recipients of the blessings of that sacred ordinance; that they “had *tasted* the [Greek],” had subjectively realized the “good Word,” sealing the remission of their sins: hence the peculiar aggravation of their apostacy.²

2. But, like [Greek] has also a further signification, a deeper and more sacred meaning. As, in the case of human language, a word, or saying, is simply the *breath* of a man which is used by him as the exponent and vehicle of his thoughts; that, by which his thoughts are made known:—so is the [Greek] of GOD, in its ultimate signification, none other than that Divine Spirit or Breath, that Energetic Utterance, whereby His Revelations become known to His creatures. In fact, as the personal [Greek] is GOD the SON; so is the Personal [Greek], GOD the HOLY GHOST.³

¹ Probably, the formulary given in v. 9, “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, &c.”

We may just notice here, in passing, that the important distinction between the subjective [Greek], and the objective [Greek] must never be lost sight of; the latter denoting the Christian Faith objectively, the former, the personal reception of it. It is much to be regretted that our E. V. renders both, so uniformly, by the ambiguous term “Faith.” Let the following passages be examined, out of many others, to show how real and important is this distinction. 1 Tim. i. 19; Rom. iii. 30, 31; v. 1, 2; Gal. iii. 23—27; vi. 10; Eph. ii. 8; iv. 13; vi. 16; Col. i. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 9; iv. 1, 6, 12; vi. 10—12; &c. &c. . . . We need not, of course, add that this distinction ceases to hold when the possessive pronoun is attached to [Greek], or from the context obviously understood (as in S. James ii. 14—18;) in such cases the “Faith” will be manifestly subjective.

² In the somewhat involved passage, Acts x. 36—38, the [Greek] (v. 35) unquestionably stands in apposition with [Greek] (v. 38); both of them being governed by the verb [Greek] (v. 37): The [Greek] signifies (as usual) “that Revelation whereof Jesus Christ is the Subject” and the parenthetic clause [Greek] seems equivalent to “The report, (or rumour) of which, spread over all Judæa,”—that is, the report, or *history*, of the personal career of Him, the Author and Subject of all Revelation.

³ It is not a little worthy, of remark that both [Greek] and [Greek], i.e., both the *verbal* and the *written* vehicle of the [Greek], when personified, refer alike to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. For the Personal use of [Greek] vid. Gal. iii. 8; Rom. ix. 17; where “Scripture” plainly signifies “the Author of Scripture.” With regard to [Greek], however, it may be observed that it is only when it signifies the Word, Utterance, or Breath of God *abstractedly*, that it can be identified with the Personal Spirit: this identification cannot hold, so long as it merely maintains its ordinary signification and refers to some *given* and *particular* saying or word of God;—although even in this case, there is involved in the

{cont.}

We have S. Paul's express authority for this in the well-known passage "And take the sword of the Spirit, *which (Spirit) is the Word of GOD;*" [Greek]; (Eph. vi. 17.) Again, (Heb. vi. 4, 5,) the Apostle joins together, as though intimately associated, the "partaking of the *Holy Ghost,*" and the "tasting the [Greek]" Again, when aged Symeon exclaimed, "LORD, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace [Greek]," the full propriety of expression is incidentally made known to us: For "It had been revealed to Him by the *Holy Ghost,* that he should not see death," &c.; and "he came [Greek] into the Temple." So, we read, "He whom GOD hath sent speaketh the [Greek] of GOD *because* GOD giveth not the *Spirit* by measure unto Him," as though the pouring forth the [Greek] of GOD was a necessary consequence of overflowing with [546] the Spirit of GOD. Even as we read, in like manner, "The words [Greek] which I speak unto you, they are [Greek]."

3. It is important further—bearing in mind that the HOLY GHOST is, in a peculiar way, the *Operative* energy of the ALMIGHTY—to observe how [Greek] and [Greek] are insensibly connected in the New Testament. Thus, the Angel tells the Blessed Virgin: "The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest overshadow thee . . . for with GOD [Greek]" So, the shepherds say "Let us go to Bethlehem and see [Greek]. "Believest thou not" says our LORD "that the FATHER is in Me; the [Greek] which I speak, I speak not of Myself, but it is the FATHER which dwelleth in Me Who [Greek]: for the [Greek] and [Greek] are identical in Him "Who *speaks,* and it is *done.*" And hence, as the words of our Great Exemplar Who had received the "Spirit without measure" were so energetic as to bear the appellation of "works," we see the foundation of that necessity which is laid upon all who have been made, in their measure, recipients of the same Spirit, that their speech be, in like manner, influential and useful; for here too, we see the basis of our LORD'S fearful protest against [Greek], (S. Matt. xii. 36;) viz., that it is an offence against the HOLY SPIRIT; against that Divine Person revealed to us in the 29th Psalm as the *sevenfold* "Voice of the LORD"—the "Voice of the LORD, mighty in *operation.*"¹

expression a *certain* allusion to the same Divine Spirit. For our Lord proclaims it as one of the distinctive functions of the Holy Spirit: "He shall *bring to your remembrance* whatever I have *said* to you." It is the peculiar office of that Blessed Person not only to suggest to the memory, but also to give meaning and life to the *words* of God. Thus, when our Lord vanquished the evil one with three Divine [Greek], we are expressly told that it was when He was "full of the Holy Ghost," (S. Luke iv. 1); for it was the Holy Ghost Who "brought to His remembrance" (as Man) these sayings of God; Who furnished Him with these weapons of defence, and gave them their sharp edge and irresistible power. In like manner, when the Holy Ghost fell on Cornelius' household; and the Apostle Peter doubtless experienced some of His Present Influence; the Apostle tells, as one immediate result of the Sacred effusion, "*Then remembered* I the [Greek] of the Lord, how He said," &c. &c.

When the same Apostle on a more mournful occasion, called to mind another saying of the Lord, viz., "Before the cock crow thou shalt deny Me, &c." we cannot doubt Who the Divine Suggester was, Who "brought to his remembrance—and so *effectually* to his remembrance,—this [Greek] (as SS. Matthew and Mark recall it) of the Lord Jesus A difficulty however, here presents itself. S. Luke, recounting the same sad transaction, instead of [Greek], employs [Greek] to designate that which was brought to the Apostle's recollection. But the interesting propriety of this change will at once be recognized. S. Luke does not barely repeat the account of his brother Evangelists, but gives a new aspect of the scene: he introduces a new Suggester—even the Divine Logos Himself. "*The Lord*" he writes "turned and *looked upon* Peter:" He himself recalled to the mind of His faithless Apostle the subject of their former conversation. In exquisite propriety then, the concluding sentence is thus altered by S. Luke; instead of [Greek], we read [Greek].

We have, in the two-fold aspect of this scene, an interesting example of the *coincident* operations of the several Persons of the Blessed Trinity

¹ We have a striking example of the *operative* Power of the [Greek] in the *Word* of Consecration in the Holy Eucharist, whereby—the ever-present Mediator uttering it through the voice of His Minister—the

{cont.}

4. Further: as we learn that creation was the joint work of all Three Persons of the Trinity; that, not only “were the heavens made by the Word ([Greek]) of GOD,” but “all their host by the *breath of His mouth*,” ([Greek], Ps. xxxiii. 6,) so do we read in the New Testament, that “the worlds were created,” not only by the [Greek], (S. John i.) but also by the [Greek] (Heb. xi. 3) and that GOD the SON upholds all things [Greek] i.e. by that energetic Utterance or Spirit eternally proceeding from Him.

5. Nor is it to be overlooked that this very mysterious subject of the Procession of the Spirit from the FATHER and the SON, receives interesting illustration from this word [Greek].

Procession from the FATHER, we must remember, is distinctly predicated in the New Testament of the [Greek] (S. Matt. iv. 4) and the [Greek] (S. John xv. 26.) Even as from the SON, we read in like manner, of the “*Procession*” (“from out of his mouth,”) of the “sharp sword with two edges,” wherewith He destroys the hosts of Antichrist, (Rev. i. 16; xix. 15,)—for “with the [547] *breath* of His lips shall He slay the wicked;”—this sword being manifestly the same Divine [Greek] or Spirit: just as in direct antagonism we read of the “*procession*,” from out of the mouth of His manifested adversaries, the Dragon, the Beast, and the False Prophet, of the “unclean *spirits*,” those pernicious maxims, doctrines, and influences, which shall pave the way for the apocalypse of the Man of Sin, and shall “make ready a people prepared for Him.”

At all events we seem to be able to discover some faint illustrations in the two expressions [Greek] and [Greek], of that Almighty Wisdom or Reason eternally begotten of the FATHER, and “which *lay* in the bosom of the FATHER” from everlasting, ([Greek] to “lay,” pass. to *lie*,) and that Divine Spirit eternally *proceeding* ([Greek]) from the FATHER and the SON, that Omnipotent Utterance which is the exponent of the former.

It is necessary to add, in quitting this subject, that when these two expressions [Greek] and [Greek] are merely employed of ordinary human language, the distinction we have been tracing seems frequently to disappear, and their two meanings to merge insensibly into one, and become *practically* identical: for a *saying* necessarily involves some *subject matter*; and the subject matter again assumes some *verbal covering* to give it form and substance, so that the difference between the two will obviously be, at times, rather an ideal than an actual one. It is mainly when introduced into *sacred* ground, (and when employed in the singular number; for in the plural the two appear commonly used synonymously) that the essential distinction between them must be carefully noticed.¹

earthly elements become (and that in an infinitely deeper and more real sense than we can ever apprehend) the very Body and Blood of the Incarnate Redeemer. It is the [Greek] which is the Operative Principle in Consecration. [Cf. Isa. lv. II. (LXX.); Rom. iv. 17.]

¹ We cannot dismiss this question without noticing one important instance where we feel persuaded the force of the original has been missed by our translators, and is, almost universally, missed, through not observing the distinction above alluded to. We refer to the ejaculation [Greek] recurring in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which is invariably rendered “This is a faithful *saying*.” Now to convince ourselves of the erroneousness of this interpretation we have only to refer to every other passage in these same Epistles where [Greek] occurs: viz.. 2 Tim. i. 9, 15; iv. 2: Tit. i. 3; ii. 5. In all which places it uniformly means—if not God the Word personally, yet that *doctrine* of which He is the sum and substance.

We have spoken of [Greek] as an ejaculation, and we may observe that there are just seven occasions in S. Paul’s Epistles, where he employs either it or an ejaculation precisely similar, e.g.

(a) [Greek] 1 Cor. i. 9.

{cont.}

But our space does not permit us to proceed farther with this [548] discussion, the importance of which must be the excuse for our, prolixity. We may just add, in quitting the subject, that a similar kind of distinction to that existing between [Greek] and [Greek] will be found to exist between the verbs [Greek] and [Greek], the former referring rather to the subject matter and inward meaning of what is said, the latter to its outward expression; the former being rather “to speak intelligently,” the latter to “utter,” (mechanically or intelligently, as the case may be,) cf. 1 Cor. xiv, 11—16; [Greek] moreover, being the word usually employed for the utterances of the Spirit. Cf. S. Matt. x. 19,20; S. Mark xiii. 11; S. John iii. 34; 1 Cor. xiv. 2; &c.

We find ourselves reluctantly compelled to pass over many subjects most worthy of notice, which Mr. Lee’s volume brings before us. We may specify his remarks on the important distinction between the *official* and *personal* inspiration of the sacred writers; the former, a gift peculiar to themselves, being *perfect*; the latter, the common inheritance of all Christians, *imperfect*; a striking example of which is furnished in the case of S Peter, who though he *officially* proclaimed the call of the Gentiles, yet *personally*, entirely misapprehended the bearing of his own words. In one capacity he was infallible, in the other fallible.

In fact, it is only in our belief in the objective and all-pervading *official* Inspiration of the sacred writers that we have any real ground for reverently examining their very *words*. Such a discussion, for instance, as that which has just been engaging us, would be worthless did we believe that the writers had been left, like ordinary authors, to select their own words and expressions. It is because we believe the language of Holy Scripture to be *inspired*, that therefore we examine it so carefully; following herein the example of the very writers themselves, who, in their private capacity, “searched diligently” and earnestly into the meaning of that which they officially announced:—Nay, following the example of Inspiration itself, as evidenced by the case of S. Paul, who in his [549] inspired Epistle to

-
- (b) [Greek]..... 1 Thess. v. 24.
 - (c) [Greek] 1 Tim. i. 15.
 - (d) [Greek]..... 1 Tim. iii. 1.
 - (e) [Greek]..... 1 Tim. iv. 9.
 - (f) [Greek]..... 2 Tim. ii. 11.
 - (g) [Greek]..... Tit. iii. 8.

Now in *all* these cases (with but one exception) the ejaculation is immediately consequent on, and *subsequent to*, some allusion to *salvation* in the ‘day of the Lord,’ or other glad promises of the Doctrine of Christ. In the only case (c) where the ejaculation refers primarily to what *succeeds* it, S. Paul has been speaking (v. 11) of the “glorious gospel of the blessed God,” and of that ‘superabundant’ grace and mercy which had been shown to him, even him the persecutor; and then he bursts out [Greek]. “The doctrine is most true, and most worthy to be embraced by all, that CHRIST JESUS came into the world to save sinners—ay, even the chief of sinners!”

It will be observed that this ejaculation (c) (e) consists of seven words; the first three referring to the objective truth of the word or doctrine, and meeting their explanation, Rev. xix. 11, 13; the last four, alluding to the subjective reception and appropriation of that word.

The position of (d) in our version is singularly unfortunate. The Apostle has been speaking about “*woman*” in the preceding context, and affirming that through one of her own sex she has inherited both a curse and a blessing. Man was deceived through a woman; but the Son of Man was born of a woman. Therefore though woman in lowly recognition of the former, must for ever remain mute in the churches; yet she shall not, therefore, be excluded from that Eternal Life which her Offspring the SAVIOUR of all came to bestow; for “If she continue in faith and love, she also shall obtain *salvation* through *Him that was born of a woman*.” [Literally through *the Childbearing*.] The Apostle then adds [Greek], “the Word of Promise is sure!” and then turns to a different subject.

The other cases (a) (b) (f) (g) present no difficulty.

the Galatians builds an important argument on the fact of a particular word in an Old Testament writing, occurring in the singular rather than in the plural number, (Gal. iii 16)—nay, further, following the example of our LORD JESUS CHRIST Himself Who deduces the great doctrine of the resurrection of the dead from the circumstance of a particular verb, in a document written by Moses, being employed not in the past but in the present tense. (Vid. Lee, pp. 197—.8; 270—4; 366—371.)

Mr. Lee has a valuable lecture on the quotations made by one sacred writer from another; and some admirable remarks on the alleged contradictions between Scripture and Scripture, between Scripture and profane History, between Scripture and the results of Science. The length of the present paper, however, forbids our entering upon them.

We can only repeat, in conclusion, that the work is one which will amply repay perusal; and although, as we have hinted, somewhat defective in lucidity of arrangement, and sadly standing in need of an index, in order to render available the mass of valuable material, original and collected, scattered throughout its pages, (a want which we trust hereafter to see supplied,) it yet bids fair to become the standard treatise on the important subject of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 17 (Joseph Masters: London, 1855)
 [303]THE INTERPRETATION OF THE PSALMS.

Parochial Lectures on the Psalms from the Fathers of the Primitive Church. By the Rev. F. H. DUNWELL, B.A., Curate of Gleadless, near Sheffield. London: J. H. Parker. 1855.

It has often been remarked, and not without reason, that of all portions of the Bible, none is so well known or so little understood as the book of Psalms.

Twelve times in the course of the year is the Psalter sung through in the services of the Sanctuary: so that to those who attend Church, its words must necessarily become very familiar. And yet it needs but a limited acquaintance with the mass even of educated Church people, to convince one how very little the book is either appreciated or understood.

The fact of the Psalms forming so large a portion of our daily devotions, and the Church taking such diligent heed by this means to impress them on our memory, may of itself indicate that they are of infinite importance to our spiritual progress and advancement. Yet the Psalter is unquestionably a book of great difficulty. A book, in fact, so deep, rich, and varied in its spiritual treasures cannot be otherwise. And perhaps there is no portion of either Old or New Testament, standing in greater need of a good, plain, accessible, Catholic and attractive commentary. The perpetually recurring historical, personal, and national allusions; the artificial structure of the poems themselves;¹ the deep poetic character of the language, so full of images borrowed from natural objects, and the sacred ceremonial of the Jewish Religion; the continuous vein of profound mystical, allegorical, and spiritual meaning perpetually underlying the literal sense; the constant changes of the speakers, and the perplexity frequently produced thereby as to who the speaker for the time being really is; then the difficulty of arriving at the leading idea of each several Psalm, and the earthly (historical or other) groundwork on which it rests, from which it derives its peculiar form, and on which its spiritual and higher meaning is so fundamentally dependent; here are some of the numerous obstacles in the way of a thorough and intelligent apprehension of the meaning of these Sacred Songs.

Not that a mastery of all these points is necessary for a practical and devotional use of this most delightful book. GOD forbid. Else would these streams of celestial comfort be effectually closed up against the poor, the simple, the unlearned. Nay, though there are mines of priceless value, veins of the richest ore to reward the labours of the diligent and studious, requiring the toil of the critic and the scholar—yet, is wealth in rich profusion, for the devout but unlettered reader, to be found even on the surface requiring neither learning nor wisdom to appropriate it, but simply a reverent use of the ordinary helps which the Holy Spirit has so abundantly afforded. For “doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction,” are here ready at hand; the noblest utterances of praise, the deepest expressions of penitence, the brightest consolations: here is comfort in sorrow, advice in difficulty, sympathy in distress. Here may we learn the “whole counsel of God,” and find all the mysteries of Creation and Redemption epitomized and converted into subjects for meditation, self-examination,

¹ For some account of the artificial appliances employed in the construction of the Psalms, see the Appendix (No. V.) to Hengstenberg’s learned and laborious commentary;—a work, we may add, not less valuable and important, than it is (on the whole) heavy and unsatisfactory.

devotion, or thanksgiving. “*All good*,” says Hooker, (speaking of the Psalter) “necessary to be either *known*, or *done*, or *had*, this one celestial fountain yieldeth. Let there be *any* grief or disease incident unto the soul of man, *any* wound or sickness named, for which there is not in this treasure-house a present comfortable remedy at all times ready to be found.” Here too is an infinite field of delight even for the intellect of the renewed man. In these Divine Songs the Old Testament Scriptures are, throughout, exhibited to us as instinct with a new and spiritual life: in them the Jewish ceremonial is shown to be but a veil concealing the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and the earthly Jerusalem a dim shadow cast by “Jerusalem from above, the mother of us all.” In them, too, the voice of Nature is unloosed: the fields, the floods, the trees; the sun in his glory, the moon in her beauty, the stars in their brightness, are all endowed with a supernatural utterance, and are made to speak of a more glorious Sun, a fairer Moon, and Stars more resplendent, of trees whose fruit is Life eternal, and streams “which make glad the City of God,”— and, under the direction of the “*Chief Musician*,”¹ to join in one concenting voice of glad harmony in hymning the lauds of the Ever-blessed Creator.

Why, then, is it that the truth of all this is not more commonly *felt*? these sacred features and uses of the Psalter not more generally recognised? Chiefly because there is such a wide extending ignorance and misapprehension even amongst good Christian people as to its intent and scope; so little practical realization of its profound Catholic character, and of the interest therefore which we *individually* have in Divine utterances; so little living, actu[305]ating conviction that while recounting David’s history and experience, we are, in truth singing the mystical history and experience, the trials and temptations, the sufferings and persecutions, the triumphs and glorious ultimate Universal Empire of CHRIST and His Church.

Now one *great* cause of this misapprehension (leaving out here, what of course, is *the* great cause, viz.: the general spiritual torpor which has enchained the Church, incapacitating it for seeing those things which are “spiritually discerned”) is, as we have before said, the neglect of the individual use of those important helps towards understanding the Psalter, which are so copiously vouchsafed to us in Holy Scripture. There is no Book so frequently referred to, or

towards the interpretation of which we have more assistance offered. Fifty Psalms are quoted in the New Testament. Nor are these mere barren quotations, or (as they are too often regarded) but casual *adaptations* of the words. For they not only furnish us with a Divine key wherewith to unlock the spiritual (and therefore real) sense of the particular Psalm whence they are taken; but further, present us with important canons of interpretation which by the ordinary rules of analogy we may ourselves apply to others.

Let us adduce a few instances of New Testament quotations from the Psalter. And here, perhaps, the introduction to the Epistle to the Hebrews will furnish us with one of the most obvious as well as convenient examples:

S. Paul commences this Epistle by declaring the perfection of the present, as compared with all former Dispensations; this perfection being based on the infinite superiority of the “Minister” and “Messenger” commissioned to proclaim it, over all other GOD’S ministers and messengers. And this the Apostle sets himself to prove—beginning with the case of

¹ This title, as Mr. Dunwell truly reminds us, is referred by the early Fathers to Christ Himself; Who indeed seems to appropriate the office of Chief Musician in these words: “In the midst of the Church will I sing praise unto Thee.” [Heb. ii. 12; Psalm xxii. 22.] He it is who is at once the great Leader and the great Object of the Hallelujahs of Israel.

“the Angels,” whose inferiority to the MESSIAH he establishes in a series of quotations from the Psalter which we will briefly follow out.

1. And first: what is the *title* of this new Messenger? For even in this very title, adds the Apostle—which belongs to Him by exclusive right, and is His “by inheritance”—we may see the *measure* of His superiority to the Angels. The title is that of “SON,” given Him by the FATHER when He inaugurated Him to His Mediatorial functions on His Resurrection from the dead. For, saith the 2nd Psalm, “Thou art My SON, this day have I begotten Thee.” Now it is needless to say how entirely this quotation together with those of Acts iv. 24—28; xiii. 32, 33, settles the drift of this Psalm, showing it to refer to the solemn commitment, on the part of the FATHER, of the Mediatorial kingdom, despite all the malice and machinations of His foes, to the victorious Redeemer, (“made perfect through suffering,”) on His New-Birth from the Spirit quickened womb of Death.

2. But are the functions of this new “Messenger” to continue? Is [306] the dignity, involved in the title conferred on Him at His Resurrection, to be an abiding one? Yes, proceeds the Apostle. For not only does Jehovah say, “Thou *art* My Son, this day *have* I begotten Thee;” but He declares the permanence of the relationship, “I *will be* to Him a Father, and He *shall be* to Me a Son”—words originally found in 2 Samuel vii. 14, and more fully developed in Psalm lxxxix. 26—28, “He shall call Me My Father, My God . . . and I will make Him My Firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth: My mercy will I *keep with Him for evermore*, and My Covenant *shall stand fast with Him*.” And here again, how entirely have we the spiritual sense of this long 89th Psalm unlocked to us—a Psalm of such peculiar importance, in these times, to the Church Catholic, containing as it does, a prophetic description of that very state of division, disunion, disorganization, which has actually come upon her; her “hedges broken down;” her “strongholds in ruins;” “spoiled by her enemies;” “reproached by her neighbours;” and all for *her own sins*, because she has “forsaken God’s law,” “walked not in His judgments,” “broken His statutes,” “kept not His commandments:”¹—a Psalm, nevertheless, which proclaims that, notwithstanding the dark present, of Jehovah’s covenant-promises to the “SON” shall yet be triumphantly vindicated: “I have sworn by My Holiness that I will not fail David.”

3. And this, the Apostle proceeds to show, in his next quotation. For a time has still to come, he tells us, when the full meaning of the august title of “Son,” conferred upon the risen Mediator shall be gloriously manifested: for He shall yet be visibly presented as the Deified² Object of worship to all the Hierarchy of Heaven—“Let all the Angels of God worship Him,” Psalm xcvi. 7. And here, too, how important is the information incidentally communicated by S. Paul as to the central design of this particular Psalm. It

¹ There is no portion of Holy Scripture which contains a more solemn illustrative comment on our Lord’s parting commission to His Church than this Psalm. There is the same gracious *promise*, “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world,” (v. 22—29), and the very same *condition* to which this promise is annexed, the Church, (namely) “teaching” and “observing” “*all things whatsoever* Her Lord had commanded” (vv. 31, 32), handing down without mutilation, without augmentation, His Sacred Deposit. The Psalm, however, adds the sad prophetic sequel;—the condition disregarded; the sacred Presence in a great measure withdrawn; the Church therefore split up and disintegrated, (vv. 37—45). Nay, it points to a darker future than she has ever yet experienced, still brooding over the Church. Although it assures us that even in the gloomiest times, God shall yet have a witness who having “kept His Word” is “kept by Him;”—“My Loving kindness will I not *utterly* take from Him.” The elect shall still be gathered in from the “highways and hedges,” till their number is made up; till the House is filled; the Bride perfected.

² “Deified.” i.e., as to His human nature.

celebrates, he tells us, the visible inauguration of Christ's kingdom of Glory at His second Advent. For these words are spoken, says he, when the Father "bringeth the First-begotten again [307] into the world" ([Greek]). That is to say—When Christ comes again in glorious majesty to assume, *manifestly*, the throne of that kingdom now swayed for Him, through the medium of His Church, by His Vicar the Holy Ghost; then shall the words of this Psalm be accomplished, "the earth and hills rejoice," and "the multitude of the isles be glad," "the Heavens declare His righteousness, and all the people behold His Glory."¹

4. But can the *Angels* lay claim to any dignity or dominion corresponding with this? Nay, the very same Almighty Who I this Psalm commands them *all* to "*worship the Son*," is represented in another, as "making His Angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire"—merely creating and sending forth, as the earthly elements, to execute His several commissions. Nor is even this quotation without its important bearing upon the whole Psalm whence it is taken. That Psalm, as is well known is David's joyful Creation: and the verse quoted by S. Paul is, in the original, simply, "He maketh the winds His messengers, the flaming fire His servants." (civ. 2.) Now it is obvious that the Apostle by referring this verse to the Blessed Angels, and transferring the words thus into a higher spiritual region, sanctions a corresponding transfer of the whole of the Psalm. If the "winds" and "fire" have their counterparts in a higher sphere, so also have the "earth" and "water," &c. And we shall thus see that S. Augustine's beautiful, though apparently fanciful exposition of this Psalm, however unsuccessful in particular points of detail, is at least, sound and scriptural in principle.

5. The Apostle proceeds further to show from the Psalter, that while the Angels are thus, mere spirits without independent power, *sent* to and fro, like the flame or wind, on special embassies; the "Son" on the contrary, is that very Eternal King Who *sends* them, of Whom the 45th Psalm sings, "Thy throne, O God,² is for ever and ever," &c.—the reference, be it remarked, fixing who is that Mighty Rider, Warrior, Victor, Bridegroom, King and God, first introduced in this magnificent Hymn, and subsequently in the Revelation of S. John.

6. And while they are but creatures made; He is none other than their Omnipotent and everlasting *Creator*, invoked in the [308] 102nd Psalm in these words, "Thou, JEHOVAH, has laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of Thy hands," &c.—the quotation incidentally making known to us that the 5th of the Penitential Psalms is addressed to "GOD the SON, Redeemer of the world."

7. And in further proof of His Personal and essential, as well as economical and official dignity, S. Paul shows from the 110th Psalm that, at this very time, the "SON" is seated far above all blessing and praise, in Majesty inaccessible, on the Throne of Deity itself, at the FATHER'S right hand; awaiting the time when, His enemies being made His footstool, He

¹ Hengstenberg in this, as in many other cases, entirely ignores the Apostolic reference to the Psalm.

² It must not be unnoticed how forcibly this word illustrates the mysterious prayer of the SON (S. John xvii. 5.). "And now, FATHER, *glorify Thou Me* with Thine own Self *with the glory which I had* with Thee before the world was." The Godhead which is predicated of the SON in this Psalm is not (primarily) His Essential Deity, of which He never divested Himself, and with which therefore He could not be reinstated; but that Deity which in His Man's Nature He purchased, prayed for, and *earned* as the reward for His obedience. It is needless to add that His *ability* to do this must rest on, and imply, His inherent Godhead. Man may earn human rewards. None but GOD can *earn* and *merit* Divine Rewards.

shall come, attended by ten thousand times ten thousand of His holy Angels to assume His own victorious Throne.¹ (S. Matt. xxv. 31; Rev. iii. 21.)

8. One link more has the Apostle yet to add to this lustrous chain of quotations from the Psalter.² And as it is one bearing so closely upon the general question of Psalmic interpretation, and exhibiting in so interesting a way, the depth of spiritual meaning often to be found underlying the plain literal sense, we must notice it somewhat more fully. He is expatiating on the *greatness* of the “Salvation” brought in by the SON. And, as one element in its greatness, he proclaims that they who embrace it, though now heirs of corruption and death, and, like their Master, *for a little time* ([Greek]) made lower than the Angels, shall yet be exalted to a dignity and glory far above that of the highest Seraph. Even at the present time these Blessed Spirits, by us unseen, are ever hovering in radiant bands around the “heirs of Salvation,” ministering unto them. But when corruption shall have put on incorruption, and the New Creation have unfolded itself, then will this super-angelic exaltation of the “Brethren” of the Firstborn” be illustriously and eternally manifested. The Apostle’s eighth quotation then, is devoted to the elucidation and proof of this marvellous Gospel revelation. It is from the eighth [309] Psalm: “What is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the Son of man, “ &c.?”

Now here we are at once met with the important discovery that this 8th Psalm in its full and ultimate design, is still an unfulfilled prophecy, and that it relates to the “*coming age*” ([Greek], Eph. i. 21) to a future glorious period for which “all Creation,” old and new alike, “groaneth and travaileth in pain together;” the “eighth day” or “Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory.”

But has the Psalm then, it may be urged, *no* reference to the present time, or to the past? is its plain surface meaning to be excluded by its higher aim and scope? By no means. With whatever ulterior spiritual truth it may be charged, its simple literal announcements are not thereby a whit compromised. And this is a very important general consideration, as we shall have occasion further to show. But at present, a word as to its mystical grasp and import.

i. And first, Who is the “LORD the Governor?” None other than the “SON given,” on Whose “shoulders shall be the Government,” and “His Name called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty GOD,” &c. We have His own warrant for this; when, as the “SON of David,” He elicited “praise from the mouth of babes and sucklings” (S. Matt. xxi. 16)

¹ Mr. Dunwell (vid. p. 226) says this word “until” merely means “for ever.” Now without questioning it *may* have that meaning, or that, in *one* sense, it *must* have that meaning here, inasmuch as CHRIST must ever partake by virtue of His Divine Nature in the incommunicable Divinity, Majesty, Supremacy, of the Eternal FATHER; still, the allusions made by our LORD and His Apostles to this verse, and His own words, Rev. iii. 21, implying a mysterious *distinction* between His FATHER’S Throne, which He has yet *visibly* to assume, point to some ineffable but specific meaning contained in the word “*until*,” which we must not evade by merely identifying it with the word “for ever.” S. Paul tells us (Heb. x. 12) that the SON “after offering His one, perpetual [Greek] Sacrifice,” has “sat down at the right Hand of the FATHER;” but immediately adds that He is “*awaiting the time when* His enemies shall be made His footstool.” It is not the FATHER’S Throne which S. John describes in those sublime words, Rev. xx. 4, (cf. 11); vid. also S. Matt. xix. 28; xxv. 31. The whole subject however is one of profound mystery.

² Quotations, we mean, in proof of the super-angelic Dignity of the SON. For the two succeeding references to the Psalms (vid. vv. 11, 12) are in illustration of a different subject, viz. the blessed oneness between the SAVIOUR and His people, the Sanctifier and the Sanctified, the “firstborn” and His “many brethren.”

and, appealing to this Psalm, identified Himself with the “LORD and Governor” to whom it asserts that praise be due. But

ii. Has the first verse of the Psalm yet been fulfilled? Is CHRIST’S Name yet “excellent in *all the earth*?” Do all own Him as their LORD? Is His will yet “done on earth *as it is in Heaven*?” No, for the Psalm, as we have already remarked, has its standing-point and sphere, not in the present [Greek], but, as S. Paul tells us, in the “*world to come*” [Greek]; not till when shall its words be abundantly realised.

iii. And who is the “enemy and avenger?” Our LORD tells us who the “enemy” is (S. Matt. xiii. 39; S. Luke x. 19; vid. also 1 Cor. xv. 26). He is none other than that great “Corpus Diaboli,” whose head has already been bruised; who has been cast out of Heaven; who has yet to be bound, head and members, with a “great chain;” and then crushed and silenced for ever.

iv. And what are the sheep, oxen, and beasts; the “fowls of the air;” the “fish,” and other denizens of the “great deep,” over whom “man and the Son of Man” have obtained supremacy? S. Paul simple explains them by the words “*all things*” (Heb. ii. 8) or, in another place, (Phil. ii. 10) by “things in heaven, things in earth, and things under the earth.” That is to say, CHRIST and His Elect, are to have *universal* Dominion: every tongue shall confess that CHRIST is [Greek] [cf. Ps. viii. 1; Phil. ii.11]; every knee shall bow to Him; alike of [Greek], i.e., “Angels, Princi[310]palities, Powers,” here represented as the “fowls of the air;” of [Greek], here spoken of as “sheep, oxen, and beasts,” i.e., the several classes of men (cf. Ps. cxliv. 13, 14; S. John x.; 1 Cor. ix. 7—11; Isa. xi. 6—9;) and of [Greek], the “fish of the sea,” the gloomy inhabitants of Sheol, on whom “Death gnaweth,” and over whom “the Righteous shall have domination in the *Morning*.” (Ps. xlix. 13.) In fact, this Psalm only recounts the actual attainment by the second Adam (the [Greek]) of that visible Lordship over the New Creation, the correlative to which over the old creation had been promised to the first Adam in precisely similar terms. Rather perhaps, seeing that “*Novum Testamentum in Vetere latet*,” we might speak of Psalm viii. 6, 7, as recounting the fulfilment of the prediction originally made in Gen. i. 28.

Here then we are arrested by a consideration of great importance. It seems we cannot apprehend the full meaning of the Psalms without constantly bearing in mind the important typical character impressed not only upon the Old Testament History, but also on the whole of the material universe; how that all things earthly are but figures and shadows of heavenly realities; that between the two there is a continuous harmony and correspondence.

Holy Scripture itself is perpetually attesting this. Let a single familiar example in addition to those already adduced, suffice. The Apostle Paul (Rom. xi. 18), speaking of the universal diffusion of the Gospel, and the full realization of the Apostolic commission, “Go ye into *all the world* and preach the Gospel to every creature,” has recourse to the Psalter for a confirmation of this prediction. And where does he find it? In the 19th Psalm; where David says that the heavenly luminaries, though without voice and sound, intelligibly proclaim, “*in all lands*,” the “glory” of their great Creator. The natural light is sent into all the world. The spiritual Light therefore “which lighteth every man” cannot be less universally diffused.

Now from these few examples (which we have selected almost at random) of the Holy Spirit’s manner of interpreting the Psalms, we have at least seen sufficient to convince us how meagre and inadequate are our own ordinary expositions, and that this is, in a great measure attributable (as already, maintained) to our individual neglect of the helps provided for us in the written word of God.

For there are, as we have already stated, about fifty Psalms quoted in the New Testament, and some of them more than once. E.g. There are no less than seven distinct quotations from Psalm xxii. alone, and the same number from Psalm lxix. One particular verse of another Psalm (cxviii. 22) is quoted *six times* by different writers in the New Testament.¹

And even in the case of Psalms not absolutely quoted, how frequently have we light incidentally thrown upon them. Take, for instance, the short 29th Psalm, with its magnificent description of the effect of the sevenfold “voice of the Lord;” so often regarded merely as a poetical description of a thunderstorm.

By the light of the New Testament, however, we unquestionably see portrayed in this Psalm the tremendous convulsions and transformations effected in the moral universe by the Almighty “Voice” or Spirit of Jehovah—that Omnipotent Breath, which, if it does not renew and purify, rushes forth as a whirlwind and storm of devouring fire to destroy. But do we ask at what particular crisis of the world’s history this mighty seven-fold Utterance is most energetically felt, and the Psalm therefore meets with its specific, and most complete fulfilment? S. John tells us, in the Revelation, that, immediately before the seventh or “last trumpet,” announcing the visible inauguration of Messiah’s kingdom of Glory, then it is that “*the seven thunders* utter their” mysterious “voices” [Greek]² the article evidently appearing to refer us to this Psalm. Here then is the true Baptist “preparing the way” before the victorious Saviour; the great “*Voice*” before the Almighty “*Word*.” Here is the “fiery Utterance;” here the “rushing mighty Wind” tearing up the “cedar trees;” bringing down everything that exalteth itself against the obedience of Christ; and levelling “a way” for the King of kings and Lord of lords.

But ere we proceed further with our subject, two questions demand attention.—

1. Are we justified in giving a mystical sense to *every* earthly thing whereof the Psalmist speaks ? and
2. In giving this mystical interpretation are we justified, ordinarily, in ignoring the literal sense ?

Both these questions must undoubtedly be answered in the negative. For first; it is most true that Holy Scripture gives us ample warrant for supposing that every part, not only of the Mosaic Dispensation but also of the old creation, has its mysterious counterpart (or rather, archetype) in the Christian Dispensation and the New Creation. And doubtless, one of the fruitful sources of intellectual joy in the future Life will be the tracing out these Divine analogies, listening with “opened ears” to their wondrous harmonies, comparing the earthly picture with the heavenly Original, and the shadows of the world which now is with the blissful realities of the “World to come.”

But with our present limited faculties. “knowing but in part,” “seeing but through a glass, darkly,” is it possible to translate accurately from its earthly to its heavenly sphere the words of [312] wisdom which the book of nature (to confine ourselves at present to this) utters? It cannot be. We know so little of the original that we cannot rightly adjust the parts, or appropriate all the points of the model. And hence, where Scripture has furnished us with *no* key wherewith to unlock its symbolic meaning, we must be humbly content to

¹ Viz. S. Matt. xxi. 42; S. Mark xii. 10; S. Luke xx. 17; Acts iv. 11; Eph. ii. 20; 1 S. Peter ii. 7

² For the thunder appears to be the outward expression in the natural world of the voice of the Lord in the spiritual World. So, when Jehovah speaks from heaven, S. John xii. 28, His “voice” was understood and interpreted by the eternal Son, whereas “the people that stood by said, *it thundered*.”

remain in ignorance; believing that what is hidden from us, is hidden from us for some wise purpose, and that it is healthier for us to abide in reverent, trustful ignorance than to give the rein to mere presumptuous, profitless, imaginings.

But again; may we in Scripture interpretation, safely neglect as unimportant the earthly vehicle whereby the heavenly truth is conveyed? As a general rule, certainly not. One of the great beauties and excellencies of Scripture language is this, that we constantly have two, sometimes even three, distinct streams of interpretation running side by side of one another—literal, it may be, spiritual, allegorical; or past, present, and future—each maintaining its own proper course, keeping its own separate channel, without confusion or mutual interference. And here is one particular wherein Holy Scripture so infinitely transcends all earthly compositions. Here is one of the most significant signs of the presence of the One All-pervading Spirit, who speaks in nature, “who spake by the prophets,” to whom past, present, and future, to whom “all flesh” and “all spirit,”¹ with accordant voice, though each in their own tongue, give harmonious testimony.

In human allegory, the outward covering may be safely passed over as neither being nor professing to be anything beyond a mere verbal clothing of the higher truth, and having no independent existence of its own. But this is not the case with the words of God. Here “deep answereth to deep,” nature to grace, the old Dispensation to the new, the past to the present, and both to the future. Here, the outward vehicle has no less an objective reality in its own region than the inward mystery: and the evolution of the latter no more necessitates the abandonment of the former, than the verity of the “Res Sacramenti” involves the annihilation of the “Sacramentum.”

This, however, is sadly overlooked in Scripture exegesis. How are we perpetually hearing of the “carnal dreams” of the literalists, and the “mystic unrealities” of the spiritualists; and yet both parties, as far as they go, are right in principle. The fault of either lies in the advocacy of one system exclusively, and to the neglect of the other, or perhaps in the arbitrary confusion of the two together.

Now we cannot doubt for instance, that S. Augustine was right in regarding the beautiful language of the 104th Psalm which recounts God’s works in the old creation, as, throughout significative and symbolical of His corresponding greater works in the New Creation; and that the whole Psalm is pregnant with a deeper [313] import than that which appears on its surface. But is its literal meaning to be therefore disregarded, or its earthly truth thereby compromised? No; it has a beauty of its own, even in its lower sphere which is well worthy our loving and adoring gratitude. What lover of nature would lose this fresh, healthy, joyous description of GOD’S universal providence, this illustrious homily on the text, “Thy tender mercies are over all Thy works?” In fact, in some portions of the Psalm where we seem to lose our way in tracing the Heavenly Original, it would seem far safer and more reverent to satisfy ourselves with the intrinsic excellencies of the earthly shadow, without fancifully intruding into what we have not perhaps sufficient data for interpreting correctly.

But this branch of our subject forces upon us another consideration.

The material universe is represented in Holy Scripture as having a past history, a present, and a *future history* of its own. Now we all readily acknowledge that the real *truth* of the past and present history of the natural world, as recorded in Scripture, is not the least affected by the fact of its having pictured, throughout, a continuous parallel series of

¹ Psalm cl. 6.

greater and antitypical correspondencies in the spiritual world;—Are we then arbitrarily to maintain the reverse, in the case of its future history? Are we to affirm that the material universe is to have *no* future of its own; to enjoy no “resurrection of the *body*,” to be utterly annihilated? We are fully persuaded that this great exegetical inconsistency is not more unwarrantable than it is detrimental to the proper understanding of the things which GOD has revealed to us.

Let us take an example. And here perhaps the word “earth” itself will be most to our purpose. What then is the meaning of this word? When the Psalmist speaks of its *past* or *present* history, all interpreters—however they may legitimately refer to some illustrative (or illustrated) parallel in the spiritual Creation—do so without any idea of robbing the word thereby of its literal signification. But let the Psalmist allude to the *prospective* destiny of the “earth.” Let him speak of a yet glorious *future* of the *material* universe when cleansed and purified by the purgatorial fiery deluge of which S. Peter writes—of a “Paradise restored”—of the removal of the curse which came over creation at the fall—of the re-appearance, with blessed “interest,” of that long-suspended state pronounced by the ALMIGHTY Himself to be “very good,” for which all nature is “travailing in pain,” when even “the *earth* shall bring forth her increase,” and her womb energized again by JEHOVAH’S “blessing,” may once again perhaps become instinct with Sacramental virtue and bring forth “the tree of Life” for the “healing of the nations.”¹ Then immediately the word “*earth*” [314] must lose its proper meaning, the stream of literal interpretation must be suddenly and arbitrarily dammed up, and the word in question mean anything, everything rather than what it obviously does mean.

How, for instance, does the great S. Augustine explain this word? It has reference, he says, in one place, to the “inward man;” it signifies a “stable inherence in God.” Again, “every thing,” he writes, “which is *infra spiritalem hominem*,” is deservedly called “earth.” He explains it as the “future kingdom of glory;” as “this present life;” as the “inferior part of man;” as the “sinner,” in contradistinction to “*cœlum*” which is the “righteous man” (inasmuch as both are “the habitation of God”); as the “flesh” in opposition to the “spirit;” as the “flesh of Christ.” Or again; whereas “*cœlum*” alludes to the exalted saints who are able to understand the mysteries of the kingdom, “*terra*” refers to those who are *below* the former in spiritual understanding, although established firm in the faith and stably fixed upon the baptismal waters (“*firmavit terram super aquas.*”) Or “*terra*” is the common people in the Church as distinguished from the “*prædicatores*” or “*cœlum*,” because “*cœli enarrant gloriam Dei*,” &c.

Now, without for a moment questioning the truth, or appropriateness, or beauty, of these and kindred adaptations—perhaps legitimate symbolical interpretations—of this word; still we cannot think it either safe or justifiable to ignore one other meaning of the word—viz.: its own peculiar and literal meaning.² It is undoubtedly most reverent to expect that the

¹ For the natural and sacramental blessings in store for this earth and the “nations of the saved,” (Rev. xxi. 24.) are, it must be remembered, generically *distinct*.

² This word, be it remarked, receives an additional interest from its finding a place in the Lord’s Prayer, and from its meaning therefore being perpetually pressed upon us. We are constantly praying that God’s will may be done on *earth* as it is done in heaven. Now, inasmuch as the curse originally came upon the earth as an outward visible token of God’s and man’s will having become discordant, it seems but reasonable to suppose that when they are again brought into unison, the cause of the curse having been removed, the curse itself will vanish—the earth again “bring forth her increase.” But how often is this petition offered without even the remotest idea, on the part of the offerers, that it ever will be answered; nay, with a deep-rooted conviction that it will *not*?

words employed by the Holy Spirit should mean far *beyond* what they outwardly express; it is dangerous to assume that they therefore do *not* mean *that*.

As we hope to return to this subject again, we will just conclude the short space yet remaining to us by a few words with regard to the little volume which heads our article. It is a sort of running commentary, chiefly in the words of the early Fathers, upon the first 23 Psalms, together with the 45th and the 110th, given in the form of “lectures” or homilies to a country congregation.

If we regard the Book in the light in which it claims to be viewed, as a series of “Parochial Lectures” on the Psalms, it is [315]very successful. Mr. Dunwell has in a plain natural way, given to the Psalter somewhat of its proper dignity, and used it as a vehicle (even as the Church in her purest days has ever done) for conveying and enforcing sound Catholic Truth. But regarded as a commentary, as a help to the understanding the real central and specific meaning of the several Psalms, we can hardly think that the Biblical student will reap much benefit from it; Mr. Dunwell having invariably adhered (as in fact was almost necessary under the circumstances) to the musical though imperfect translation of our Prayer Book;¹ having confined himself almost entirely to the mystical meaning of the several Psalms; and not having taken, we think, sufficient heed to settle their original framework and skeleton, before clothing them with flesh and blood—thus rendering them at times vague, indefinite, and unsubstantial.

Mr. Dunwell professes in his Preface to ignore all modern commentaries on the Psalter. This (if we are to regard his own work as a Commentary) seems to us wrong in principle. If we are *tied* to the use of *either* the ancient *or* the modern expositors, by all means, let us have the former. But why not combine the excellencies of both? We are convinced that a really satisfactory commentary can dispense with neither; and that each are equally important in their own territory. The earlier commentaries, while of infinite value in disclosing to us the deep spiritual treasures of the Psalms, are yet little to be depended on as critical guides in unravelling their constructional and other difficulties; suffering as they do, so seriously at times, from the inaccuracy of the translations their writers had to work upon. Who has not observed this again and again in S. Augustine—how constantly he is thrown off the right track by his adherence to his faulty version; establishing important arguments perhaps, on what turn out after all to be mere mistranslations? But it is obvious, as Bishop Lowth truly remarks, that

“Whatever senses are supposed to be included in the” Psalmist’s “words; spiritual, mystical, allegorical, analogical, or the like; they *must* entirely depend on the literal sense. This is the only foundation upon which such interpretations can be securely raised: and if this is not firmly and well established, all that is built upon it will fall to the ground.” *Preliminary Dissertation to Isaiah*.

“The ancient expositors,” writes Bishop Horne, in the very admirable preface to his commentary, “Were chiefly taken up in making spiritual or Evangelical applications of the Psalms. The modern, in investigating their literal scope and meaning. Piety and devotion

¹ For this version, though well adapted by its smooth and flowing rhythm for devotional purposes, and musical expression, yet, being but a translation from a translation, can never be safely adhered to, if we would seek to arrive at the real and precise meaning of the words of the Psalter. How, for instance, could any expositor treat a verse of this kind? “When the company of spearmen and multitude of the mighty are scattered abroad among the beasts of the people, so that they humbly bring pieces of silver, and when He hath scattered the people that delight in war; then shall the princes come out of Egypt,” &c. (lxviii. 30.)

characterize the writings of the ancients: the comments of the moderns display more learning and judgment. The ancients have taught us how to rear a goodly superstructure: but the moderns have laid the surest foundation. To bring them in some measure together, is the design of the following work; in which the author has not laboured to point out what seemed wrong in either, but to *extract what he judged to be right from both.*”

However, Mr. Dunwell’s work, as far as it goes, is one to be truly thankful for; not only as likely to prove to many an introduction into a deeper knowledge of the spiritual riches of the Psalter, but as being in itself a hopeful indication that the claims of this Divine Book are becoming more devoutly recognized and appreciated by Churchmen.

We trust to be enabled to resume this subject next month. {*cont. below*}

[365]

The most important of all the general questions connected with the interpretation of the Psalms is, Who is the chief Speaker in them, the principal Subject of them? All other considerations connected with their exposition are subordinate to this, and in a measure dependent thereon. On this leading question, together with certain of the consequences thence resulting, we propose in the following paper to offer a few observations.

Who then is the chief speaker in the Psalms? But this question may seem to involve a second—Who are the several authors of these Sacred Songs? as the Person of the speaker may be naturally supposed to depend, in some measure, upon the writer of the Psalm, and to vary with the several variations in the authorship.

Of the hundred and fifty Psalms, David appears to have been the author of about eighty; twenty-six we owe to David’s singers, i.e., twelve to Asaph and his school, fourteen to the school of Korah: Psalm xc. is due to Moses; lxxii., cxxvii., to Solomon: besides which we appear to have forty-one nameless Psalms.

Now as many of these Psalms are occupied with the recital of personal history and experience, are we therefore to assume that the individual subject of it, is constantly varying, and that in singing this experience day by day, we are merely recounting the private trials and deliverances of certain holy Jews?

One remarkable fact here deserves notice, that *personal* history finds place in the Psalms in reference to one individual only, viz., David. It is in his Psalms only, together with certain of those composed by his singers, that personal narrative, occurs at all: and even in these latter cases, it is not the person of the writer that appears, but that of David alone.¹ He is the one representative Psalmist. Now this is an important and suggestive fact; and points to another probable conclusion, viz., that David himself *qua* ‘Psalmist,’ is a typical personage. And this probability is converted into a certainty when we listen to his own description of himself in this capacity, and see how he unconsciously identifies himself with his Divine son and LORD. He describes himself as “the Man that was raised on High, the Anointed One of the GOD of Jacob, the Sweet Psalmist of Israel,” in whom “the Spirit and Word of JEHOVAH spake.” (2 Sam. xxiii. 1.) Here then we have an explicit declaration as to the real Person of the “Psalmist:” he is the [366] Exalted One, the Anointed One, the Tabernacle of the Spirit of JEHOVAH.

¹ Our readers will find some interesting facts connected with the external features of the Psalter, its arrangement, division into books, &c. &c., in the appendices to Hengstenberg’s Commentary on the Psalms.

But how does the dying monarch yet further describe his compositions? They are not only Psalms or ‘Praise-Songs,’ but ‘Praise Songs of *Israel*.’ Therefore the chief Singer is CHRIST Himself. The Songs are the Songs of Israel. In other words, it is the Church of CHRIST in the Person of her Head, it is the ‘whole CHRIST,’ Who is the one complex centre, subject, sum, and substance, of the Psalmic Poetry. The Songs are the Songs of Israel—of every one of us. Each individual member of the Church, no less than the collective Body, may claim them as the expressions of his or her sorrows, experience, temptations, consolations, triumphs. They are the blessed inheritance of every ‘Israelite indeed.’

Now this individual multiplicity of the speaker in the Psalter, this idea of a Representative Psalmist, who is at once Israel and Israel’s ‘chief Musician’—an individual Head, but with many members; a ‘First-born,’ but with ‘many brethren’—will go a good way in explaining many of the surface difficulties of the Psalms, such (e.g.) as the abrupt apparent changes in the Person of the speaker; his one while appearing, as Divine, at another as human; now as holy, now as a sinner; now as a single individual, now as a whole congregation. It will also tend to give us a much more living and personal interest in these Holy Songs, than we could otherwise possess; by reminding us that in uttering them, we are speaking of nothing extraneous to ourselves, but of what affects us most intimately; that we are singing CHRIST’S own words, in so far as He was one with us, nay, *our own* words, in so far as we are really one with Him; and that in them we may recognize “et in Illo voces nostras, et voces Ejus in nobis.” (S. Aug. in Ps. lxxxvi.) The ‘Psalmist’ is the Anointed of the LORD—that Holy Corporation on Whose HEAD the HOLY GHOST was poured without measure, that it might descend to the skirts of His raiment, (Ps. cxxxiii.) and suffuse the whole Body. So that, in our humble degree—each in his measure—the ‘Psalmist’ is every one of ourselves: His experience is ours; His sufferings are, or will be to some extent, ours; His triumphs and glory, ours. The career of the Head is repeated, corporately as well as individually, in the members: “CHRISTUS illuc pergat quo præcessit: præcessit enim CHRISTUS in Capite, sequitur in Corpore.” *S. Aug. ubi sup.*

We see then *by* whom the Psalms are uttered—by CHRIST in us, by us in CHRIST. But *to* whom are they uttered? Can CHRIST be separated from that Eternal GODHEAD Who is the Blessed *Object* of these Songs of Israel? No, wondrous Mystery!—He is Subject and Object at once; the Being *to* Whom as well as *by* Whom Israel’s prayers and praises are sung; the one Divine Mediator Who prays for us, Who prays in us, Who is prayed to, by us: [367] “Orat pro nobis ut Sacerdos noster; orat in nobis ut Caput nostrum; oratur a nobis ut DEUS noster.”

But let us turn to certain other features of the Psalmic poetry which hence perhaps may receive elucidation.

And first, how often do we find sincere Christians shrinking from the use of the Psalter language, as expressive at times, (1) of states of mind with which they feel themselves to have so little sympathy, or (2) of degrees of Grace to which they can lay so little claim. We allude (1) to the ‘vindictive’ passages in the Psalms, and (2) to those claims of perfect uprightness, innocence, holiness, which are so constantly made by the Psalmist. A word at present about the latter of these.

How frequently in the Psalter do we find Righteousness, perfect Righteousness, challenged for himself by the Speaker; asserted as a *ground* for being heard, and as necessarily, even by the rule of justice, ensuring to him, at once deliverance out of his present troubles (those troubles which, arising out of the enmity of the evil world, always *must* accompany

Righteousness here), and everlasting salvation: “Judge me, O LORD, *according to my Righteousness, &c.*”¹ Language like this is often pronounced as “savouring of legality,” as unbecoming in the mouth of a Christian who knows himself a sinner, who feels that if GOD *were* to deal with him “according to his righteousness,” his case would be sad indeed.

But, irrespective of the direct allusion to “the LORD our Righteousness,” has such language no equivalent even in the New Testament? Undoubtedly it has. Not only in the Psalmic prophecies, but even in the Apostolic Epistles is *perfect Righteousness* predicated of the Christian: “He that is born of GOD. . . . *cannot sin.*”² THE Christian in such passages speaks, and is regarded, *as* “Christian.” He speaks in the Psalms, and is described in the Epistles as a member of the New Creation “created in CHRIST JESUS unto good works,” and is viewed solely in reference to this New Birth. The language therefore and description are not only approximately, or in a qualified manner, but absolutely true. And this must be fully recognized if we would understand the real force of the words of the Psalmist and S. John. True, in many places, alike in the Psalms and (still more) in the Epistles, we meet with the ordinary complex Christian, with his twofold nature, the old and the new—his two lives, struggling the one against the other; the Spirit elevating the flesh, the flesh dragging down the Spirit; the two being “contrary the one to the other,” and ever fighting for the mastery—their sub[368]ject himself possessed as it were of a double personality; able “to do all things,” and yet capable of nothing; superior to “all the power of the Enemy,” and yet groaning under the weight of “the body of this death.” While in other places, as we have already said, (keeping exclusively to the order of the Spirit) we read of the old man having *died*, of the flesh having been buried in Baptism, of the old creature having become a New Creature; and this creature, as having sprung from “incorruptible Seed,” and born “through the Word”—regarded in its own essential nature—a Holy Thing.

It is this New Creature then, regarded in its abstract type, and viewed irrespectively of the earthly vessel or organ through which it has here to work, and the sable “Tabernacles of Kedar” wherein it is condemned to “dwell,” whereof this real, absolute Righteousness is asserted: even as, on the other hand, it is the old nature viewed in itself,—regarded as to its own inherited degradation and disorganization, uncorrected by any Regenerating Influence, direct or indirect, prelusive or retroactive, of the Divine Word—that in other and opposite passages, is the personified subject of the severe descriptions and indignant denunciations of the Psalmist and the Apostles.

This latter is “corrupt and abominable,” it can do “no good thing;” “Destruction and misery” is its present portion, the bottomless pit its future destiny. Now inasmuch as in one Son of Adam alone has the New Birth been fully and absolutely realized; it is obvious that the outward description, inward experience, prayers, and praises of the Righteous One, the “Man of God, the express, unsullied ‘Image’ of the Most High, can belong, in their simple unqualified comprehensiveness, to Him and Him only: while, on the other hand, the converse character, the ‘fool,’ the ‘sinner,’ the ‘enemy,’ of the Psalmist, when not Satan personally, will meet with its full embodiment only in that wretched Son of Adam “whose coming is after the working of Satan”—in whom alone of mankind the Divine Image

¹ So, “Give sentence with me, O Lord, *according to my righteousness*, and *according to the innocency that is in me.*” Again, in the 18th Psalm, the Psalmist stops in the narration of his glorious successes and victories, to tell us the *ground* of them all, viz., his own integrity; “The Lord reward me *according to my righteous dealing;*” and to enunciate thereupon the Eternal principle that Righteousness alone is the sure and necessary pathway to Salvation.

² Vid. 1 S. John ii. 6, 20; iii. 3, 6, 9; v. 4, &c.

becomes *absolutely* obliterated, and the “image of the Beast” perfected—the “Man of sin,” the “Son of Perdition,” the Antichrist, of whom “ye have heard that he cometh; and even now are there many in the world.”

These two Representative men, the righteous and the unrighteous, meet us at the very threshold of the Psalter. In fact, the whole series of Psalms, from the 1st to the 18th is a continuous description of them under various aspects and circumstances: the former perpetually harassed, maligned, and persecuted by the latter, but still keeping his integrity, quietly awaiting God’s time—till at last, a grand final and conclusive victory is gloriously achieved, Ps. xviii. 37—50, (a victory of which bright prophetic glimpses had already been vouchsafed, Ps. ii., viii.); and the enemy vanquished and silenced for ever.¹

[369]

To trace at any length the leading features of these two antagonistic characters is beyond our present purpose, though we may add a few words on one or two of them.

No characteristic of the Righteous Man perhaps, is dwelt on so constantly as this (which is the first to meet us)—His perfect love for the Law of GOD, and perfect conformity to the will of GOD. The 1st Psalm beautifully exhibits the happy consequences of this: viz., complete success in *everything* which he undertakes. His “leaf” is ever green—none of his *words* fall to the ground; his “fruit” withers not—all his actions are crowned. For, his will being coincident with GOD’S will, whatever he willeth *must* come to pass; “whatever he doeth” must “prosper.” He is ever imbibing Blessing; ever communicating Blessing. He is the ever Blessed source of Blessing.

It is in token of this his perfect love for the Law of GOD, that the Psalmist, in the person of the Righteous Man, is represented as praising GOD upon a *ten-stringed lute*—his *peculiar* instrument, (Ps. xxxiii. 2; xcii. 3; cxliv. 9). For what is the import of this symbolical expression? S. Augustine at once refers us to the Decalogue. Nor can there be any doubt that he is correct. The idea is this, that the Psalmist’s heart is brought into such perfect accordance with the Divine Law; each several string of his inner man is tuned in such strict unison with the particular Mandate whereby its note has to be regulated; that his whole soul vibrates in active response to the sound of the Law of the Most High, and thus gives forth sweet and delicious music to the ears of Him Who “inhabiteth” and delighteth in “the Praises of Israel.” The expression, “I will praise Thee on a ten-stringed lute,” is simply a beautiful symbolical rendering of the plain words, “O how I love Thy Law;” “The Law of Thy mouth is dearer unto me than thousands of gold and silver.”

Another interesting indication of this complete coincidence between the Psalmist’s will and GOD’S will, is found in this—which is at first sight, rather an unaccountable feature in some of the Psalms; we mean the frequent inversion (as to position) of his prayers, and his thanksgivings for the answer to those prayers; the latter often preceding the former. Take for example, the 9th Psalm. Here the former part (vv. 1—6) contains the thanksgiving for the abundant accomplishment of the petition contained in the concluding part (vv. 13, 18—20.) And how is this to be accounted for? It is merely a practical indication of the perfect holiness of the petitioner. For acceptable prayer pre-supposes *faith* in the suppliant: “Believe that ye receive, and ye shall have;” “*according to your faith*, so shall it be unto you.” Hence [370] the faith must be *perfect*, in order that the answer may be perfect. But who can pray in *perfect* faith? None but he who is fully conscious that (his will being in

¹ Not but that these two Personæ are constantly reappearing, and are described even at greater length in sub-sequent Psalms: but that the title of the 18th Psalm—the song of the Beloved One on his deliverance from *all* his enemies—seems to suggest the idea of its being intended to form the close of a cycle.

entire accordance with the Divine Will,) whatever he desires, as being the desire of GOD Himself, *must* be accomplished. And this is the case with the Psalmist. His introductory thanksgiving then, is but the expression of a victorious faith, overpassing the bounds of time, and “substantially realizing things hoped for.” But does this faith supersede the necessity of prayer? By no means. Not even the fullest assurance of a future and joyful answer, can ever justify the neglect of the Divinely-appointed subjective means through which alone that answer is to be obtained. Hence we find our LORD Himself praying, even “with strong crying and tears,”¹ for His own Resurrection. Hence we ourselves pray in like manner for the joyful Resurrection of His sleeping Saints, His Body Mystical; as we do for the ‘coming of His kingdom,’ the spread of His Glory, *the accomplishment of His Will*.

One other feature of the Righteous Psalmist’s character we will just notice.

He is ever exhibited, not only as the great friend, but as the very representative of the *poor*;

himself the poor one—“As for me, I am poor and needy.” And how does this only the more identify him with Him Who “though rich, yet for our sakes became *poor*; and with that Society whose very charter is “Blessed are ye poor, whose highest glory it is to be emptied of self and the world, that it may be filled with GOD, to be “poor yet making many rich, to “have nothing” while “possessing all things.”

Corresponding to the varied description of the “Psalmist’s” character, is the opposite description of his antagonist—wealthy, mighty, powerful, cunning, malignant, unscrupulous, in great prosperity, fearless of death, regardless of GOD and His law, his “eyes swelling with fatness,” having “Whatsoever his soul lusteth after.” And here it will be observed that, as the Psalmist or “Corpus Christi” is described equally as an individual and as a corporation, the same is the case with its great antagonist the Corpus Diaboli; the character and aspect of the latter, being ever correlative and conversely correspondent to the particular form and manifestation of the other, against which it may be brought to bear. The poor one meets his adversary in the rich one; the feeble and expiring, in the “lusty and strong;” the humble in the proud one; the Holy One in the wicked; the “beloved” in the “enemy;” the keeper of GOD’S law in the “lawless one;” David in Saul, Absalom, or Ahithophel; the faithful one in the traitor; the helpless and persecuted in the relentless and cruel; the “hind of the morning” (the enigmatical title of Psalm xxii.) in the “dogs, buffaloes, and lions,” (the natural adversaries of the former,) which are re[371]presented as gaping and roaring upon it. Or, if the Psalmist assumes a collective character, and personates GOD’S Israel, his enemies are the successive foes of the national Israel; Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Philistines, Assyria, Chaldæa. We see him as the captive Church in Babylon, exulted over by the godless victors; then after the captivity, vexed and harassed by the Samaritan false professors during the building of the second Temple.

Under these and many other typical representations, do we see shadowed forth the various forms of evil and enmity which the Church militant, in her ever changing circumstances, will ever have to encounter. Many of the Psalms referring to these conflicts appear to recount, or to be suggested by, real historical events; and therefore, not only serve as memorials of past trials and deliverances, but as earnest and prophecies of future ones,—prophecies admitting of many inchoate, rudimentary, and germinant fulfilments, all pointing to some more real, grand, complete accomplishment yet to come. Other Psalms

¹ Cf. Heb. v. 7; Ps. vi. 5,6; lxxxviii. 3—13, &c. &c.

again, treating of the same class of subjects,¹ appear to have been written, as far as we can ascertain, without immediate reference to any particular event, to be expressed in mere general comprehensive terms, or perhaps to border more closely on the territory of pure prophecy.

Take (e.g.) one of the earliest Psalms of this character—the 7th “Shiggaion² of David which he sang to the LORD concerning the words of Cush the Benjamite.” Now, what is the meaning of this title? Who is Cush the Benjamite? Holy Scripture mentions no such person. Nor does there appear any reasonable doubt but that under the designation of *Cush* (i.e. “*Niger*,” the black one) is represented the emissary of the “Prince of Darkness” himself. The title then will be “An Ode to the Beloved One (i.e. the Mystical Body of the ‘Beloved SON’) concerning the slanderous accusations of the Ethiopian, or Black One.” And Cush will be but an enigmatical designation of the *organ* (whoever he may be, and at whatever period of the Church’s history) of Satan *qua* “*Diabolus*.” He will be the vehicle or instrument, for the time being, of the “Accuser of the brethren, who accuseth them before our GOD day and night.” So that the whole Psalm may admit of many specific interpretations according as its Cush happens to be Saul;³ the “false witnesses” (S. Matt. xxvi. 60); the “Son of Perdition,” or any of his shadows or emissaries; or the “Father of lies” himself. The grand fulfilment of the Psalm is yet future. [372] Its real and final scene is laid (as is the case with so many other Psalms) at the “Resurrection of the just,” when the challenge, “who is he that condemneth?” is triumphantly and unanswerably heralded aloud through Heaven, earth, and Hell; and the Bride “*overcomes* through the Blood of the Lamb.”

In truth, the Church has yet to learn the deep, inestimable value of this her sacred treasure-house of song. She has practically to discover an awful significance and reality about many of the strains she has daily on her lips, of which perhaps in these seasons of comparative calm she knows nothing. Nor will it be till the emergencies therein foreshadowed are assuming form and shape, or are actually pressing upon her that she will fully recognise and apprehend their import. Still, she should have her appliances ever at hand. She should keep her armour burnished, and accustom herself to its use in her present daily recurring preliminary contingencies, that it may stand her in good stead when she has fairly to gird herself therewith for the final encounter. The Church’s songs have yet to do a glorious work. They are even now instinct with living, mighty energy. But a time has to come, when “the praises of GOD in the mouth of the saints,” shall be “a two-edged sword in their hands,” dealing “vengeance to the heathen, rebukes to the people.” [Ps. cxlix. 6, 7.] How soon this glorious time shall come—this first dawn of Everlasting Day, or the dark and stormy night which has to usher it in, GOD only knows. Even now the shadows seem little by little to be lengthening upon her; the cold, mysterious thrill of twilight to be insensibly stealing over her: silent mutterings as though of a distant tempest, may be ever and anon faintly heard; the still solemn voice of the Watchman, warning that “though the Morning cometh, the night has to come also:” heavy banks of cloud may be seen looming over the western horizon. And the Church (our own branch of it, at least, GOD be thanked!) seems instinctively bestirring herself for a coming something. Through the

¹ We are not now referring to the ordinary *didactic* psalms. These, having generally *no* historical element, are (of course) applicable, equally and alike, to all times.

² That is, “A Wandering Ode,” says Bp. Horsley.

³ It is Saul probably at whom the title primarily, though not openly, points—himself a Benjamite; the *Cush*, as Hengstenberg, thinks, containing a gentle play upon his father’s name, with an intimation (we may perhaps add) *whose* son the slanderous king showed himself *really* to be, by his conduct.

longsuffering mercy of the LORD, Who has not cut her off in her sins, she is yet alive, is awakening from her slumbers, “arising from the dead,” girding on her armour, and preparing herself against the season of “great tribulation,”—that evening of portentous gloom, which has yet to fall upon her, whereof the Psalmist speaks, “Thou makest darkness that it may be *night*, wherein all the beasts of the forest do move; the lions roaring after their prey, [cf. Ps. xxii. 13,] do seek their meat from GOD (Ps. civ. 20, 21)—That terrible time, the very anticipation of which fills the Church with “fearfulness and trembling,” and “overwhelms” her with an “*horrible dread*.” (Ps. lv. 4—8.)

And here we would beg the reverent attention of our readers to a subject of very solemn interest, (which we can but advert to,) viz., the intimations which Scripture gives, that the closing career of the Divine Head and LORD has yet to be mysteriously re-enacted [373] in corporate history of His Mystical Body; that the Church has yet to undergo her bereavement, (her untrue members “scattered every man to his own,” and she “left alone,” her betrayal, her Gethsemane, her Calvary.

A comparison of the language of the 22nd, 69th, and other “Passion” Psalms, with the bitter wails of GOD’S Jerusalem in the Lamentations, seems undoubtedly to point to the conclusion that the former have yet *again* to be mystically fulfilled.

Thus, for instance, we see GOD’S Jerusalem, like her LORD, stripped of her raiment, made naked and bare; her enemies dividing her vesture among themselves, and making them rich with her spoils and pleasant things. (Lam. i. 8, 10.)

Her “beauty,” like her LORD’S, “is gone for very trouble, and worn away because of all her enemies.” (Ib. i. 5, 6.)

We see “all that pass by laughing her to scorn,” “shooting out their lips, and wagging their heads,” saying, “Is this the city that men call the perfection of beauty, the joy of the whole earth?” (ii. 15, 16.)

We see her, like her LORD, bowed down beneath the weight of a heavy and accumulated load of sin—her “iniquities a sore burden, too heavy for her to bear;” but her sins *personal*, His imputed; “for Jerusalem hath grievously sinned, therefore she is removed.” Of her is required “all the righteous blood shed from righteous Abel.” She had inherited sevenfold the blessings of her elder sister. Those blessings she has abused. Therefore has she also reaped sevenfold her sister’s *curses*. (Rev. xviii. 24.) “The LORD hath accomplished His fury, He hath poured out His fierce anger upon Zion. . . . for the sins of her prophets and the iniquities of her priests,” who have “crucified the SON of GOD afresh” in her streets.

Again, like her LORD, we find her suffering an awful racking “*thirst*,” “her tongue cleaveth to the roof of her mouth.” (Lam. iv. 4, 8.) There is a dreadful, mysterious, and retributive “cry for *Wine* in her streets,” (cf. Isa. xxiv. 11,) as though the abused Sacrament was judicially dried up, the channels of Grace closed.

Like Him, she is “poured out like water,” “all her bones¹ are out of joint,” and “consumed;” “the heart in the midst of her body is like melting wax,” her “strength dried up.” (Lam. i. 13, 14; ii. 11, 19.)

¹ The very framework and support, as it were, of the Body Mystical, the strong members of the Church, her prop and stay,—“*Ossa sua firmos suos dicit, ossa enim firma sunt in corpore.*” (S. Aug. in loc.) Thus in prosperity the Church sings, “All my *bones* shall say, ‘LORD, who is like unto Thee?’” In distress, “Make me to hear of joy and gladness, that the bones which Thou hast broken may rejoice.” In persecution “Our bones lie scattered before the pit.” (Ps. xxxv. 10; li. 8; cxli. 7) And, alas! the Church may yet be able to “tell all her bones,” to count them for their small number; when “there is hardly one godly man left, and
{cont.}

[374]

She is deserted, too, of the Father, there is none to comfort her. “The Comforter that should have relieved her soul is far from her.” (i. 21, 16.)¹

But this consideration of the ulterior mystical exposition of the Passion Psalms (which seems fully recognized in the Patristic commentaries) brings us to another point, and it is this,—that there is no portion of Scripture where we meet with such copious details of the precise nature and phases of the final Anti-Christian catastrophe, of the man of sin and his confederate bands, as in the Psalter.

There are two classes of Psalms which in an especial way appear to refer us to the times of Antichrist, (for their full accomplishment,) and to exhibit the two leading components in the impious coalition which shall then exist. The one series of Psalms having reference mainly to heathen, the other to Israelitish foes. The one prefiguring God’s enemies external to the Church, the other His enemies within the Church;—Assyria, Chaldæa, Edom, &c. being the representatives of the former; Saul, Absalom, Ahithophel, of the latter. Saul especially, as the most powerful and malignant of all David’s Israelitish foes, being a sort of standing typical representative of the *Israelitish* enemies to be encountered by the True David and His seed. To the former belong such Psalms (e.g.) as lx., lxxiii., lxxiv., lxxix., lxxx., lxxxiii., &c.; to the latter, such as vii., xxxv., xli., lv., lix., cix., cxli.² The “Enemy” in the one series having its mystical equivalent in the “Beast,” or world-power of the Revelation—Satan’s great secular organ; the Enemy in the other series having its equivalent in the “False Prophet,” Harlot—Rider, or Faithless Church—Satan’s great ecclesiastical organ. The one a representative “of the heathen,” the other “of the people.” (Ps. ii. 1; xviii. 43; cxlix. 7.)

[375]

Saul himself, it must be remembered, is a type of an unhallowed *visible kingship* over GOD’S Israel, opposed to the original divine idea of the Theocracy, and but a late development of the carnal Church; professedly borrowed, too, from the “kings of the Gentiles.” (Cf. S. Matt. xx. 25, 26; xxiii 8—12; S. Mark ix. 33—35; x. 42—44; S. Luke xxii. 2.5, 26; 1 S. Pet. v. 3.) The most powerful ingredient in Saul’s hatred of David was an instinctive feeling that the kingdom was not to abide with himself, but to revert to David. The sovereignty he held was, in itself, opposed to the mind of GOD, and though

the faithful are minished from among the children of men,” when even “all the Apostles have forsaken” her “and fled.”

¹ This parallelism extends even to the particular figures under which the two are described. Take, for example, the emblem of the *hart* or *hind*. Messiah is likened in the 22nd Psalm to a hind (see Title) hounded by its pursuers, “many dogs,” &c. So the Church and her rulers are likened to the “*harts* that no pasture, and go without strength before the pursuer.” (Lam. i. 6.) The same figure appears in the 42nd Psalm,—Messiah thirsting for His Father’s presence on the Cross, or the Church during the times of Anti-Christ, gasping for the comforter who is far from her,” is likened to a “*hart* panting after the water brooks.” Even as the mystical woman—the Zion travelling with the Promised Seed (the “Man Child Who is to rule all nations,”) whose period of gestation terminates at the second Advent—is likened to a “*hind* bringing forth her young,” (Ps. xxix. 9,) bringing it forth with sorrow and difficulty, “in pain and crying out in her pangs. (Cf. John xvi. 21, 22; Job xxxix. 1—4; Isa. lxvi. 6—8; Rev. xii. 2.) We considered the mystical meaning of this 29th Psalm in our last Number, p. 311.

² In other Psalms (e.g., the 9th and 10th which make one in the LXX) we see both phases of wickedness combined. In fact, in most of the Psalms referred to above, we meet with *some* recognition of each element. For the power of the world derives its peculiar barb and sting during this terrific emergency, from the religion which for a while it adopts; while the false Church derives her unholy might from the vast world-power which for a time backs her up. The Church gives point, the world strength. The fair flatterer is seated on the monstrous Beast. *She* directs *him*. *He* supports *her*.

permitted by Him, was permitted only for a time and in wrath, "I gave thee a king in Mine anger, and took him away in My fury." But further, Saul had personally misused this sovereignty, so that even now, in the Divine Mind, it had been taken from him and given to the meek shepherd stripling. And hence the burning jealousy, the ill concealed dread and hatred, the malignant and calumnious misrepresentations, the ruthless persecutions, of his innocent rival, on the part of the "King of Israel."

This gives a tone and colour to all the Sauline Psalms, which, without exception, appear to point us, for their full realization, to the times of Antichrist. The Saul of that period being (as already stated) the representative, not so much of the infidel might of the world, as of the more bitter and remorseless foe the Church shall meet in the false and dominant part of herself; an enemy exhibited under many aspects, as at once Absalom, Ahithophel, Judas Iscariot, Saul—member of my own family, faithless and crafty counsellor, false Apostle, king of Israel.

And this, in the Psalter no less than in the Revelation, is represented as being far the most appalling feature of this dread period,—that it is not the heathen world alone, but the city of the Living GOD itself, in which Iniquity has taken up its seat, ("I have spied unrighteousness and strife in the *city*; wickedness is therein: deceit and guile go not out of her streets,")—that it is not "the Enemy and Adversary" alone that "magnifieth himself against" the prostrate Church; for that were to be borne; but her "guide, her companion, her familiar friend," her fellow-member in the household of faith, who "having eaten bread with her hath lifted up his heel against her."

It is when the impiety is at its head; when the world-king, mainly through the instrumentality of the temporizing Church, has well nigh reached the summit of his ambition; and the dominant Church, become now the State-Religion of Anti-Christ,—caressed, and (for his own wicked purposes) mightily befriended by him,—is at last permitted to realize, as never before, the carnal dreams of universal dominion, and is at the height of her short-lived Babylonish and tyrannical security; it is then that the "vindictive" portions of the Psalter find their place and full meaning, those [376] tremendous denunciations of GOD'S wrath upon ungodliness, and particularly upon this grand culminating antichristian confederation of iniquity. It is now that the souls under the altar cry aloud for vengeance. And vengeance "lingereth not." For the "sin unto death" hath been committed, and in the very Tabernacle of GOD. Anti-Christ, Prosperity, and Apostasy have been chosen instead of CHRIST, Persecution, and the "Faith once for all delivered." And now the day of grace is past. The "night¹ has come when no man can work" The faithful remnant may *not*, then, pray for their apostate brethren. The beloved Apostle has forbidden this. Their's is a very different duty. They have but to utter the ALMIGHTY'S fearful sentence of commination against their own flesh and blood, Jerusalem become Babylon, the "faithful city become the harlot:"—"Let death come down hastily upon them; let them go down quick into hell:" "for the blasphemy wherewith (not the heathen world only, but) our *neighbours* have blasphemed Thee, reward Thou them, O LORD, sevenfold into their bosom," a petition anticipatory of, and answered by, the pouring out of the seven apocalyptic vials.

And these soon ensue. For the Church having at last followed her LORD to Calvary; the two witnesses having been at last put to death; and the Body having now "filled up that which lacked of the sufferings of" the Head,—judgment has but to run its tremendous course "beginning at the household of GOD." The 'governor of the Jews' and the world-

¹ "He then having received the sop went immediately out, ("they went out from us,") and it was *night*."

king have had a shortlived friendship. Jerusalem leagued with heathen Rome, has put to death the SAVIOUR: Jerusalem shall yet fall by the hands of Rome. The Beast and the Harlot have joined in killing the witnesses. The Beast at last turns round upon his rider, and tears her furiously to pieces. The heathen world rushes wildly upon the false Church. "Jerusalem, who hath killed the prophets," is now in her turn visited; and "not one stone is left upon another that is not thrown down." "The eagles" of prey carouse in bloodthirsty riot over the "dead Body." (S. Matt. xxiv. 28; Rev. xi. 8; Job xxxix. 30.) "Come and let us root them out that they be no more a people, and that the name of Israel be no more in remembrance."

But the Church has also her Resurrection. LORD, be merciful unto me," has been her prayer, "raise Thou me up again, and I shall requite them." And the prayer is heard. The Spirit of GOD reanimates the dormant Body; while a quaking fear seizes the ungodly world. The Heavens open. In dazzling terror appears on high the "sign of the Son of Man;" while, careering in awful majesty, is seen the white-robed warrior train of the "King of kings, and LORD of lords." And the faithful remnant are "caught up to meet their LORD in the air."

[377]

But this brings us to another point.

The Church is seen, in the Psalter, to live again,—as well corporately, as in her individual members,—her Lord's life; to share in His trials, woes, crucifixion, and death: "she suffers with Him, shall she also *reign* with Him?" The righteous *Sufferer* in the Psalms is not only an individual but a Mystical Body; who then shall be the righteous Judge and *King*? Is He *only* an Individual? Is He the Personal Head without the members? the [Greek] apart from the [Greek]?

On this deeply interesting question we must be brief. But we may at once observe, that the very fundamental passage bearing on this subject,—a passage asserted by S. Paul to be spoken of the Messiah,—distinctly proves that the kingship there promised to Him, not as an Individual but as "Head of the Body of the church." "I will set up thy Seed," says. God to David; "I will establish His kingdom. He shall build an House for My Name; and I will establish the Throne of His Kingdom for ever. I will be His Father; and He shall be My Son. *If He commit iniquity I will chasten Him with the rod of men, &c.*" (2 Sam. vii. 12—14; Heb. i. 5.) Now here, inasmuch as it is the very Everlasting Son and King whose "Throne is to be set up for ever," of whom it is also added, "if He commit iniquity," &c. it is evident that the subject of the passage can be only that Mystical Body, to which, in virtue of its Head, the Eternal Kingdom belongs; but of which, in respect of its members, the preliminary and corrective course of discipline is foretold. In fact, the royal Seed here spoken of is none other than that [Greek] (Gal. iii.) whereof S. Paul tells us, (v. 16,) that "It is Christ" Himself; and yet (v. 29,) that it is *we ourselves* also "if we are Christ's." It is the [Greek] of which the same Apostle writes, (1 Cor. xii. 12,) which, though "One," yet [Greek].

But *when* is this Anointed One raised to the kingdom? Has this exaltation yet taken place? In its plenary sense undoubtedly *not*. "The Heir, the Lord *of all*," is yet "under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father." Even the departed saints are *awaiting* their kingdom. "They without us cannot be made perfect." So that the regal Psalms, as to their full significance, are yet unfulfilled prophecies.

Take the first of them, Psalm ii. Has this been fully accomplished? Unquestionably not. It received *a* glorious and germinant fulfilment at the resurrection of the Head. It shall receive complete accomplishment at the resurrection of the Body; "when He bringeth His

First-begotten *again* into the world.” For the Psalm recounts the triumphant *adoption* of the [Greek], i.e., the [Greek], (Heb. xii. 23.) But when shall this *visible, official* adoption take place? In the case of the Head it took place on His victorious conquest over death. And the same [378] shall be the case with the Body. Not till its glorious election *from out of* death, its resurrection *from* the dead, shall its “adoption” take place. For though “now the sons of GOD,” though sealed with the adopting Spirit, though “saints elect,” yet are CHRIST’S members not “declared to be the sons of GOD in power,” till their “resurrection from the dead.” And therefore S. Paul says, that though even now sons, though “heirs of GOD, and joint heirs with CHRIST,” though endowed with “the firstfruits of the SPIRIT,” yet we are “*waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.*” (Rom. viii. 23.) It is not, then, till the last member is brought in, the mystical number of the elect made up, and “the resurrection of the just” effected, that this visible “adoption” ensues; the Anointed One, the [Greek], the full grown perfected MAN, is formally recognized as SON; and the “King set upon the holy hill of Zion.”¹

And how beautifully do all the Scripture types of the Church combine in elucidating this subject. What does S. Paul’s application of the word [Greek] to the Church (Eph. i. 23; iv. 13.) the “complement of CHRIST,” indicate, but that, without her, the full idea of CHRIST is not realized; that, till her number is wholly made up in every part, the CHRIST of the Mediatorial kingdom cannot be said to be ‘perfected?’ Even as the word ‘*Head*’ so plainly shows. The Head is incomplete without the Body. And [379] till the Body is full grown, Christ is still said to be incomplete. And so too with the image of the *Bridegroom* and the *Bride*. “It is not good for man to be alone.” The full complex ‘*homo*’ consists of man *and* woman. “God created man in His own image; male and female.” Either is incomplete without the other; incapable of reproduction, and the exercise of many of the natural feelings and affections. Infinite, unspeakable, Almighty Love has imposed this same condition to the perfection of “Man Christ Jesus.” He is *incomplete* (with all lowly and adoring reverence be it said,) without His *Bride*. He assumes not, visibly, His glorious Kingdom, (for love will not permit Him,) till she is ready to share it with Him, and “sit with Him on His Throne.” Again, the Church is the “*Temple of God.*” But it is not while the building is in course of erection that the title can with full propriety be given it. The

¹ In further proof of the correctness of this explanation of the ‘*King*,’ in Ps. ii. we have but to compare Ps. ii. 9, with Rev. ii. 26, 27; iii. 21, where we see that the very promise made in the former to the King, is made in the latter to all the faithful.

We may just remark, in passing, that any idea of a *visible kingship* exercised by the Church during the present [Greek], is fundamentally erroneous. It is essentially inconsistent with the character of the present dispensation which is a dispensation of Grace, not of manifested Judgment and Royalty. Moreover, Christ Himself, though *visibly manifested* as Prophet and Priest, has not *yet* openly assumed His Kingly functions. “*Nondum se regem appellat Christus, quia in primâ apparitione nondum regiâ fungebatur potestate.*” And the Church during the present [Greek], has to live again her Lord’s life, to share in His sufferings, His meekness, His humility, His Cross, and Passion. The last act recorded of her, in her corporate history, is her resurrection and ascension to meet her returning Lord. The Spirit of God reanimates the witnesses, and they “ascend up in a cloud” in sight of their enemies (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 14—17). The present dispensation, again, is altogether preparatory. It is the dispensation of the Spirit introductory to the more glorious one of the manifested ‘Christ.’ The Church during the present ‘age’ is the mystical ‘Messenger,’ sent to ‘prepare and make ready’ her Lord’s “way, by turning the hearts of the disobedient to the wisdom of the just, that at His second coming” to reign, He may have “an acceptable people” prepared for Him, whom He may “exalt the humble and meek one,” (to dethrone Saul, and lift up the houseless David,)—any idea of her settling herself down to *reign*, establishing in the person of her chief bishop a visible mundane autocracy, and carnally antedating the inauguration of the kingdom,—is simply anti-Christian; it is a development, not of the Spirit of Christ, but of the spirit of the world. “*I sit as a Queen,*”—these are not the words of the *Bride*.

title will *then* only be realized, when the last “living stone” has been added, the solemn Dedication taken place; when the “Glory of the Lord has filled the House,” and consecrated it to be for evermore the Habitation of Him whom “the Heaven, and Heaven of Heavens cannot contain.”

We have said that the official ‘adoption’ and inauguration of the King, the Anointed One, the “perfected Christ,” takes place on the resurrection *from among* the dead, of His Mystical Body. Is this event synchronous with the general resurrection (the resurrection *of* the dead)? We have referred on a former occasion to this mysterious and interesting subject,¹ and can only repeat our firm conviction that the two events are *not* contemporaneous, but two distinct and successive stages of the one grand event—the Resurrection—whereof a still earlier stage has already passed, to wit, the resurrection of Christ.²

He is the “First-begotten *from out of* death; “*from* the dead,” [Greek]. But His Bride is called the “Church of the first-begotten ones.” Of *her* therefore is this same resurrection from the dead, or [Greek] predicated. For “if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus *from out of* the dead dwell in her, He that raised up Christ from the dead will likewise raise up her.” In fact the very word [Greek] of itself seems to point to the same conclusion. The Church is called out of the living, (to a higher life,)—she shall be called out of the dead. The election of God impressed upon her, shall follow her into the grave and raise her from amongst the ‘sleeping ones,’ not only that she may be for ever “blessed,” but [380] to a *higher* glory; that she may be (with her loving LORD,) the *source* and channel of Blessing for ever. “It is more blessed to give than to receive.”

“We believe” then, that at the ‘Coming’ or [Greek] of CHRIST, “all men shall rise again with their bodies.” “*but*,” as S. Paul adds, “*every man in his own order*—CHRIST the first-fruits; *then* those that are CHRIST’S; *afterwards* cometh the end.” The Seventh Day, the Day of Rest, the Day of Judgment, the Day of Resurrection, *opens* with the rapture, and revival out of death, of the living members of “the Resurrection and the Life,” who having already “passed from death unto Life,” shall not enter into judgment, or “be condemned with the world;” nay, who shall be assessors with CHRIST on the judgment-seat, and “judge angels.” It *closes* with the Resurrection of the *dead*, and the judgment “according to their works” of [Greek] (cf. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; S. Matt. xxv. 31, 32; Rev. xx. 12, 13;) multitudes of whom shall receive a merciful sentence of acquittal; and shall be rewarded with a joyful entrance into the Kingdom of everlasting Peace, as happy *subjects* of the King and glorified Bride, as members of those “saved nations” who “walk in the Light of” the Golden City.

And what a meaning does all this give to those incessant prayers, wherewith the Psalter abounds, of the Mystical CHRIST (the members as well as the Head), for *Resurrection*; and to the Prayers which the Catholic Church has ever continued to offer up for the “dead in CHRIST.” The trustful, loving, use of such prayers is but a living and practical realization of the glorious doctrine of the Communion of Saints; it is but an expression of that

¹ Vid. *Ecclesiastic*, May, 1854, pp. 208—211. φ Dykes’s review ‘The Lord’s Prayer and the Beatitudes.’ p. 118 *supra*.

² The earlier prophets, looking through the vista of futurity, seem to view all three stages as simultaneous. We find the resurrection of Christ spoken of as contemporaneous with that of His members, (“Thy dead men shall live, *together with My* dead Body shall they arise,”) even as, by the same prophetic perspective, the two advents of Christ seem constantly combined into one. It is only by little and little that the several stages of events begin to unfold themselves, and the intervals which separate them to become apparent.

personal interest which *each* must necessarily take in the welfare of *all*. The members must, like their Divine Head and exemplar, be earnest in -their prayers for the ‘Resurrection of the *whole* Body,’ for the ‘accomplishment of the number of the elect,’ for the hastening of the Kingdom of Glory. Till that glad time, the bliss of the ‘departed’ is but inchoate and incomplete. They are awaiting their ‘perfection’—their ‘adoption’—the awful, ineffable, UNION. And this beatific consummation may be hastened even by us. Our prayers and Eucharists are not merely our own breath and food, but, in their degree, the breath and food whereby the whole Body ‘groweth the growth of GOD.’ The restoration too, of every wanderer to the fold—the addition of every new member, by Holy Baptism, to the Church—these are events, in like manner, affecting the whole Body: they are for the benefit (by accelerating their Resurrection) of the departed: they are deeds done “in behalf of” (i.e. for the benefit of) “the Dead” ([Greek] 1 Cor xv. 29), who can only by such means attain to their “perfect consummation and bliss both in body and soul.”

Into the kindred, but most difficult and mysterious question, as to the nature of that ‘Pit,’ ‘Grave,’ ‘Corruption,’ ‘Hades,’ *from* [381] *which* the mystical Body prays for Resurrection, out of which It is raised, by which “it is not possible for It to be holden,”—or into an examination of the unsatisfactory solution which has been forced upon this question in another branch of the Church, we do not propose to enter.¹

With a single remark on a different subject we must conclude. We have referred frequently to GOD’S Israel, the Heavenly Jerusalem, the true SEED of Abraham:—are the predictions concerning the literal Israel, Jerusalem, Canaan, to be all absorbed in their higher spiritual fulfilment?

We feel earnestly persuaded that this cannot be; and that the system of interpretation which would abruptly cut off the history of the national Israel at their present ‘dispersion’ and ‘blindness,’ is one, not only involving conclusions utterly repugnant to the revealed character of Him “Whose gifts and calling are without repentance,” but productive also of inextricable confusion, if legitimately carried out, in the prophetic Scriptures. Unquestionably the natural seed has a history of its own, as well as the Spiritual SEED. S. Paul categorically declares this in Rom. xi.; drawing a marked distinction between “All Israel,” i.e., his brethren after the *flesh*, who “shall be *saved*,” and the “Remnant according to the Election of Grace,” who are admitted into the higher Fellowship, and lose all national distinctions by incorporation into that Sacred Body, “where is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, but only CHRIST.”

There is to be a renewed earth, as well as New Heavens: a “Paradise restored” as well as a “Tabernacle of GOD.” And “glorious things are spoken of” both. Not only have ‘glorious’ celestial promises been made to the Spiritual Israel, but glorious terrestrial promises to the natural Israel. True, the latter are a continuous outward type of the former: but are they therefore, not to be realized? Is the current of literal interpretation to be suddenly arrested, and merged in the hitherto parallel and distinct stream of spiritual interpretation? Are the mundane promises solemnly pledged to ‘Israel after the flesh’ to be broken, merely because they have been consecrated to a further purpose—to bear the weight of, and shadow forth, more glorious promises in a higher heavenly sphere? It cannot be. As truly as ‘Angels, Principalities, and Powers,’—all things in the New Heavens—shall be subordinated to the Spiritual SEED, so truly would it appear that, in the new earth, the natural seed shall hold a corresponding position, and Israel be the first among the “nations

¹ Cf. Ps. xxviii. 1; xxx. 3, 9; xl. 2; xlix. 14, 15; lxix. 15; lxxxviii, 4—8, &c. See also Isa. xxiv. 17—23; xxxviii. 17—19; Ezek. xxxi. 14—17; xxxii. 18—30; Jon. ii. 2—6; Zech. ix. 11, 12; S. Matt. v, 25, 26, &c.

of the saved;”—their deep national repentance,¹ and the fact of their being the first of the nations to acknowledge, and humbly submit themselves to, their returning [382] King, being perhaps the formal cause of their realizing this high, foreordained position.

But we must conclude. We have ventured to offer these latter suggestions with the more freedom, inasmuch as they deal with points (of acknowledged difficulty and mystery) which have never been ruled by the Church, on which there is no real ancient and continuous tradition, and which lie therefore in that debateable territory, wherein individual conjecture has a legitimate sphere of exercise. We believe, moreover, that some mode of interpretation like that we have adopted, is necessary in order to harmonize the older and literal, with the later spiritual, Patristic commentators; to render full justice to each of their systems; and to exhibit the two (with the modern repetitions of each), not as contradictory, but rather as complementary the one to the other.

We will only add (inasmuch as these suggestions have been based upon the Psalter language) that, though the Prophetic student may receive most valuable guidance from the Psalms, by tracing out the several emergencies and triumphs of the Church, as seen reflected in the Songs and Prayers to which these events give rise;—yet, after all, this is not the primary object of the Psalter. Its whole end and scope is pre-eminently devotional and practical. And the former employment of it is desirable, and even legitimate, only so far as it is made subordinate and auxiliary to the latter.

¹ Cf. S. Matt. xxiv. 30; Jer. iii. 21, 22; xxxi. 8, 9; Zech. xii. 10—14; Ps. cxxx.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 18 (Joseph Masters: London, 1856)
 [389] **THE SYMMETRICAL STRUCTURE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE**

The Symmetrical Structure of Scripture; or the Principles of Scripture Parallelism, exemplified in an analysis of the Decalogue, the Sermon on the Mount, and other passages of the Sacred Writings. By the Rev. JOHN FORBES, LL.D., Donaldson's Hospital, Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Clark. 1854.

THE estimate formed of a book of this character will necessarily vary, to a considerable extent, with the habit, tastes, and tone of thought of the reader. While to some, investigations such as those pursued in the present volume will prove at once interesting and suggestive; to others they will present themselves rather in the light of the profitless speculations of an ingenious fancy. We claim to be regarded among the former of these classes. And although we are far from thinking the author of the work before us to have been peculiarly successful in certain of his elaborate exegetical detail, still we are unable to withhold from him our thanks for an instructive and thoughtful volume. It bears traces of extensive and accurate Biblical knowledge. It is written in a calm, reverential, earnest tone; and has evidently been to the author a labour of love. He evinces a becoming eagerness to acknowledge the obligations under which he lies to others, and a corresponding modesty in offering his own private opinions. He is an ingenious and original writer, and though not always convincing, seldom fails to be suggestive: and few can read his book without learning something new, or having their views with regard to the infinite perfection of the Sacred Writings deepened.

The treatise professes to be an application of the principle of "Scripture Parallelism"—first brought into prominent notice (we believe) by Dr Lowth, and subsequently developed by Dr Jebb and other recent writers, English as well as German—to the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount, as well as to other portions of the Old and New Testament.

"Under the powers of this new instrument of investigation, the Sermon on the Mount is shown to be one of the most perfect compositions that can be conceived, not only from the depth of wisdom which it displays, but for the exquisite arrangement of all its parts, which constitute one grand symmetrical whole, while yet each smaller portion is finished with the most consummate skill and minuteness of detail."—Pref. p. 1.

Dr Forbes reasonably anticipates the very obvious objection [390] which is sure to be made *in limine* against investigations such as those which occupy him:—

"The author is fully aware of the preliminary objection which will be taken by many to the artificial character of the arrangements of Scripture given in the following pages. Such extremely minute attention to numbers and order, as is alleged to pervade much of the Holy Scriptures, will repel some minds as a littleness unworthy of the oracles of GOD. The author candidly confesses that, when he first began to remark these niceties of composition, he felt extremely jealous of himself lest he should be allowing his mind to be carried away by the creations of his own fancy, and, instead of humbly following the guidance and teaching of the Spirit, should make the Scriptures speak his own conceits. But the truth has gradually forced itself upon him by its irresistible evidence, and forms only another illustration of the maxim, that GOD'S 'thoughts are not our thoughts, neither are His ways like unto the ways of the children of men.' Yet why should it be thought a thing incredible that a GOD of order should have stamped this impress on the Book of Revelation; and that attention to number, the symbol of order, should characterize His works of Revelation as well as His works of nature?"

We would gladly quote the remainder of this passage, did our space admit of it. Dr Forbes concludes by saying, that

“he has not ventured to publish this first specimen of his inquiries, until he had tested the accuracy of his principles by their application to a great portion of the Sacred Volume, and in some cases even to entire books.”—pp. vii. viii.

Our author begins by explaining the nature of what is termed “Parallelism,” and endeavours to show that, whereas it is the recognized and formal characteristic of Hebrew Poetry, just as rhyme or metre is of modern verse, yet that it is not confined to strictly poetical compositions, nor yet to the Old Testament; but is frequently employed even by our LORD and His Apostles.

He proceeds to illustrate and exemplify the various species of Parallelism. At these we can give but the most cursory glance.

(1.) The first class he styles (after Bishop Jebb) *gradational*¹ parallels, of which the following familiar instance from the lot Psalm may serve as a short and convenient example:—

[391]

“Blessed is the man,
Who bath not *walked* in the counsel of the *ungodly*,
Nor *stood* in the way of *sinner*s,
Nor *sat* in the *seat* of the *scornful*.”

Where the regular ascending gradation of each of the three members in the three consecutive lines will be obvious to all.

(2.) The second class consists of “Parallel lines *antithetic*.”

e.g. “*Faithful* are the *wounds* of a *friend*,
But *deceitful* are the *kisses* of an *enemy*.”

So again: “The *mouth* of the *wise* man is in his *heart*,
But the *heart* of the *fool* is in his *mouth*.”

(3.) Next come “Parallel lines *synthetic* or *constructive*,” in which, the parallelism consists only in the similar form of construction.

e.g. “The *Law* of JEHOVAH is *perfect*—converting the soul;
The *Testimony* of JEHOVAH is *sure*—making wise the simple;
The *Precepts* of JEHOVAH are *right*—rejoicing the heart;
The *Commandment* of JEHOVAH is *pure*—enlightening the eyes.
The *Fear* of JEHOVAH is *clean*—enduring for ever;
The *Judgments* of JEHOVAH are *truth*—they are righteous altogether.”²

¹ Dr. Lowth gave to this class of parallel lines the title of “synonymous;” as intimating that they were but *repetitions* one of another, expressing precisely the same sense in equivalent though different terms. Our author, after Bishop Jebb, properly vindicates Scripture language from the charge of a mere useless tautology, insisting that in all these cues, with the change of language, there is, and is designed to be, a change in meaning—each succeeding line generally forming an advance upon that going before; expressive of some “*gradation* either in the ascending or descending scale.”

² Dr. Forbes gives an example of this kind from S. Paul’s detail of his own labours and sufferings. 2 Cor. xi. 22-27. [Greek]

It is needless to add, what vividness is imparted to this enumeration, by the sort of rhythmical cadence into which the Apostle appears unconsciously to fall.

Our space does not permit us even to allude to the subordinate varieties of these several species of parallelism, or to illustrate the numerous combinations, comprising stanzas of 8, 4, 5, 6, or more lines, which are thereby formed.

(4.) It is interesting to notice, however, how the parallel lines sometimes “answer to one another *alternately*, the 1st to the 3rd; the 2nd to the 4th.”—P. 20.

[392]

e.g. “Fret not thyself because of *evil men*,
Neither be thou envious at the *wicked*;
For there shall be no reward of *evil men*,
The candle of the *wicked* shall be put out.”

Sometimes, in the four-line stanza, the “third line forms a continuous sense with the 1st; and the 4th with the 2nd.”

e.g. “I will make mine arrows drunk *with blood*,
And my sword shall devour flesh;
With the blood of the slain and the captive,
From the heads of the chiefs of the enemy.”—
(Deut. xxxii. 42.)

Or again: “Being darkened in the understanding,
Being alienated from the life of GOD;
Through the ignorance that is in them,
Through the callousness of their heart.”—
(Eph. iv. 18. P. 21.)

In which cases it is at once evident that the 1st and 3rd lines form a continuous sense; the 2nd and the 4th.

Still further. It often happens that the first line is connected with the *last*; the 2nd with the 3rd.

e.g. “Give not that which is holy to the *dogs*,
Neither cast ye your pearls before *swine*;
Lest they [the *swine*] trample them under their feet,
And they [the *dogs*] turn again and rend you.”

(5.) But this last example introduces us to a very interesting form of parallelism which is of common occurrence, especially in the Psalter, viz., the *introverted* parallelism. In this case, says Bishop Jebb, “the stanzas are so constructed, that whatever be the number of lines, the *first* shall be parallel with the *last*; the *second* with the *penultimate*; and so throughout.”¹ Those of our readers who have read Mr. Palmer’s masterly, though wild and unequal, “Dissertations on the Orthodox Communion,” will remember that he endeavours to show, in his last chapter, that this arrangement obtains in the Epistles to the Seven Churches in the Apocalypse. In fact, in this particular instance, there would appear to exist (though Mr.

¹ This arrangement is familiar to musicians under the title ‘Per recte et retro.’ The following may serve as a brief example:

“NO MAN CAN SERVE TWO MASTERS:
For either he will hate the one,
And love the other;
Or else he will hold to the one,
And despise the other.
YE CANNOT SERVE GOD AND MAMMON.”

Palmer does not notice it) an antecedent probability that it should be so. The symbol to which the seven churches are [393] likened is the seven-branched golden candlestick, or rather the “seven golden candlesticks.” Here there would manifestly be a centre branch, and a correspondence between every pair of branches equidistant from the centre. This is a very common arrangement of the No. 7. That it is moreover the arrangement of the seven petitions in our LORD’S perfect form of prayer, we shall hope to notice shortly.

But we are here treading on the interesting question of the symbolism of numbers, on which our author has some sensible remarks. It is impossible for us to follow him in his elaborate analysis of the Sermon on the Mount, the Decalogue, or the longer passages whose construction he examines—in which he is occasionally very felicitous, and occasionally (as it appears to us) equally unsatisfactory. We will confine our attention to two points alone, (each incidentally involving questions of numerical symbolism) viz., *the main division of the Decalogue*, and *the arrangement of the petitions in our LORD’S prayer*.

It is perhaps hardly necessary to make any apology in these pages for assuming, what was universally taken for granted in the early Church, that *numbers* have a language of their own in Holy Scripture. Yet in some quarters such apology seems necessary. “On this subject,” wrote a thoughtful dissenting writer a year or two ago, “I scarce *dare* enter. A belief in mystic numbers too often in these days provokes only a smile.” He proceeds however to fortify himself with the authority of S. Augustine, and adds—“I confess I cannot see, why, if all creation be a type, numbers alone should be excluded as having no signification. But here, as everywhere, the seer is wanted.” “No one,” writes Dr Pusey, “can observe the use of numbers in Holy Scripture, especially in the Old Testament, without being *convinced* that they have some special meaning. . . . This is recognized alike by Jewish, Christian, Heathen antiquity.”

We have frequently had occasion, in this journal, to allude to this interesting subject of inquiry. We must be pardoned, if the points at present under discussion render it necessary for us again to advert to it. We will endeavour to be as brief as possible.

And here, of course, the first number that arrests us is the sacred *seven*, occupying as it does so marked and prominent a position throughout the whole of the Sacred Volume. Nor are we left to mere idle conjecture as to the fundamental idea conveyed by it. The literal meaning of the common Hebrew verb (*nishba*) ‘to swear,’ or ‘bind oneself by solemn engagement,’ is ‘to become *be-sevened*.’ (p. 159.) Hence the leading signification of this number would appear to be that “of a *covenant* or engagement entered into between GOD and His creatures.” For here is the sacred *Three*, the symbol of the Blessed TRINITY, brought into combination with the *four*, which, as is well known, is the ordinary [394] signature of the earth.¹ But as we have referred to this on former occasions, we need not here enlarge upon it. The familiar division of the petitions of the LORD’S Prayer into the three of heaven and the four of earth, may serve as an appropriate illustration.²

But further: as the 3 and 4 *united* make up the covenant number 7; so do the 3 and 4 *multiplied together* (the 4 being in this case, as it were, penetrated by the 3) make up the

¹ On the number *four*, as being the recognized symbol of the perfection of earthly things, see the quotation from S. Augustine and Anastasius of Sinai, in our number for May 1854, page 198.

² It is interesting to observe that, as the *seven* is the ordinary signature of the *covenant*, so the broken or divided seven, $3\frac{1}{2}$, which appears in the Apocalypse in connection with the mystic Babylon and Antichrist, (the latter of whom reigns $3\frac{1}{2}$ years) is plainly the signature of the *broken covenant*.

twelve, or the signature of the “covenant-people, ‘the *midst of whom* the LORD walked and dwelt.’”

“The same idea was designed to be conveyed by the form of the encampment prescribed by Divine appointment to the Israelites . . . in the wilderness. They formed a square, each side of which was composed of three tribes; or, in other words, they formed a *four*, or regularly ordered whole, but which received its distinctive meaning from its interpretation by the *Three*, the symbol of the Deity, which, on whatever side one looked, was that which first met the eye.”—p. 161.

Hence the High Priest, as the representative of the covenant-people, always appeared before the LORD with the 12 precious stones thus significantly arranged on his breast.

And when we come to the new dispensation, we find the same number still speaking the same language. We yet find “the twelve” the representative of the covenant people. First we have the 12 Apostles. Afterwards we find the Church enlarging her borders; and hence, to symbolize as it were her future extension, the first time we hear of her numbers after our LORD’S ascension we still meet the sacred 12—but multiplied, now, by *ten*, (which, as the basis of all *multiplication*, usually symbolizes the idea of numerical extension;) “the number of the names,” we read, “was an *hundred and twenty*” (i.e. 12 x 10.) And yet further: more fully to indicate the Church’s all-embracing Catholicity, we find the elect spoken of as the “sealed” from each of the 12 tribes;—out of each tribe 12,000 (i.e. 12 multiplied by the solid cube of 10)—making altogether 144,000. And in like manner the new Jerusalem, the tabernacle of GOD (“as GOD hath said, I will dwell in them and I will walk in them”) lieth *four-square*; and the measure of the city is 12,000 furlongs; and the wall thereof is 144 (i.e. 12 x 12) cubits; and the wall of the city hath 12 foundations, and 12 gates—“on the east 3 gates, and on the north 3 gates, and on the south 3 gates, and on the west 3 gates.” (Rev. xxi.)

We have stated that the number *ten*, from the fact of its being [395] the basis of numerical multiplication, is the ordinary exponent of the idea of totality, completeness, or perhaps *multitude*.¹

The number *five*, as the imperfect, broken ten, is the ordinary symbol of *incompleteness* or imperfection, looking to another half as its necessary complement.² Our author barely alludes to this number, while touching on the question of numerical symbolism; but as it is a number which has a somewhat important incidental bearing on the subject immediately before us, we must crave the indulgence of our readers while we dwell some little time upon it.

Now this number is commonly recognized by the Fathers as the signature of the *law*. It was an imperfect dispensation, and looked forward to “some better thing.” When “that which

¹ *Ten*, according to Mr. Isaac Williams “is a mystical number in Scripture; the *complete aggregate* of individuals; itself like unity brought back to unity; the foundation, too, of indefinite multiplication.”—*Apocalypse*, page 29.

“Ten,” writes Dr. Forbes, “is the symbol of completeness, since it closes the series of fundamental numbers, and contains in itself, as it were, the germ of all numbers; the rest being but a repetition of the first ten, and a further development of them.” Thus, he continues: “the Commandments by being ten in number, are thereby indicated to be a complete whole; and as they evidently relate to man’s duty both to His GOD and to his fellow-men, are intended to form a perfect summary of religious and moral duty.”—p. 140.

² “*Five* speaks of what is *imperfect*: ten is a perfect number, indicating indefinite multitude; but five, as half the same, is of incompleteness and deficiency.”—*Williams*

was *perfect* should come,” then “that which was *in part* should be done away.” The Law looked forward to the Gospel as its necessary complement.

And fast it is to be noticed that the law was actually the *fifth* day, or dispensational era of the world. The *first* day saw man in blissful communion with his Maker in Paradise.

After the dark night of the fall, the *second* day dawned with GOD’S Covenant-promise to our first parents, that the woman’s seed should ultimately vanquish the serpent seducer.

After the flood followed the *third* day, opening with GOD’S new Covenant with Noah.

Then ensued the *fourth* or Patriarchal day, ushered in with the more explicit Covenant to Abraham, limiting the promises made to the Seed, to one particular line.

Next in order came the *fifth* day, or Law, extending from Moses to CHRIST.

With the birth of the Son of Man the *sixth* day dawned. “In the *sixth* day,” (writes S. Augustine, Serm. 269,) “we are now living. And as man was originally formed on the sixth day in the Image of GOD, so in this, the sixth age of the world, are we renewed in Baptism, that we may again be made to bear the Image of our Creator.”

“After the sixth day is past,” (continues S. Aug.,) “the *day of rest* shall ensue, and the Saints shall enjoy their *Sabbath*, [“[Greek]—Heb. iv. 9.]

[396]

“And after the seventh, we enter that life whereof it is written, ‘Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,’ &c. Then we return to the beginning (caput). For even as [in the natural week] after the seven days have passed, the *eighth* is the same as the *first*, so after the seven eras of transitory time have terminated, we return to that blessed immortality whence man originally fell.”¹

The law, then, is the *fifth* day. Its charter is the Pentateuch, or five Books of Moses; even as the Psalter, the manual of praise and prayer for GOD’S Israel has in like manner always been divided into five books.²

¹ There is a singular inconsistency in Augustine’s distribution of these several “*days*,” which is worth noticing, as it appears to have been followed, as far as we have seen, (with more or less diversity of detail,) by all writers who have referred to this subject. We mean his meaning the “*first day*” to extend from Adam to Noah, and being compelled in consequence, in order to bring the present “*day*” to the *sixth* place, to divide the period from Abraham to CHRIST into three eras. But, to mention no other objection, if, “*octavus ipse est qui primus*,” on what principle can the everlasting Octave, the ineffable bliss of Heaven, be typified by a state of lawlessness and iniquity which necessitated a universal deluge? Whereas if the “*first day*” embraces, and *only* embraces (as unquestionably is the case) the happy, short-lived period in Paradise, then “*octavus ipse est qui primus*” has some intelligible meaning. And the beautiful idea of a “*Paradise restored*,” and restored with untold “*interest*,” comes out with due force. The “*second day*,” it will be remembered, extending from the Fall to the Flood, will thus correspond with that particular day of creation which was characterized by this mysterious mark,—that it alone, of all the days, received no blessing.

While on this point we may just add that our author will perhaps see from what has been advanced, that there *is* a specific and interesting symbolical meaning attaching to the number 8 (the octave) which he has strangely missed, (pp. 208, 209.) *The repetition (viz.) of the first, as a higher phase*, thus typifying *re-generation, re-creation, &c.*; of which the eighth Beatitude furnishes so beautiful an example. The *first* blessing and the *eighth* are alike, “The kingdom of heaven,”—the flower and the fruit,—begun in time, developed and consummated in eternity.

² The divisions are distinctly marked by the Doxologies; the order being as follows:—Psalms i—xli.; xlii.—lxxii.; lxxiii.—lxxxix.; xc.—cvi.; cvii.—cl. Dr. Forbes endeavours to show that the fifth book is plainly divisible into three parts, e.g., Psalms cvii.—cxvii.; cxviii.—cxxxv.; cxxxvi.—cl., thus making the division of the whole Psalter a seven-fold rather than a five-fold one. Be this latter subdivision real or not, {cont.}

We have said that the Fathers commonly recognize this number as the symbol of the law. Thus when David chooses his “*five* smooth stones” out of the brook, wherewith to attack Goliath, “it is the *law* of GOD that he takes,” writes S. Augustine. “*Prefiguratur enim Lex quinario et denario numero.*” (Serm. xxxii. in Psalm 143.) In like manner does he explain the Pool of Bethesda. “The *five* porches,” he writes, “are the law. But wherefore did not the five porches heal the impotent folk enclosed within them? Because, ‘had there been a law given which could have given life, righteousness had been by the law.’ Wherefore then did the porches contain those whom they could not heal? Because the Scripture *conclussit omnes sub peccato,*” &c. Tr. xvii. in Johan. c.5.)

So again, of the *five* brethren of Dives, who, not believing Moses [397] and the Prophets, would still remain incredulous even though ONE should rise from the dead,—he tells us that, the “*Jewish people under the law* were thereby signified.” (Enar. in Pa xlix.)

S. Ambrose in like manner explains the “*five* husbands” of the Samaritan woman (S. John iv. 18) as the law to which she as the representative of her people had hitherto professed allegiance.¹ (vid S. Amb. in Luc. xiv. 21; xx. 28) The Samaritans, it will be remembered, received only the five Books of Moses.

It will be borne in mind also that when our Lord miraculously fed the *Jewish* (as distinguished from the Gentile) multitude, we have the signature of the law characteristically appearing—the “*five* thousand,” the “*five* loaves,” (*barley* loaves, moreover—barley being a well known type of the law.)

So when S. Paul warns us against the sins of Israel of old, he represents them (as being violations of God’s law) as *five*-fold, viz., lust, idolatry, fornication, tempting of God, murmuring, (vid. 1 Cor. 1.6-10.) Even as our Lord, when He re-enunciates in the Sermon on the Mount, the precepts of the Divine law, rescuing them from the carnal glosses of the Scribes and Pharisees, and opening out their true spiritual and all embracing significance, as though to preserve their characteristic signature, distributes them under *five* heads, as will be seen by the five times recurring expression, “*Ye have heard* that it hath been said,” &c.² Thus again when our LORD foretells the disruptions and divisions which His Gospel would introduce into the Jewish polity, He tells that the “*five*” in the “household” [i.e., of Israel] “shall be divided, three against two, and two against three.” Nor is the suggestion of S. Irenæus unworthy of notice, that when our LORD revealed Himself in glory on the mount to the “law and the prophets,” in the persons of Moses and Elijah, He revealed Himself before five witnesses, the three Apostles and the two visitants from the other world. (S. Iren. Lib. ii. c. 42.)³

it still must not interfere with the universally received tradition which establishes the former five-fold arrangement.

¹ S. Augustine refers in this passage to the *five senses*; telling us that the woman had hitherto only served the flesh. For this is another common patristic explanation of the number *five*, the five senses being the means whereby the soul holds converse with, and receives impressions from the external world,—in awful correlation to which the Church has ever devoutly contemplated the five ghostly Wounds on the Cross.

² On the rationale, so to speak, of our Blessed LORD’S selection of these five precepts (three only of which appear in the Decalogue) the embodiment of the whole spirit of the second table, and as thereby leading us on, as though to their necessary complement, to the fulfilment of the whole law,—our author has some very valuable and suggestive remarks.

³ S. Cyril’s explanation of that number in S. John xxi. 11, which has exercised the ingenuity of so many of the ancient commentators, is worthy a passing notice. We allude to the 153 great fishes caught by the
{cont.}

Look also at the Tabernacle itself. Here we find ten curtains coupled together, *five* and *five*. (Ex. xxvi. 3.) So, the veil for the entrance into the holy place hung on *five* pillars, in *five* sockets of brass. (ib. 36, 37.)¹

Again, the altar of burnt-offering was *five* cubits long and *five* broad, (its height three cubits.) The length of the court of the Tabernacle was one hundred cubits, the breadth “fifty everywhere,” and the height five cubits, (Ex. xxvii. 18.) In like manner the redemption money of the first-born was “*five shekels apiece*,” impressed, as it were, with the symbol of imperfection, to point to a more real and perfect redemption yet to come. Again, in Solomon’s temple we find the molten sea five cubits in height. We meet with ten lavers on ten bases, five on the right side of the house, five on the left. In like manner the golden candlesticks before the oracle, five on the right side and five on the left. (2 Chron. iv. 6—8; also 1 Kings vii. 23, 39, 49.)

We alluded just now to S. Augustine’s explanation of the five smooth stones wherewith David smote Goliath. May we not trace a like mystical reference in another incident in his history, when he calls upon GOD’S High Priest and asks for bread? He inquires for “*five loaves*,” (1 Sam. xxi. 3.) What is this but a symbol of the “man after GOD’S own heart” esteeming the *law* of GOD as “his necessary food?” “Thy words were found and I did eat them.”

I. But to come to our immediate point—the Decalogue itself. *What was the original division* of the Ten Commandments? We are not now inquiring what division of them the Christian Church, under the teaching of the Spirit, may adopt, in pressing them in their full spiritual import upon her children, but what *was* the division of them when they were originally written by the finger of GOD upon the two tables of stone?

It appears to us that what has already been advanced may serve to show that there is a strong *antecedent* probability that the divi-[399]sion advocated (we believe with reason) in the volume before us, maintained also by Professor Hengstenberg and other learned

seven Apostles at that mysterious fishing scene on the Sea of Tiberias. That the whole narrative is instinct with deep spiritual and prophetic significance is admitted by all. We see a picture of the mighty work the Church has yet to accomplish in the world,—but not yet,—not till the “night” has passed; for the scene takes place “in the *morning*.”

What then signifies this number—this *hundred* and *fifty* and *three*—in reference to the “shoals” hereafter to be gathered into the Apostolic net?

The *hundred*, says S. Cyril, (i.e., 10x10, the symbol of indefinite multitude, multiplied into itself,) signifies the vast concourse of the Gentile world that shall be saved, “the *fulness* of the *Gentiles*” who have yet to “*come in*.” (“Centenarius significat plenitudinem Gentium intraturam in rete Petri et Ecclesiæ.”)

The *fifty*, (i.e., 5x10, the symbol of the *law* into the symbol of *multitude*,) signifies “*all Israel*” who “shall be saved.” (Rom. xi. 26.)

Whereas the *three*, the symbol of Deity, “representat mysterium S. Trinitatis in cuius fide et cultu, tam *hi* quam *illi* congregantur et salvantur.” (Lib. xii., c. 63; vid. *Corn. à Lap.* in loc.)

Thus the signature of Israel stands intermediate between that of the Gentile world and that of GOD; as though Israel were to be instrumental in bringing the “nations” to the faith of GOD, and under the yoke of His Church. “If the fall of them be the riches of the *world*, and the diminishing of them the riches of the *Gentiles*, *how much more* shall their fulness be?” “GOD shall bless *us*, [i.e., Israel,] and *all the ends of the world* shall fear Him.”

¹ When we reach the Holy of Holies, however, the type of “some better thing,” this number disappears. Here we meet the Evangelical, or Ecumenical *four*. The veil hung on four pillars in four sockets of silver, (v. 31, 32.)

Biblical students, is correct; the division, namely, which assigns *five commandments to each table*.

But first, for external testimony. What say the ancient Jews? [Moses] “presented to them,” says Josephus, “two tables, with the Ten Commandments engraven thereon; *on each table five* [Greek] written with the finger of GOD.” (Ant. lib. c. 5, sect. 18.)

In like manner Philo, “He distributed the commandments which were ten in number, into two *divisions of five each*, ([Greek]) which He engraved on two tables. The former *Pentad* embraced the primary precepts, the latter contained the secondary ones. The *first* table treats concerning the unity of GOD, . . . concerning images, concerning profane swearing, concerning the sanctification of the seventh day, concerning the reverence due to parents. . . . So that it begins with GOD the FATHER and Framer of the universe, and closes with our parents who resemble Him in their measure, in being *authors of life*. The *second* table consists entirely of interdictions. [It prohibits] adultery, murder, theft, false-witness, covetousness.”¹

Irenæus bears testimony also to the same division. “Unaquaque tabula quam accepit [Moses] a Deo præcepta habebat *quinque*.” (Ubi sup.)

Nor are the internal reasons for this division less worthy of notice. The first table, we know, has reference more immediately to GOD, whereas the second embraces our duty to our neighbour. It is not a little significant then to find (as Dr Forbes reminds us) that in each of the first *five* commandments we meet with the expression, “THE LORD THY GOD,” (occurring once in each, and only once); in none of the last five.

Again, what is the summary of the second table with which our LORD furnishes us? “Thou shalt *love thy neighbour as thyself*.” But

“none of the terms here employed apply to the fifth commandment. The idea uniformly attached in Scripture to the word translated ‘neighbour,’ is that of *fellow, companion, equal*. But our parents are not our *neighbours or equals*, but our *superiors*. Again, the sentiment with which we are ordered in this commandment to regard them is not that of ‘*love*,’ but of ‘*honour*.’ We are called upon not merely to love them ‘as ourselves,’ that is, as our *equals*, but to ‘*honour*’ them as our superiors set over us by the LORD.—P. 142.

In fact our author seems undoubtedly right in classing the first five commandments under the general head, “The Law of *Piety*;” the filial reverence due to our earthly parents, the “*piety at home*”[400] ([Greek]) to which S. Paul refers, (1 Tim. v. 4,) being the Divinely appointed type and earthly manifestation of that higher reverential love due to “our FATHER in heaven.” The first table then tells us that (i.) GOD claims our love and honour as the one sole object of our worship; further, (ii.) that He wills to be revered, not by our spirit only, but by our bodies also, and while worshipped, to be worshipped in a particular manner; (iii.) that He will be honoured with our lips, in all revelations of Himself, in everything whereon He has placed His Name, or wherein His Name can be named by us; (iv.) that He will be honoured in the honour paid to His positive *ordinances*; and (v.) in the reverence bestowed on His earthly *representatives*. Thus “the fifth commandment,” says Philo, “while it is the last of the 1st Pentad which treats of our duty to GOD, forms as it were the link to the 2nd, which treats of our duty to man. And for this reason. The nature of parents is, as it were, a border nature between the mortal and the immortal. It is mortal, from its relationship to man and the other animals; immortal, from its faculty of producing its own likeness, in which it resembles GOD, the Parent of all. . . .

¹ See the “Treatise on the Decalogue.” (Op. t. ii. pp. 188, 189. Ed. Mangey, London, 1742.)

Parents moreover are able to confer benefits on those who have it in their power to make no like return.” He goes on to speak of piety, whether towards GOD or man, as the queen of virtues. “Nor can the man who fails in piety towards his parents whom he can see, cultivate piety towards Him whom he cannot see.” (*De Decal.* pp. 198-201.)¹

With regard to the division of the Decalogue adopted by S. Augustine (probably from the Masorites) and after him, by the Church of Rome—which assigns three commandments to the first table, and seven to the second; joining the first two commandments into one, and dividing the tenth into two—it appears demonstrably untenable: nor, in fact, has it anything to recommend it save this alone, (which appears to have suggested it) that it adopts a division of the number ten, which is by no means uncommon in Holy Scripture. Thus, the only reason assigned by S. Augustine for his arrangement of the Decalogue appears to be this *à priori* reason, that as the first table relates to GOD, so it ought to be marked with the signature of the TRINITY, and embrace three commandments, thus leaving seven for the second table (vid. *Ques.* 71 in *Exod.*; also Ep. lv. cap. xi.) But

1. First, a word with regard to the separation of the tenth commandment into two. That this division is purely arbitrary, is self-evident. So little did Origen conceive of it as admissible, that he maintains that, whereas certain persons are for uniting the first and second commandments into one; this can never be admitted, [401] because “if so, *the number of the ten commandments will not be completed,*” (in *Exod.* xx. *Hom.* 8.)

For, that neither of the introductory clauses of the tenth commandment can possibly stand by itself, to serve for the ninth, is evident from the simple fact (often referred to) that on the two occasions when the Decalogue was proclaimed, *these two clauses were transposed.* Thus the tenth commandment in *Exod.* xx. begins: “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s *house*; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s *wife*;” and in *Deut.* v., “Neither shalt thou desire thy neighbour’s *wife*; neither shalt thou covet thy neighbour’s *house*;”—this significant change being apparently introduced as a plain Divine intimation of *the intentional connection under one head* of these two clauses: as is unequivocally evidenced also, even from the New Testament, where the two are simply classed under one comprehensive title, “Thou shalt not *covet.*”

Moreover, as the fourth commandment which treats of the observance of the seventh day is impressed on the very face of it with the *covenant number, seven*: “Thou, thy son, thy daughter, thy manservant, thy maidservant, thy cattle, thy stranger:” so is the tenth commandment, which closes the Decalogue, similarly impressed, reminding the chosen people with its last words, that they are not their own, but the LORD’S. “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s *house*, thy neighbour’s *wife*, his *manservant*, his *maidservant*, his *ox*; his *ass*, nor *anything* that is thy neighbour’s.” But this characteristic mark is, of course, lost, when the commandment is arbitrarily split up into two.

2. And as there is every reason for not *dividing* the tenth commandment, so is there every reason for not *joining* the first and second.

We have already remarked that there is a fundamental distinction between the two ideas of, the *Being* whom (and whom alone) we are to worship, and the *mode* in which that Being chooses to be worshipped. In both these respects did Israel again and again rebel; (i.) in

¹ Since the above was in type we have found that this fivefold arrangement of the tables of the Decalogue has been defended with considerable ability (on the ground of its being the original arrangement) by Dr. Kalisch, in his recent learned work on the Book of Exodus. (Longman, 1855.)

worshipping *false Gods*, as Baal, &c.; and (ii.) in worshipping the True GOD in *an interdicted manner*, under similitudes of various kinds, as (e.g.) the golden calves,—this latter phase of idolatry, be it remembered, being *the specific sin* for which Israel was cut off.

Moreover, nothing is more obvious than that in the first three commandments there is a plain and manifest reference to the Three Persons of the HOLY TRINITY.

As the *first* has an evident relation to “the FATHER of an infinite Majesty:” so has the *second*, to Him by Whom the FATHER has been manifested to us, and through Whom alone we are to worship the FATHER—“the *image* of the invisible GOD”—the Co-eternal SON—the one, only representation and embodiment of Deity, “GOD manifest in the Flesh,” “CHRIST the Image of GOD.” And as plainly, has the *third*, reference to the Third Person, the Eternal SPIRIT, by whom we have been named with the Sacred Name of [402] GOD;—Who “spake by the Prophets;” and through Whose Holy Inspiration alone it is that the ‘things of GOD’ can be clothed in human language, and the Ineffable and Incomprehensible One can be named by us.’¹

And in striking antithetic correspondence we find (as we have shown in a former number of this journal) that the sins of the people of Anti-Christ are represented as threefold. 1st. They “worship the *Beast*” instead of the FATHER: 2nd. They worship his “*Image*”—the Image of the Beast, instead of the Image of GOD, the Eternal SON: and 3rd, they are marked with his *Name*; branded on their right hands and foreheads with his mystic signature. But we have not space to pursue this subject further.

The question before us has simply been, what *was* the *original* division of the Decalogue? Into the further inquiry, what *is* the division which should now be practically adopted, we do not propose to enter. The *glossator* on Irenæus says that, though according to the *Jewish* division the fifth commandment belonged to the first table, according to the Christian division it belongs to the second. Nor can there be any doubt but that our common division is that for which there is the far greatest amount of authority in the early Church.²

The single question of interest which in any way hinges upon the inquiry (at least as far as regards our own Communion) is the question concerning the nature of parental authority—whether it is to be viewed as coming within the scope of our reverential duty to GOD in His Representatives, or rather, of the more familiar and unrestrained duty towards our neighbours. It *may* perhaps be that, since “the kindness and love of God the FATHER have been manifested towards us by Jesus CHRIST,” the altered position of the commandment may be a kind of tacit intimation of the more endearing, the less distant and awful light in which we are now encouraged to regard “our FATHER” than was permitted to those under the former covenant; and therefore of some corresponding relaxation—less of restrained awe, more of affectionate familiarity—in our intercourse with our earthly parents.

We are not able to follow our Author in his minute analysis of the structure of the Decalogue. His arrangement of it appears to us ingenious: but as its discussion would

¹ It is singular that the division adopted by S. Augustine with the view of preserving (as he thought) the signature of the TRINITY, should have the very effect of obliterating that sacred impress which according to the true division is so plainly discernible.

² The Latin division, according to Ger. Joh. Vossius (“*De Divisione Decalogi*,”) is opposed to that of “*all*, or *almost all* the Fathers, Greek and Latin, who lived before Augustine, and of numbers, especially among the Greeks, who flourished since his time.” (“*Theses Theologicæ*, pp. 338—364.)

involve more space than we have at our disposal, we must leave it for the study of those who are interested in investigations of this character.

[403]

2. To the Sermon on the Mount, Dr Forbes next proceeds; entering upon an elaborate examination of its structure, and the mutual relationship of its parts.¹ He draws out at great length the parallelism between the seven petitions in the Christian's prayer, and the heptad of Beatitudes. As we brought this interesting parallel before our readers' notice on a former occasion,² we need not again advert to it; save only to remark, that this independent recognition of it from a different quarter (even although Dr Forbes differs from us in certain matters of detail) serves to attest the existence and reality of the harmony itself—a harmony first noticed, we believe, by S. Augustine. We cannot, however, dismiss the subject altogether without adverting, as we proposed, to one or two of the structural features which characterise our LORD'S Prayer.

We noticed while touching on the subject of "*introverted* parallel lines," that *one* of the common Scriptural arrangements of the number seven, was that exhibited by the familiar emblem of the seven-branched candlestick. We say, *one* of the arrangements; for those who have examined the subject will not need to be told that this number, like most of the mystic numbers, admits of several arrangements. Thus a very common division of it is into *six* and *one*; pointing to the six days of Creation and the sabbatical rest. "The number six," (writes Mr. Williams,) "is of *man* on the sixth day created; of Adam in whom 'all die,' without the *seventh* of sanctification; the *creature* without the *rest* of GOD . . . of man in self-sufficiency without Christ." And hence, this number *intensified*, as it were, and expanded as though to form a sort of *human* counterfeit of the Trinity—6 6 6—becomes the number of Anti-Christ (whose "number is the number of man,") the "man of sin." Another not unfrequent division of the seven (especially in the Psalter) is 5 and 2. But the most symmetrical, and as our Author maintains, far the most common division of this number is the following, 3.1.3:—a centre unit, like the centre branch of the candlestick, with a triplet on either side; the two triplets having some mutual correspondence; bearing either a direct, or inverted, parallelism one to the other. In our LORD'S Prayer the parallelism appears to be of the latter kind. The petitions have their origin in the unfathomable abyss of goodness—"the waters which are above the Heavens,"—the Author of all Good. From Him they descend, by little and little, through Heaven to earth; gradually converging and contracting, till they reach, in the centre, the very petitioner himself, and touch upon the present moment of time and its needs. No sooner is the creature introduced than he is seen surrounded by evil; evil within him and without him; evil gradually intensifying [404] and diverging, in antithetical correlation with the fore-mentioned good, till it closes with the Author of evil; the Evil One. The whole structure of the Prayer is not a little singular and artificial.

[Greek]

Now here let us notice the following structural peculiarities.

¹ While our Author throws valuable incidental light upon particular passages in the Sermon, we cannot think his general arrangement of it—as to the progressive sequence of its subjects and their mutual relation—satisfactory. We may possibly return to this question on some future occasion.

² φ Dykes's review 'The Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes', pp. 118 *supra*.

1. The number of petitions is sevenfold. The Prayer bears upon its front the signature of GOD'S covenant. It is impressed with the 3 of Heaven, and the 4 of earth:¹ "GOD reconciled with the world."

2. The particular arrangement, however, of these numbers is 3, 1, 3. In other words, we have a *central petition*, enclosed on either side by a *triplet*. We have the suppliant, who appears in the centre clause, asking for the needs of the present hour—that Bread which connects him with Heaven, and that bread which connects him with earth—hemmed in, as it were, between two worlds; enclosed within two mighty spheres of attraction: an abyss of good above him, an abyss of evil beneath him; a "mystery of godliness" and a "mystery of iniquity:" himself "willing to do good," but having "evil ever present with him."

3. We have then two divisions in the Prayer, connected by a central petition.

(i.) In the *former* of these divisions—rather in the *body* of it (omitting the introduction and conclusion)—we meet the signa-[405]ture of the *Covenant-people*; the sacred 12; *three* petitions, each containing *four* words: these twelve, giving us the outward expression of the very *heart* of the Body and Bride of CHRIST, "the Tabernacle of the Most High," in its ideal and perfected condition. In them we find a voice given to the very "stones" of the "Temple of GOD." From them, as they ascend in three-fold cadence, (like the thrice-repeated "Holy") we learn what it is which constitutes the very being and essence of the "Holy People"—the hallowing of that *Name* which is in and upon all; the extension and development of that *Kingdom* of which there shall be no end; the entire conformity of all will to the One *Will*.

(ii.) In the *latter* division, we no longer meet "the LORD in His Holy Habitation," but the *creature*; and not only so, but the creature surrounded with *evil*. Here therefore we find each petition significantly impressed with the number *six*; the meaning of which we have already briefly hinted at. We have a triplet of sixes.

4. We have stated above, that the two triplets of petitions are in inverted parallelism one to the other. Thus

(i) The 3rd and 5th petitions are plainly seen to be parallel; each having a dependent clause attached to it (consisting of 7 words, and commencing with the adverb [Greek].) Both the one and the other allude to the confluence of man's will on earth with GOD'S will in Heaven. But we meet with the following antithesis. In the former case we pray that what is done on *earth* may respond to what is done in *Heaven*: in the latter, that what is done in *Heaven* may respond to what is done on *earth*. Hence the latter petition presupposes, and

¹ "The Beatitudes," says our Author, "are divided into 4 and 3, beginning with man and man's wants, and ending with GOD and GOD'S fulness. The Christian Prayer, on the contrary, is divided into 3 and 4, beginning with GOD and His Glory as the first and highest object to be contemplated in prayer; second and subordinate to which must be the petitions for the supply of our own wants, however pressing." —P. 190.

This observation is interesting and valuable. It appears, therefore, that in the formation of *character* we must begin from the negative, or receptive, side of Christian perfection, and ascend thence to the positive. We must first learn poverty of spirit, meekness, Godly sorrow, hunger and thirst after Righteousness; then we shall be fit to exhibit the *positive* and *God-like* graces of the Christian—*mercy, purity, active beneficence* or "*peace-making*." When we have thus ascended from the 4 to the 3, and the whole character in its seven-fold perfection is realized in us, then—and not till then—shall we be worthy to be "*persecuted* for Righteousness' sake." In *prayer* however, this order of progression is reversed. We must first have our faith strengthened by the contemplation of GOD'S love and power; our souls raised by desire for His Glory;—and *then* we shall be qualified to prefer, with confidence, the petitions for ourselves.

is based upon, the actual fulfilment *in ourselves* (to some extent) of the former one. The former prays that GOD'S Will *may* be wrought, as everywhere, so *in us*. The latter pleads, that in one respect this will *has been* wrought in us. *We are* (in our poor measure) "merciful, even as our FATHER in Heaven is merciful:" as then we are merciful to others, may GOD extend mercy to us. Through His grace preventing us, we have striven *to do as He does*. May *He now do as we do*. *We* forgive others on earth: may He forgive us in Heaven.

(ii.) In like manner are the 2nd and 6th petitions related; the one, however, referring to the realms of light, the other to the realms of darkness;—the former supplicating for the Advent of the Kingdom of Glory, the latter deprecating whatever may hinder our sharing in that Kingdom. They both alike have a present as well as a future bearing. In the *Kingdom of Grace* alone is there security from *temptation*. Satan has been expelled from Heaven. So long therefore as we maintain our position in this Kingdom (even in its present undeveloped stage) and abide in those "Heavenly Places" to which we have been exalted by Christ, so long every temptation *must* be but a means of grace; and the "endurance" of it but an augmentation of "blessedness" (S. James i. 12.). Before [406] Satan can harm us, he must persuade us voluntarily to "throw ourselves down" from our high position in the "Temple of GOD," and so bring ourselves within the boundaries of *his* own dominions. Entering, thus, a region where he is *king*, we throw ourselves into his power. Quitting the borders of the "Kingdom of Heaven," and visiting the world, the "Prince of the World" becomes our recognized master, and *has* sway over us: we are defenceless against his temptations.

But let us turn to the future. "The Kingdom of Heaven" is yet "*within us*." The day of its *manifestation* has yet to appear. And what does the apocalyptic seer represent as being the correlative occurrence in the kingdom of darkness, to the visible inauguration of the Kingdom of Glory? "I saw thrones; and they sat upon them . . . and they lived and reigned with CHRIST." Here is the fulfilment of the prayer, "Thy Kingdom come." And how does S. John proceed to describe the events in the other kingdom? "I saw an Angel descend from Heaven . . . and he laid hold of that old Serpent which is the Devil, and bound him a thousand years, *that he should not deceive the nations* any more until the thousand years should be fulfilled; and after that, he must be loosed for a season." Three times it is stated in this brief glimpse of the visible setting, up of CHRIST'S Kingdom, that during this period (whatever this period may be—into which we are not now inquiring) Satan's *seducing* power shall be crushed, his temptations entirely suspended. "The whole earth shall be at rest." The [Greek] shall have come. There shall be a glorious manifestation to Angels, Principalities, and Powers, of the effects of the Incarnation, "Peace on earth—good will to men." Thus, literally, the cessation of *temptation* is the one marked consequent upon the "coming of the *Kingdom*."

(iii.) But "the *end* is not yet." The Everlasting Octave has not yet dawned. Even the *seventh day*, together with the preceding six, has its evening.¹ *Evil*, though suspended, is not extirpated. Satan, prior to his everlasting overthrow and the universal judgment of [Greek], is loosed "for a little season." His *instruments* have, one by one, been vanquished. The slimy

¹ In one sense the "seventh day" *has* no "evening." It has no evening to the "Blessed and Holy" ones "who have part in the first resurrection," on whom "the second death has no power," and whose bliss, first realized in body and soul on the morning of the seventh day, shall but go on expanding [Greek] (Eph. iii. 21). It is to the wicked alone that this day has an evening; and a very dread evening; the eve of Everlasting Death.

serpent; the “*Angels* that kept not their first estate;” *Sodom*; *Egypt*; the carnal *Jerusalem*; and lastly, *Anti-Christ*, in whose crowning temptation all previous phases of temptation have been recapitulated; which is therefore designated (in the *sixth* Apocalyptic Epistle, which specifically alludes to it) as “THE *Temptation* which shall come upon all the world to try them that dwell on the earth;”—[407] that dread masterpiece of temptation (the several elements of which have been long in secret preparation) which closes this *sixth* day of the world, and ushers in the peaceful reign of the saints—all, all are now past and gone; the Beast and False Prophet long since confined to the burning lake. But the Evil One still exists. Bound, incarcerated, his *final* “judgment” still “lingers.” He has still to be everlastingly vanquished in his Own Person. At the evening of the seventh day, the solemn vigil of Eternity, Himself appears upon the stage; “having great wrath;” “knowing that his time is short.” The whole of this scene is so replete with profound mystery that we forbear to comment upon it. That the “nations” who, so long untempted, have enjoyed the peaceful reign of the “Saints of the Most High,” should yet, in great numbers, take part with him¹ in this his final attack upon the “kingdom”—quite passes the bounds of our comprehension (cf. Isa. xxvi. 10). It only shows us how weak, even in its best estate, is the creature if left to [408] itself. It shows us, further, that *freedom from temptation* and *deliverance from evil* are by no means the *same*. Temptation may be suspended; and the germ of evil lie long undeveloped; but if not finally eradicated, circumstances may yet call it into action. Thus then, at the close of the seventh day, “Satan shall be loosed, and shall go out to deceive the nations And they went up, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the

¹ The only parallel to this would be the case of our first parents in Paradise, between whose condition and that of the untempted nations of the earth during the seventh day there would appear to be (whether as regards the physical condition of the earth, the revealed Presence of the Deity, the freedom from sin and misery,) a marked correspondence. The very *day* is the same: in both cases alike it is GOD’S *Sabbath* (cf. Heb. iv. 4,5,9.) The punishment to those who yield to the temptation also, is the same—expulsion from Paradise.

And as the first and seventh days correspond, as well in their concluding catastrophe as in the temptation itself and the subjects of that temptation, so do the *second* and *sixth*. Both of these terminate with a purgatorial *Deluge*—the one of water, the other of fire. In the former case there had been an illicit *confusion* between Heaven and earth—“between the sons of GOD and the daughters of men.” The *giants* were born; and “the earth filled with violence.” In the latter case the same unholy *confusion* is spiritually realized. The mystic Babylon rears her head on high. There is an impious commixture between the Church and the world; the woman and the beast; the lamb and the dragon. The great [Greek] (or [Greek]—the “Man of the Earth,” Ps. x. 20) is thence generated; and the whole earth again “filled with violence.”

The specific temptation of the *third* day (the day of the Noahitic Covenant) was the “Lust of the Flesh,” which came to a head, and was awfully visited, in the cities of the Plain. But “the *flesh* lusteth against the spirit.” *Sodom*, therefore, and *Jerusalem* are antithetical. Hence the temptation of the *fifth* day (which is in inverse parallelism with the *third*) is the abuse of *spiritual* privileges; which was visited in the tremendous catastrophe upon the Holy City and whole Jewish Polity. Of the former of these two visitations the Apostle writes, “even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them, giving themselves over to fornication and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire,” (S. Jude 7). Of the *latter* the Prophet writes, “The punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown as in a moment.*” (Lam. iv. 6.)

And thus we reach the *central*, the *fourth* or Patriarchal day; during which we find the “seed” brought down into *Egypt* and ground down under the tyranny of the *world*; the day closing with the signal catastrophe upon the hosts of Egypt and their King. Here is our great central enemy—the *world* and its Prince—that “world,” the personified Adversary of “the FATHER”—the present stage of all our temptations, whether “the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life.” This is the true halting-place and culminating point in the history of temptation; having Sodom on the one side, the false Jerusalem on the other. The descent of the “Seed” from Paradise to Egypt; its recovery to the restored Paradise; and the final destruction of Egypt and its King;—here is the burden of Scripture.

Beloved City: and fire came down from GOD out of Heaven and devoured them. And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the Beast and the False Prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever.” (Rev. xx. 7—10.) And with this final and everlasting destruction of *evil* and the *Evil One*, shall ensue the consummated and eternal glory of the Re-deemed. “Delivered” *for ever* “from the bondage of corruption;” every vestige of the curse removed; “all creation shall be brought into the glorious liberty of the children of GOD.” And thus, the correlation between the first and seventh petitions of our LORD’S Prayer becomes manifest. For not till the final “*Deliverance from all evil*,” shall the “*Name*” of the *Triune God* be perfectly “*hallowed*.” When evil is for ever put down, when the SON hath vanquished every enemy, and especially the last Enemy, Death, and “Him that had the power of death,”—then shall the SON “deliver up,” i.e. present in its glorious and consummated perfection, “the kingdom to the FATHER, that GOD may be all in all.”

As for the obvious connection between these two petitions (the first and the last) in the sphere of practical conduct, it need hardly be dwelt on. It is at once manifest that as we have been baptized *into* the Name of the All-Holy, and that Name is upon us, all *evil* in *us* is so much *dishonour* done to *Him*; every “defilement” to the “Temple of GOD,” an indignity done to Him that dwelleth therein; and therefore that this “Name” will only *then* be fully “hallowed” in us, when we are “delivered from *every* evil work.”¹

[409]

¹ We have been gratified to find the view here taken of the general arrangement of the petitions in our LORD’S Prayer corroborated by Mr. Palmer (*Diss. on the Orth. Comm.*, pp. 323—4 ;) and the more so, as we were unaware of the fact until we had traced it out independently for ourselves. We quote Mr. Palmer’s words.

“To those who have noticed the correspondence or analogy which exists between nature and revelation, it will be no new thing to be told, that there is often discoverable in spiritual things a regular symmetry, or proportion, or harmony of measured parts or numbers, answering to the symmetry, proportion, and harmony of numbers, lines, sounds, colours, and the like, in the material world. So the seven petitions of the LORD’S Prayer form a symmetrical whole, which may be represented by writing them in seven parallel lines, thus:—

H a l l o w e d b e T h y N a m e
 T h y k i n g d o m c o m e
 Thy Will be done in earth, *as it is in Heaven*.
 Give us this day our daily bread.
 And forgive us our debts, *as we forgive our debtors*.
 A n d l e a d u s n o t i n t o t e m p t a t i o n .
 B u t d e l i v e r u s f r o m e v i l

The 1st petition corresponds as a parallel with the last, the 2nd with the 6th, and the 3rd with the 5th. The 3 first petitions above relate to what is good; and from the highest and most comprehensive wish gradually narrow down to that which is lower and nearer to the individual soul that prays on earth. The 3 last petitions relate on the contrary to what is evil; and from the narrowest contemplation of evil and that nearest to the individual soul that prays (concerning our own trespasses and our neighbours’) gradually widen and deepen to the contemplation of the lowest depth and greatest extent of evil, and to the author of evil himself. The two contrary triplets of petitions in their inverse order are connected in the centre as at a point, by the personal petition for our own necessary subsistence for this day The parallelism holds good even to the least details in the *sense* of the corresponding petitions.”

Dr. Forbes, by removing from its place the words “*as in Heaven so in earth*,”—which, standing as the dependent clause to the 3rd petition, are plainly seen to correspond with the similarly dependent clause at the end of the 5th petition—and by regarding them as belonging equally to the whole of the first triplet, loses sight of the peculiar symmetry of the whole prayer, and thus misses this most interesting example of the introverted parallel.

5. One only point further, in the structure of the LORD'S Prayer, have we yet to notice.

It was originally delivered by our LORD on the "Mount," when, as the Antitype of Moses He was proclaiming His own Divine Law; asserting meanwhile that in this His New Law He was not abrogating the old but fulfilling it.

This Prayer is the devotional epitome of the New Law; at once embodying all man's duty, and meeting the supply of all man's needs. We have already alluded at some length to the number 5 as being the recognized symbol or signature of the Law. It is not a little singular to find the sacred Prayer secretly impressed with this same number. In each of the two divisions *there are exactly 25 words, (5 x 5)* i.e. The Signature of the Law, multiplied into itself; The *Law*, as it were, *fulfilled*.

Even as it may just be noticed, that the little word, in which our LORD tells us "the whole Law is fulfilled," is (as Irenæus has incidentally remarked—Lib. ii. c. 42) a word of 5 letters—[a five-letter Greek word].

But let all such hints be taken for what they are worth.

A word in conclusion. We are well aware that throughout the whole of this discursive paper we have exposed ourselves to the charge of indulging in a somewhat perilous licence of speculation; and shall probably have startled some of our readers with suggestions which may appear fanciful and visionary. We can only say, they *may* be but fanciful and visionary. If so, by all means let them be rejected. We object however *in toto* to any *à priori* inhibition of all original suggestion, merely because it may turn out to be erroneous, or may chance to appear fanciful. "Guesses," such as those we have ventured to throw out, or like some of those proposed in the interesting volume before us, will in course of time find their own level, and be accepted or rejected according to their inherent value. They are at least calculated to stimulate thought, and awaken a more diligent attention to the Inspired Volume; and, even though valueless [410] in themselves, may incidentally lead to the discovery of unknown beauties which would have escaped a less minute examination.

We have not alluded to our author's admirable concluding Essay on the "Inspiration of Holy Scripture." We can merely add that we heartily subscribe to the views on this all-important subject therein maintained. We are glad to see that he proposes to pursue his Biblical investigations, and shall look forward with pleasure to meeting him once more in this interesting field.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 18 (Joseph Masters: London, 1856)
 [501] **THE INTERNAL STRUCTURE AND ARRANGEMENT OF
 THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.**

In reviewing Dr Forbes' interesting treatise on the 'symmetrical structure of Scripture' in our September number, we had occasion incidentally to notice his analysis of the "Sermon on the Mount;" and while admitting the value of his remarks on certain isolated portions of the Sermon, yet expressed our opinion that, in regard to the particular end proposed to himself—namely, to trace out its *leading* divisions, the sequence of its subject-matter, the arrangement and mutual relation of its parts, and the general symmetry of the whole—we could not think he had been successful.

Our space will not admit of our following Dr Forbes in his elaborate analysis. It will save confusion to treat the subject independently, and offer for our readers' consideration the view of the matter which commends itself to our own mind.

Olshausen tells us that "the Sermon on the Mount, in the form in which it is given us by S. Matthew *cannot possibly have formed* [502] *a whole* when delivered by JESUS." And it must be fully admitted that the internal connexion of its several sentences and sections, the progressive order of thought, the central aim and scope of the entire Sermon is by no means obvious at first sight; as indeed the numerous and ever-varying synopses of its contents, no less than the opinion just quoted, sufficiently attest.

Still, we strongly suspect that we are not really left without a clue to guide us in the prosecution of this interesting inquiry. In the very heart of the Sermon we cannot but think we meet with an index—how little soever it may have been hitherto regarded in this light—which conveys to us the very information we desire; not only pointing out the successive divisions or sections of the Sermon, but showing us, further, what is the leading thought of each section.

But before we proceed, let us ask, What does the Sermon on the Mount profess to be?

On the Mount of Beatitudes we meet our LORD as the archetypal Moses, the Law-giver of the New Covenant, formally introducing and inaugurating His everlasting Gospel: and the Discourse there delivered forms a compendious abstract of the moral teaching of the Kingdom of Grace—a complete ethical code—an authoritative manual of practical guidance, to be studied and exemplified by all who submit themselves to be ordered by His holy governance.

Now imbedded in the very centre and heart of the Sermon we meet with a short devotional epitome of its entire contents—a brief but comprehensive Prayer, in the few concise clauses of which is summed up and compressed (that thus it may be at once graven on the memory, presented perpetually as matter for supplication before GOD, and informed into the whole spiritual being) the full substance, burden, and essence of the complete Discourse:—the legitimate answer to the *prayer* (viewed, at least, in its relation to the petitioner) being the personal exhibition of every point of moral duty enjoined in the *sermon*.

It is simply, therefore, to be anticipated that, as in the central Prayer we have the whole teaching of the Sermon gathered up and concentrated, so inversely, in the Sermon itself we should meet with the natural expansion and unfolding of the Prayer; and hence, that while the latter forms a short summary of the former, the former should serve as the recognized exegetical development, and Divine commentary on the latter—the two reciprocally imparting and receiving light the one from the other. That this is really the case we feel

forcibly persuaded; and further, that the regular sequence of thought and subject-matter in the Sermon is precisely the same as in the Prayer; each continuous section of the former forming a “plain,” practical, and (which is of such infinite importance) *Divine* “commentary” on each successive petition of the latter. As the whole Prayer constitutes (as its very position indicates) the [503] kernel of the entire Sermon, so does each successive *petition* form the kernel of each successive *section* of that Sermon.

Let us briefly endeavour to show this.

First, then: what was our LORD’S parting injunction to His Apostles concerning the admission of members into His holy Church? They were to be baptized *into the Name* of the Blessed TRINITY, and instructed in whatsoever He had commanded. They were to have, therefore, not only a new Name impressed upon them, but a new nature thereto corresponding, implanted within them, and a new character externally manifested by them. With the unfolding of this new nature, and a delineation of the features of the Divine character to which the new Name is attached, the Sermon opens. And here we must beg our readers to notice that the chain of Beatitudes, which forms at once an introduction to, and a succinct compendium of, the whole subsequent Dis-course—a *practical* compendium, as the LORD’S Prayer forms a *devotional* one—stands in precisely the same relation to the entire body of the Sermon, as the introductory invocation (“Our FATHER Which art in Heaven,”) does to the entire body of the Prayer. Moreover, the two introductions form a sort of complement and counterpart the one-to the other. In the one we address GOD as “our FATHER: in the other we learn what it is to be *His children*. We belong to GOD’S Family—says the former. If we do, rejoins the latter, such and such are the features that must characterize us.

One further point here demands notice. We mean the solemn and crucial test which our LORD adds, by way of helping us to ascertain the extent to which this Divine Life is actually realized in us. The Godlike character has to be exhibited in a world lying under the dominion of the Enemy of GOD. If then, “all men speak well of us,” and the world smiles on us, and we are on excellent terms with it, this character cannot be exhibited in its *fulness* in us. The one only perfect embodiment of the “Blessed” character—the only-begotten SON, in the bosom of the FATHER—was ‘*persecuted*’ and put to death. The character itself is still the same; still in absolute, essential antagonism to the “world lying in evil;” and still must—if it come in contact and collision with it—evoke, in some form or other, the malignant hatred and envenomed opposition of the world and its king. “Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you:” “Great is your reward in Heaven.”

I. After the Introduction (ch. v. 3—12,) follows the *first* section of the Sermon, (v. 18—16) containing the first lesson—the first practical exhortation—the first direct precept. And what is it, that our LORD would thus, first of all, press upon us? It is this: that we are not *our own*, but *Anther’s*: that we belong to GOD; and therefore, to GOD’S honour and glory must live. We are called by a very Sacred Title. The Name of the HOLY TRINITY is on us. In us, therefore—through us—by us—upon us—this Name must [504] be hallowed; and honour given to “Our FATHER Which is in Heaven.” This is the burden of the first section.

We have our several positions—so our LORD intimates,—in society, in the world, in the Church: in all these our FATHER must be glorified; and the Life-giving, self-diffusing, self-manifesting energy of the Sacred Name be felt and seen.

(i.) We have duties, each in *our own immediate sphere*. Placed in the midst of corruption, we must, like the “*salt*,” silently, unobtrusively communicate life and health to

all around, and let our correcting and vivifying influences be felt.. And they *must* be felt if we are what we claim to be. Salt which. seasons not is salt no longer. (v. 13.)

(ii.) We are placed, too, in the *world*, and have duties towards it, both *active* and *passive*. We have (a) to *enable it to see*, and (b) to *be seen by it*. We are (a) “the Light of the World,”—the representatives and organs of the True Light: we must therefore diffuse Light. Nay, if true receptacles of the great Name, we cannot help doing so. The sun *must* shine: so must we. But we have a further duty to the world—we have (b) to be *seen by* it. “A city set on a hill cannot be hid.” For, not only are we to enlighten men—encircling them with the Light of Day without disclosing the instrumental source of that Light, but we are to *be seen*—or rather, CHRIST is to be seen in us. And hence, the additional image of; the noble City, “the City of GOD,” high and lifted up, rearing its lofty battlements far into the blue Heaven: seen, that is, by the world—but not as *of* the world—towering aloft *above* the earth and its concerns. (v. 14.)

And still further: we have a position in the *Church*. We are the “*Lamp*” in the *House*, and have to keep the Sacred Flame of pure, unsullied doctrine ever burning bright. We must be constantly fed with the Holy Oil, and be ever communicating an ever-communicated radiance. (v. 15.) And thus, whether in the Church or in the world, we must “let our light so shine before men that they may see our good works, and glorify our FATHER Which is in Heaven.” (v. 16.)

Here then we have our LORD’S practical commentary on the first petition of His own Prayer. Here we see what we mean when we ask that our FATHER’S Name may be hallowed. Here we learn the dread responsibility which the possession of this Name entails upon us—the vast amount of personal duty which it involves.

And here, we cannot fail further to observe the exquisite propriety and significance of the first Beatitude which corresponds with all this.

If we would really live the life of GOD’S children, it is not *ourselves* that must live; but “CHRIST” alone Who must “live in us.” Our name has not to be hallowed, but GOD’S Name. We have to be merely like the Cherubim, “full of eyes before and behind,”—[505] purely receptive—absolutely *nothing* in ourselves, that we may be everything in Him. Here then is the deep meaning of the first Beatitude—“Blessed are the *poor* in Spirit.” For our riches in CHRIST are in exact proportion to *our own* “poverty.”

II. We come now to the *second* section, (v. 17—20) the leading subject of which is at once indicated by the thrice-repeated expression, “The *kingdom* of Heaven.” It is addressed to all who desire to be enrolled as citizens of the Heavenly Kingdom, who profess a wish to be identified with its interests and to aid in its extension. Our LORD straitly reminds such, that His Kingdom, though doubtless one of Grace, is yet a kingdom of perfect, uncompromising Righteousness. It professes no antagonism to—nay, it is but the continuation and unfolding of—the ancient Theocracy; and demands, no less than the former, implicit, unfaltering obedience. So far is it from holding out any prospect of relaxation from GOD’S revealed Law—that Law which, as an expression of the Mind of the ALMIGHTY, is eternal as Himself—that its peculiar glory. consists in this, that in IT for the first time the Law is *fulfilled*.

Here then we see the Christian in a new light—not now as an individual, but as the subject of a Kingdom. And we see further, what is the nature of this Kingdom, and what is wrapped up in the idea of personal subjection to its rule. As its full establishment in the world will result in the absorption into itself of all authority and power, and a universal subordination to its King; so does the setting up of it in any individual heart involve the

surrender of “every *thought* to the obedience of CHRIST.” There can be no divided service. “If I be a Master, where is Mine honour?” Hence our LORD would have His hearers count the cost, and not close in with His allegiance until they have fully realized the nature of the engagement into which they are entering. If they are willing without reserve, without compromise, to “fulfil all righteousness,”—then they may say heartily, “Thy Kingdom *come*.”¹ If not, they must choose some other king.

The submission, indeed, to the laws of the Kingdom will be found its own blessed reward; the “yoke easy,” the “burden light,” the “service perfect freedom;” but this, only in proportion to the reality and extent of the self-surrender. And this feature, it will be remembered, of unreserved submission and unquestioning obedience, is the second phase of character to which our LORD has attached a [506] blessing, “Blessed are the *meek*, for they shall inherit the earth.”² Yes, they who have most resolutely *rejected* the earth in not being possessed by it, who in calm hope and patient confidence have pursued this one engrossing object—“The *Kingdom* of GOD and His Righteousness,”—they shall have even this “*added* to them” that “they shall *possess the earth*.”³ While they who have loved this earth too well to forego it for CHRIST’S sake shall, with their forfeited place in the Kingdom, lose even *it* also; “They shall be rooted out of the earth.”

Such then, our LORD would teach us, are the strict requirements of His Kingdom; and such the solemn promise virtually contracted to *keep* all those requirements, and to “fulfil” every “jot and tittle,” even every “*least* commandment” of His righteous Law—when we daily pray in His own words, “Thy *kingdom* come.”

III. But *how* are these commandments to be kept, and this obedience rendered? In the oldness of the letter, or the newness of the Spirit? Is the conformity to the requirements of the Kingdom to be external or internal? a carnal bondage to the outward forms of its precepts, or a hearty reception of their inner life ?

This is the question disposed of in the *third* section (v. 21—48.) Our LORD’S answer takes the form of a series of examples. In these He brings before us, one by one, the main constituents (in so far, that is, as they relate to our practical duty) of GOD’S revealed *Will*, embodied in His written Law. He unfolds to us the infinite comprehensiveness of that expressed Will; and the nature of the obedience which it claims—hearty, spontaneous, in

¹ Twice in this section our LORD uses this word ‘*come*’ with regard to Himself. ‘*I am come*,’—I, as the Head and Representative of the kingdom. His personal Advent being one great stage in the progressive coming of the kingdom. Nor will this gradual *coming* ever cease until GOD’S Law and Will being *perfectly* performed on earth, the object of the prayer. will have been answered and the kingdom shall have fully *come*. If then we desire to know what are the results to be effected (as regards ourselves as well as others) by the full establishment of the kingdom, we have but to ask what are the objects for which our LORD came. This question He answers in the present section. He is “*come to fulfil*” GOD’S righteous “*law*.” (v. 17.)

² We have stated our reasons for reversing the common order of this and the succeeding Beatitude (i.e., for placing ‘Blessed are they that mourn,’ *after* ‘Blessed are the *meek*,’ instead of before it) in a previous Number,—May, 1854, p. 200,—in which we traced out more at length the parallelism, here necessarily referred to, between the LORD’S Prayer and the Beatitudes. Dr. Forbes strongly objects to the transposition. We have given his reasons our best consideration, but as yet cannot see sufficient cause to alter our former opinion. External testimony seems decidedly in favour of the order we have adopted. And (though we confess the point has cost us no little thought, and some hesitation) internal reasons appear to us consistently to confirm the external. We shall have occasion to touch upon this order again before the close of the present paper.

³ “*Self renunciation*,” writes Stier, “is the way to *World-Dominion*. Give thyself up in passive *obedience* to Divine Grace, and It will present thee one day with a *crown* of glory.”

“spirit and in truth,” like that of the Holy Angels. The advance observable in this section upon the last is most interesting and important. There we learnt the necessity of *obedience* to GOD’S *Law*. Here we learn something as to the *nature* both of that *Law* and of this obedience. We are taught that the revealed *Law* of GOD is but the earthly transcript of the *Mind* and *Will* of GOD. And hence, would we really obey that *Law*, it must be, not by a mere naked adherence to a series of external precepts, but by an interior conformity of heart and will to that Almighty Will whereof these precepts are but the outward forms and expressions. We need not add that the [507] whole burden of this section could not be more fully conveyed than it is in the *third* petition of our LORD’S Prayer, “Thy *will* be done on earth as it is in Heaven;” even as (substituting the form of *practical exhortation* for that of *prayer*) it is not less comprehensively summed up in the short sentence which concludes the present section, bringing to a focus its whole spirit and teaching—“Be ye therefore *perfect*, as your FATHER which is in Heaven is perfect.” (v. 48.)

As we are not writing a commentary, we must not linger over the many interesting details of this section. We cannot however but notice what a striking parallel we have in the reiterated expression, “Ye have heard that it was said to the fathers, but *I say to you*,” to the words of S. John, “The law was given by Moses, but *grace and truth* (i.e., the unfolding of the *true* meaning of the *Law*, and grace to keep it) came by JESUS CHRIST.” The *Law* is to be no longer a law of commandments outside the man, but a *Law* of love within him. And this it is which accounts for many of the startling and seemingly paradoxical sayings of our Lord in this His exposition of the Decalogue; the apparent impossibility of fulfilling these in their outward letter, indicating that, under them, our Lord is giving laws to the *spirit* of man.

But the mystery of this *Law* of Love, and of our being able to keep it, lies in this, that we have been endowed with a new nature which (if we may so speak) is *consubstantial with the law itself*; being none other than the imparted nature of HIM Who is the very *Law* and *Wisdom* of GOD embodied—the “WORD made flesh,”—so that in so far as we “live after” this new nature, and “walk in the spirit,” the “righteousness of the *Law* *must be* fulfilled in us.” Hence the prayer that GOD’S *will* may be perfectly wrought in us, and the corresponding precept that we are to be perfect *as our FATHER is perfect*, are not hyperbolic expressions. The full development of the new nature—which is Christ in us—involves the realization of both; involves a “transformation” and “renewal” so complete that our own personal will shall henceforth be none other than [Greek] (Rom. xii. 2.)¹

But “that which is perfect” is not yet “come.” As yet the “flesh lusteth against the Spirit,” as yet we have to “groan being burdened,” having an old, carnal, antagonistic will resolutely opposing this new Will—itsself to be determinately and painfully brought under. It is this awful struggle—this terrible crucifixion of the old nature—this lingering and lifelong conflict, which seems to be referred to in the *third* Beatitude. (“Blessed are they that mourn.”) For this is that “godly sorrow” which has the promise of the Divine COMFORTER, through Whose mighty energy alone the old nature can be subdued, and the human will centred with the Divine Will.

IV. But how is this new Will in us to be strengthened? What [508] are the means whereby the regenerate nature must receive its daily and constant corroboration? This brings us to the great *central* section (c. vi.) of the whole Sermon—corresponding with the

¹ φ ‘And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect, will of God.’

fourth or central petition of the Christian's Prayer—in which we meet with a most instructive and minute exposition of that petition.

“Give us this day our daily bread.”

First then, what is the meaning of the subject-word of this petition, “Bread?” The fourth Beatitude answers, “Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after *righteousness*.” Hence in this expression “*righteousness*,”—one of the designations, be it remembered, of CHRIST Himself—comprehending the whole complex of our spiritual aliment, we discover the equivalent to the term “Bread.” In accordance with which, we find the very first subject-word of this section, the meaning of which is subsequently developed at length, to be this identical word “righteousness:” “Take heed that ye do not your *righteousness*,”¹ (see Marg.) even as we meet with the same word at the close of the chapter, (vi. 33,) in our LORD’S brief summary of the contents of the whole section, “But seek ye first the kingdom of GOD and *His righteousness*,” &c. The burden of the paragraph being simply, that as our spiritual life can only be sustained by the continuous impartation of HIM “Who of GOD is made unto us *righteousness*,” we must allow *nothing* to interfere with our earnest and single-hearted strivings after HIM.

But does “our daily bread” merely include *spiritual* aliment? No; it unquestionably embraces “all things necessary for our *bodies*” as well as our souls. Hence we have two co-ordinate lines of interpretation for the petition, corresponding with these two significations. And these are strikingly and beautifully recognized in the section; the former part referring to the spiritual, the second part to the earthly bread: this latter (vi. 19—34) reminding us that the body no less than the spirit has its *real* claims upon our care, that the earthly bread *has its legitimate*, though subordinate, place in our regard, and that, so long as it merely holds this its *true* place, our care for it (involving as it must a daily exercise of grateful dependence on “our FATHER”) forms but a necessary constituent of the righteousness we are to cultivate; whereas if allowed to engross an undue share of our regard, it becomes to us an “occasion of falling:” our affections are estranged from GOD; we are guilty of idolatry, and professing to be but seeking daily bread, are really doing daily homage at the shrine of a false deity, “Mammon,” the “Mammon of *unrighteousness*.”

But let us take a hasty glance at the contents of this section, as it relates to (1) our spiritual, and (2) our temporal needs.

1. In reference to our spiritual needs, the first point that arrests [509] us is (i.) that (as already noticed) our, great want is *righteousness*. *This* it is we are to pray for, “hunger and thirst” after, (ch. v. 6,) seek before everything, (vi. 33.) But (ii.) *how* are we to obtain it? The all-important answer meets us in the very first sentence of the section. We are to obtain it by *practising it*. “Take heed that ye *do*,” i.e., exercise or practise “righteousness.” The Bread is miraculously multiplied while it is being distributed. To *use* grace, is the way to *receive* grace. It will be observed however, that what we are bidden to “seek” is [Greek] (vi. 33,) and what we are to practise, [Greek] (vi. 1.)—(iii.) What then is this personal righteousness by the exercise of which we are to secure GOD’S Righteousness? Our LORD represents it as involving duties towards GOD, our *neighbour*, and *ourselves*. “Thou when thou *prayest*,”—“Thou when thou *doest alms*,”—“Thou when thou *fastest*.” Yes, devotion, charity, self-denial; or inversely, the living soberly, righteously, godly,—here are the great

¹ Our readers will hardly require to be reminded that the common reading [Greek] ‘alms,’ is universally rejected. [Greek] is without doubt the true reading.

subjective means whereby we are to receive, appropriate, assimilate, the various Self-communications which He our everlasting Righteousness is pleased “in divers manners” to make to us. But (iv.) may not this righteousness be practised *unproductively*, so that *no* augmentation of grace, no *reward* ensues? It may. It may be “done to be seen of men.” (vi. 1.) Hence the solemn warnings against hypocrisy and insincerity. A wrong intention will frustrate all, and turn what should be our aliment into deadly poison. There must be “hunger and thirst” after Righteousness *as such*, and not after the credit consequent upon the practice of it.

2. And this brings us to the second part of the section. (vi. 19—34.)

As our “hunger and thirst” must be real, so must the object of that hunger and thirst be one, and one only. Not heaven *and* earth; GOD *and* mammon; CHRIST’S Kingdom and Righteousness *and* “all other things.” No; our *hearts* (19—21) must be single; not distracted between the rival attractions of two treasure-houses. Our *eyes*, (22, 23,) our mental vision, must be single; directed to one Object alone: else our sight will grow indistinct and confused; the images presented to it will all appear vague, undefined, distorted; the “light that is in us will become darkness.” Our *service* (24,) must be single; not an attempt to satisfy the incompatible demands of “two masters.”

All earthly goods we need are comprehended under the simple expression “bread;” i.e. food, health, raiment, and other *necessaries* of life. And for these, while thankfully employing the ordinary means, we must rely on GOD’S Providence and *promise*; for in so far as we really need them, and they are good for us, they are guaranteed to us. Anxious solicitude on their account is no less *unreasonable* and *useless*, than it is essentially *heathenish*. For He who continues the greater will surely continue the less. “The [510] life is more than its meat; the body than its raiment.” Is it *reasonable* to think that He will give the one and yet withhold the other? (25.) Moreover, how *useless* is this solicitude: not all our anxiety can prevail to add span to our existence. (27.) Away then with this distrust; it may do for the *heathen*, (32,) not for children of an all-wise, all-powerful, all-loving FATHER. Day by day repose on His good and covenanted Providence. Entertain no misgivings about *to-morrow*: to-morrow will bring its own cares and duties, and strength to meet them. Let care and supplication be limited by present wants, temporal as well as spiritual: “Give us *this day* our daily bread:” “Sufficient unto the *day* is the evil thereof.” (v. 34.)

V. This brings us to the *fifth* section, (c. vii. 1—12,) the close parallelism of which with the fifth petition and the corresponding Beatitude, is not less obvious and interesting. All three alike refer to the principle of Divine *retaliation* which guards the practice of the Law of Love. As we ‘*forgive*,’ says the first, so may we hope to ‘*be forgiven*.’ As we are ‘*merciful*,’ says the second, so may we trust to ‘*obtain mercy*.’ As we ‘*judge*,’ as we ‘*measure*’ to others, adds the third, so shall we ‘*judged*,’ and ‘*measured unto*.’

The recognition of this principle of holy retribution in GOD’S dealings with us is the sole basis of this section. In the first place (1.) the principle itself is enforced and exemplified. (2.) Then its application is guarded from possible misconceptions. (3.) And lastly, a grand ethical precept, the golden rule of practical Christianity is founded on it.

(1.) The principle is enforced (v. 1-5). We are warned in general terms that we must exercise love in thought, word, and deed, towards our brethren, if we ourselves would be mercifully judged, sentenced, and dealt with by GOD. We are bidden to be rather diligent in searching out and imploring forgiveness for our own trespasses, than in detecting and passing sentence on those of our neighbour. And we are assured, that if we would receive

largely and bountifully at GOD'S hands, we must so measure out our charity towards others.

(2.) But this Law of Love must be practised *wisely* as well as humbly and heartily. (i.) Our *brethren*, it is true, are not to be censoriously "judged;" but it does not therefore follow that in the case of the *godless world* (vii. 6) this judicial faculty should not be exercised. Nay, the godless worldling, the voluptuary wallowing in the mire of sensuality, these *must* be recognized as what they are, and dealt with accordingly. (ii.) And hence, though the general rule holds "give, and it shall be given unto you;" still it does not follow that holy things are to be given to dogs, and pearls to swine. No: *discrimination*, no less than humility and sincerity, must ever characterize real charity. (iii.) We must take pattern from our heavenly FATHER. Our charities, therefore, although large and liberal—and in this respect resembling [511] His, from whom we have but to 'ask' and 'receive,' to seek' and 'find,' 'to knock' and be 'opened unto'—must, like His also, be discriminative. He *gives*; but only what is best for each, and suited to our particular needs. Like a wise and loving FATHER, He bestows not on His children what He knows would be either useless or hurtful; 'stones' for bread, 'a serpent' for a 'fish;' even though we in our ignorance should ask for them. Be our charity the same. And that it may be so, independently of our asking, and seeking, and knocking, for that Holy Spirit which is at once essential Wisdom,¹ and essential Love, take we this short golden rule,

(3.) "*Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,*" (v. 12.) In all our dealings with others let us constantly ask, how should we ourselves desire—*considerately* desire—in changed circumstances, to be treated? Let us regulate our conduct accordingly. Thus the section which began by warning us what we were *not* to do, concludes by telling us what we *are* to do. Here is the short *practical* summary of the Law of Love. Act we upon it, and we shall never 'want any thing that is good' So doing, we shall be done by; thus charitable in judging, we shall be charitably judged; thus forgiving, we shall be forgiven; thus tender and reluctant to condemn our brethren, our FATHER shall "not be extreme to mark what *we* have done amiss;" thus merciful, we shall obtain mercy; "good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over," shall be poured into our bosoms.

VI. But now we arrive at the *sixth* section (vii. 13-21.) And here a new ground opens upon us. We are solemnly reminded that this life of self-denying self-sacrificing love is no easy thing; that we have enemies within us and without us; that we live in a world full of *temptation*, whose very prince is the tempter himself; and that there is need of earnest, true-hearted, persevering watchfulness.

It is noticeable that the two great tempters hinted at by our LORD in this section, are the very same which S. John introduces and personifies in his Revelation, under the titles of the 'Beast' and the 'False Prophet,' the one the godless world, the other the religious world; rather, Satan acting through different organs, now secular, now sacred; now exhibiting himself as the 'Beast,' now as the 'Lamb.'

Here are the two seducers : the one avowedly careless of GOD; his votaries openly repudiating the "path of life," keeping the world's broad way, sharing its interests, joining in its giddy revelry, taking part with it for time and for eternity:—the other, the ostensible

¹ It is with reference to *Wisdom* that S. James quotes this promise of our LORD, 'Ask, and it shall be given;' "If any of you lack wisdom let him *ask* of GOD, who giveth liberally, *and it shall be given.*" (S. James i. 5.)

friend of GOD; his followers adopting the livery of the [512] ‘Lamb of GOD,’ their religion meanwhile (to adopt a homely expression so true to our LORD’S figure) but *skin deep*, endeavouring. to satisfy GOD with half a heart, reserving the other half for mammon, anxious to “make the best of both worlds,” trying to unite things wholly incompatible, and all eager to propagate their counterfeit religion.

Now these latter are the tempters we have most to fear. This is the sort of pseudo-religion against which CHRIST most sternly warns us. He tells us once for all that His service will admit of no false hearted compromise with the world. The ‘way’ throughout is strait and narrow, and would we ever reach its end, namely, the ‘gate’ that introduces us into the everlasting Kingdom, we must make up our minds to try earnestly for it, not satisfying ourselves with a listless LORD, LORD,’ but *denying* ourselves, and resolutely “*doing* the will of our FATHER in heaven.” (vii. 21.)

As for the broad way, He tells us, there is no difficulty about that. It is plain enough. Once enter into it, and simply follow the multitude, (‘all the world,’ who ‘run after the Beast,’) and you cannot fail to reach its destination, the wide open pit of Perdition. But not so the other way. Every step of it has to be *found*,’ and alas! ‘few there be that’ persevere in ‘finding it’ till the end. It is confined and devious, as it were a concealed mountain track, with lying guides crossing it at every turn, and giving the traveller false directions.

But what is this way, this [Greek] which leadeth unto life? As the Life to which it leads is none other than CHRIST Himself, so also is the way. He is the Life at the end of and throughout the way; He is the Way itself, and He is the Truth, the true Guide along the way, in opposition to the false Prophets who mislead the travellers to their destruction.

And who are they alone who will succeed in steadily keeping the way? Here the corresponding Beatitude comes beautifully in. They are the “pure in heart;” they whose spiritual vision is purged, and who maintain their course by keeping their eyes steadily fixed upon their Leader. These—their prayer having ever been, “O hold Thou up our goings in Thy paths:” “Lead us not into temptation”—shall “endure as *seeing* HIM who is invisible.” These shall ever hear the voice of their Guide behind them, when they would turn to the right or left, “This is the way, walk ye in it.” These, having in their hearts the image of the Crucified, will ever lovingly pursue ‘the way of the holy Cross,’ the real [Greek], till they arrive at the narrow portal of death which admits them to their everlasting rest. His grace preventing them, they have learnt “to withstand the *temptations* of the world, the flesh, and the devil, and with *pure hearts* and minds to *follow* Him” their only GOD and SAVIOUR. They follow Him to the end, ever tracking His blood-stained footsteps, going after Him ‘through fire and [513] water,’ emerging ever refined and purified; till, having long “beheld His presence in *righteousness*,” they at last “wake up after. His” blessed “likeness;” and having like their Leader, “*learned obedience* by the things they have suffered,” through “much tribulation” they “enter into the Kingdom of GOD.”

But this reminds us that the section before us will receive additional light, if we look. at it in connection with that part of the Sermon to which it answers in position. We examined at length, in our September number,¹ the peculiar structure of our LORD’S perfect Prayer, showing it to consist of a central petition with a triplet of petitions on either aide; the

¹ φ Dykes’s review of ‘The Symmetrical Structure of Holy Scripture’, p. 167 *supra*.

members of each triplet being in inverse parallelism with one another—the third petition answering to the fifth, the second to the sixth, the first to the seventh,¹

We may not unreasonably, therefore, anticipate a similar relation between the corresponding sections of the Sermon. Such a relation plainly exists.

1. Thus the third and fifth sections are obviously parallel.

The *third*, (c.v. 21—48,) as we learn from its concluding verse, teaches us that we are to fulfil the law of love *inwardly*, “in spirit and in truth,” as it is fulfilled in *heaven*. The *fifth*, (vii. 1-12,) as we learn from *its* concluding verse, teaches us that we are to fulfil the law of love *outwardly*, as we would have it fulfilled towards ourselves on *earth*. Thus the one completes the other. The former, containing as it does, a searching analysis of the second table of the Decalogue, enforces upon us the law in its interior scope as a law for our *minds* and spirits; the latter impresses upon us the necessity, as well as the mode, of exhibiting this law in our *actions*. The whole of the former section, as our LORD on another occasion reminds us, is comprehended “in this saying, namely, ‘Thou shalt *love* thy neighbour as thyself;’” the whole of the latter in, Thou shalt *do* to thy neighbour as thou wouldest have him do to thyself,—the inward love and the outward act being, in each case alike, but the overflowing of the “Love of GOD (the HOLY GHOST, namely; that Personal LOVE wherewith the FATHER loveth the SON, S. John xvii. 26,) shed abroad in our hearts.”

[514]

Now continuing this inverted parallel, we find the intimate relation between the *second* (ch. v. 17—20) and *sixth* (vii. 13—21) sections. They are strictly complementary, and reciprocally illustrative the one of the other.

“*Enter ye in,*” says the latter. The way is strait, the gate narrow. “*Enter ye in*” *whereto*? What is this strait way, and wherein consists its straitness? “*Enter into the kingdom of heaven*” answers the former, (ch. v. 20.) The strait way thereto is the narrow path of perfect undeviating *obedience*. Not a partial one-sided obedience, as the carnal heart suggests and the false teachers whisper. No: the Law of JEHOVAH is *perfect*; not “one jot nor one tittle of it” can be knowingly set aside. The “scribes and Pharisees,” the “blind guides,” maintain otherwise. But “except your righteousness shall exceed” theirs, “ye shall in no case *enter into the kingdom of heaven*.” And the concluding verse of the present section (vii. 21) reiterates the same warning, assuring us that it is only by active hearty obedience, and by “*doing the will*” of our FATHER, that we can look for admission into the Kingdom.

It will be observed that in both these sections, the *second* and the *sixth*, we meet with the same carnal opponents of the ‘*Law*’ of the Kingdom; the same subtle teachers of [Greek]²

¹ We have since found that Stier has adopted, in the main, a similar arrangement of our LORD’S Prayer. He regards it as divided into “two tables,” each consisting of *three* members, connected as at a common centre in the fourth or middle petition. He notices also the inverted parallelism between the members of these two triplets or “tables.” “The first table,” he writes, proceeds “from above, downwards;” in it we *pray down*, from heaven to earth. “The first three petitions are inseparably triune.” “The fourth petition mediates between the two tables.” After it “the prayer *returns back* . . . in the order of a Sacred Three corresponding to the former.” Thus “our *trespass* consists in our not having done the *will* of our FATHER;” hence “reconciliation is our first need. Then comes *temptation*, opposing through the might of the wicked one the coming of the *kingdom*: then the *evil* under which we sigh, opposing the full glorifying and hallowing the *Name of GOD* in His saints,” &c. (Extracted from “Words of the LORD JESUS,” pp. 224—226, vol. I Clark’s Edition.)

² It is worthy of notice that the same phase of evil—this disparagement of GOD’S Law (clad moreover, in the garb of peculiar deference to that Law)—which marks the second and sixth sections of the Sermon, {cont.}

the “Prædicatores Antichristi”—‘Pharisees’ of former, False Prophets’ of latter days; introducing a flexible, compliant *morality*;¹ or, it may be, mutilating; whether by addition or subtraction, the *Faith* once delivered;—in some way or other failing in the performance of the ascending SAVIOUR’S last charge to His Church, viz., to ‘teach’ and practise ‘*all things whatsoever*’ He had enjoined; and thus coming within the bounds of the denunciation pronounced in the Sermon, (ch. v. 19,) “Whosoever therefore shall break *one* of the *least* of these commandments, and *teach men so*, he shall be called the least in the Kingdom of Heaven.”

We must not fail, further, to notice how peculiar a significance is seen to attach to those two graces which seem, from their position, to stand out as the special antagonists and correctives of this [Greek]—the two, namely, which filling the *second* and *sixth* places in the [515] Beatitudes, would appear to bear some specific inverse relation to the forms of evil censured in the corresponding paragraphs of the Sermon. We refer to *meekness* and *pure-heartedness*.

(i.) The first is the distinctive characteristic of the Bride—of Her who, when ‘the mighty are put down from their seat,’ shall be ‘exalted’ to share with Her Divine Bridegroom the Throne of the Universe; and who, having now meekly bowed her neck to the yoke of the Kingdom, shall another day see her foes bowing their necks before her feet, and owning that her LORD has loved Her (Rev. iii. 9). She covets not dominion or worldly distinction here. All her thoughts, all her desires are centred in her absent LORD. For Him she yearns. “*Thy Kingdom come:*” “Come, LORD JESUS.” She is not seen flaunting in ‘gold and pearls and costly array’ (“I am rich and increased with goods”); Her “ornament is that of a *meek* and quiet spirit,² which in the sight of her LORD is of great price.” She presumes not “to speak, or to usurp authority over the Man,” but remains “in silence.” She claims no independence; no authority to initiate doctrine for herself. Her LORD’S voice is heard, not hers. Her one duty, privilege, glory, is *obedience*—unfaltering obedience to whatever her LORD has revealed. After His blessed example (Who said, ‘Learn of Me, for I am *meek*’) she now ‘*learns* obedience’ to the laws of the kingdom. Nor is her submission like that of the ‘False Prophets’ (vii. 21) who say, LORD, LORD,’ and yet exalt their own traditions and developments above His commands. No: “as Sarah *obeyed* Abraham calling Him ‘LORD,’” so does she *obey*. Does He say, ‘*Do this in remembrance of Me?*’ .She hesitates not. She *does* it. And if perchance she speaks, it is but to repeat that one priceless saying bequeathed to the Church by Her whom “all generations shall call ‘Blessed’”—the fairest

meets us in the *second* and *sixth* epistles to the Church Catholic in the Apocalypse—the epistles to Smyrna and Philadelphia, the only two unblamed Churches, the sound Branches of the early and the ‘latter days.’ In both these instances the faithful Body is opposed and confronted by a community claiming the exclusive honour of being GOD’S true Israel—denounced in each case as “the synagogue of Satan” (Cf. Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9;)—which imperiously presumes to tamper with that Law and impose, instead, its own unhallowed glosses; ruthlessly persecuting the faithful Remnant for its determined adherence to the original Deposit, and its refusal to accept as “doctrines, the commandments of men.”

¹ There are few more startling facts, in connection with this subject, and the probable future of the greatest Branch of CHRIST’S visible Church, than the deliberate acceptance on the part of the Church of Rome of the whole subtly elaborated system of moral [Greek] of which Liguori is the great modern exponent.

² This (i.e. the spirit of meek self-surrender) is the *gate* that opens into the *way* (the way of unswerving obedience); even as the *way* itself, in turn, conducts to the *gate*; the gate, in one case, being the entrance into the kingdom of grace; in the other, into the kingdom of glory.

member, the noblest type of the Spouse of CHRIST—“*Whatsoever* He saith unto you, *Do it.*”¹

(ii.) But meek unquestioning obedience is not the only grace necessary for the Church in her contact with [Greek]. She not only needs the power of embracing the true; she must be able also to , detect the counterfeit. Hence she needs the purgation of her visual organs—the ‘enlightenment of the eyes of her mind’—that she may ‘discern between good and evil.’ And this, after all, is but a further stage of the same grace of meek obedience: “If any man will *do* His will, he shall *know* of the doctrine.” And great indeed will be the need of this *formed* obedience (i.e. obedience developed into [516] spiritual discernment) in the latter days, when the *unformed* grace, isolated and inchoate, stunted in growth, and dis severed from its Divine Object—not a spiritualized and intelligent obedience, but (to use its own accepted and awful title) a ‘*cæca* obedientia’—is made a fearful occasion of stumbling. “Many false Prophets,” says our LORD, “shall arise and shall deceive many; and because [Greek] shall abound, the love of the many shall wax cold” (S. Matt. xxiv. 11, 12.) Claiming to be sent by GOD, they will exact ‘*blind* obedience’ to their precepts and doctrines. And then will it be that this other, most difficult, supplementary function of obedience—spiritual discernment—will have to be called into exercise. In the normal condition of the Church, whatever GOD’S Prophets, speaking officially, pronounce, ‘that’ the faithful are to ‘observe and do.’ But what, if “the Prophets” themselves “prophesy falsely in the Name of the LORD?” What, if a *false* ‘Prophetess’ is found “teaching, and seducing GOD’S servants to commit fornication?” (Rev. ii. 20.) What, if the Mystical Woman herself who claims to be the Bride, and to rule all nations by authority delegated from her LORD, is found propounding dogmas utterly irreconcilable with the Faith once delivered, industriously circulating throughout her dependent nations an intoxicating chalice of adulterated doctrine? Is the poison to be imbibed? Is the counsel to be followed? Is the teaching to be ‘*blindly*’ accepted and believed? ‘No: the natural course of obedience has here to be arrested, and its order inverted. The *teaching* can no longer be implicitly received because of the *Teacher*; the doctrine, because of the official authority of its propounders. The ‘Prophets’ themselves have now to be tested by the conformity of their doctrines with the ‘Law and the Testimony.’ The *teachers* have to be tried by their *teaching*: the ‘tree by its fruits: the fountain by its streams.

They may parade their Divine mission and spiritual powers—the “horns of the LAMB” (Rev. xiii. 11)—and with ‘LORD, LORD’ on their lips, may come in CHRIST’S Name; but if, their tenets conform not with the Will of GOD revealed in His Word, and witnessed by His Holy Church from the beginning—even though like the old Prophet of Bethel they claim angelic revelations in support of their ‘developments’—they “*lie.*” they must be determinately resisted. “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see GOD.” In His Light they shall see Light. In-gating on His Blessed Countenance, in studying His Mind and Will as revealed in His Holy Scriptures, they shall become divinely wise; and during the long protracted season of temptation, ever darkening, as the ‘stars’ one by one ‘fall from Heaven,’ and the ‘Lights of the world’ are obscured, until midnight darkness folds the earth in her deathlike embrace, they shall hold on their course “seeing HIM Who ‘is invisible;” and “enduring to the end,” “shall be saved.”

VII. But now we come to the last section.

¹ The occasion on which this solitary command of the Blessed Virgin was uttered, is not without a peculiar significance. It was spoken to the ‘ministers’ of the household, in reference to their commission to communicate to the guests at the marriage banquet, the ‘New Wine.’

[517]

As we have had the subject of *temptation* bought before us, and have witnessed some of its forms and manifestations, so are we now called upon to see the dread *consequences* of yielding to it. We have seen temptation in action: now we must see it—as essentially ‘evil,’ and ‘coming of the evil one’—exhibited in its inevitable results. As “lust when it hath conceived bringeth forth sin,” so “sin when it is finished bringeth forth Death.”

The Day of Grace, the twilight shadows of which seemed trembling, in the last section, has now passed. The Day of Judgment has dawned—“judgment *beginning* at the Household of GOD.” “Many shall say to Me *in that Day*.” The first judicial act, in this final paragraph, (vii. 22, 28) is confined to the visible *Church*, and GOD responds with the solemn proceedings pictured forth in S. Matt. xxiv. 42—xxv. 30. The last scene (24—27) portrays the terrible course of judgment in more general terms:—the two together being designed to paint the miserable end of ungodliness, and particularly of *unfaithfulness*; and to force from all, the earnest-cry wherewith the LORD’S Prayer concludes, and which is so beautifully expanded in the touching words of our Litany, “From *all evil* and mischief, from sin, from the crafts and assaults of the Devil, from Thy wrath, and from everlasting damnation—Good LORD, *deliver us*.”

It is interesting to observe that the inverse parallelism which we have seen to subsist between the *third* and *fifth* sections of the Sermon; then between the *second* and *sixth*, extends also to the *first* and *seventh*.

The first section, as we showed, proclaims the duties devolving on us as members of CHRIST, partakers of the Blessed Life, named with the Name of GOD.

The All Holy *Name* being on us, we must take good heed that IT be “hallowed” in and by us; that the Sacred Flame be kept burning; “our odorous Lamp filled with deeds of Light;” that in our Light others may see Light, and “glorify their FATHER in Heaven.”

Now what is the plea of the miserable castaways which introduces this last section? “LORD, LORD, have we not prophesied *in Thy Name*, and *in Thy Name*, cast out Devils, and *in Thy Name*, done many marvellous works? Here is the *thrice-repeated Name*. And here too is the bitter sting of the now inevitable rejection. They who are about to be consigned to the dungeons of black despair, have been impressed with the Name-of the HOLY TRINITY, and in the might of that Name profess to have *worked*. But alas! the stern answer extinguishes hope.

“*Lord, Lord!*” We have always owned Thee as our Master:—Save us!

“*Depart from Me!*”

We are called by Thy *Name*, we are Thine own Household and Family.

[518]

“*I never knew you!*”

“We have done many marvellous” and religious “*works*.”

“*Ye workers of iniquity !*”

The principle of Love has been wanting in all their deeds. The *works* have been done ‘to be seen of men,’ not for the glory of GOD. Hence, as ‘*Love* is the fulfilling of the Law,’ the deeds done without that actuating influence are simply called [Greek] (*v*. 23.)

It is most instructive to note, from a comparison of the *first* and *last* sections of the Sermon with the *first* and *last* petitions and Beatitudes, *wherein*, according to the mind of our LORD, consists the highest *good*, and wherein the greatest *evil*, to men. The highest good

we here find to consist in *knowing* and *being known* of GOD—maintaining full and loving communion with Him; in not only having His Name *upon* us, but being so emptied of ourselves, filled and penetrated with Him, that His Name is ‘hallowed’ *in* us, its Sacred Influences actively and beneficially diffused—the ‘Light’ shining, the ‘salt’ vivifying, the ‘Lamp’ burning (for ‘it is more blessed to give than to receive’):—it consists in ‘*making,*’ restoring, disseminating ‘*Peace,*’ and thus showing ourselves so truly the children of GOD, that the FATHER looking upon us sees HIMSELF in us and is refreshed. Whereas the greatest *evil* consists in having our old nature so effectually in the ascendant that GOD is shut out: Far from diffusing ‘*Peace,*’—ourselves eternal strangers to Peace; (for “there is no *peace*, saith my GOD, to the *wicked*”): The Divine Name and Image obliterated in us: Insomuch that GOD looking on us sees nothing of Himself, and *knows us not.*’

The mysterious close of the whole Sermon, pointing to the security of the righteous and the destruction of the wicked—with its iterated description of the desolating and inexorable career of Judgment—defies all exposition, and must be left in its simple and terrible language, to proclaim its own solemn lesson.

One point yet deserves notice—we mean the corroboration incidentally afforded by the close of the Sermon, to the fact (so abundantly attested from external sources) of the Doxology, which the Church has been guided by the Spirit to adopt in her ordinary use of the LORD’S Prayer, having yet had no place in its original delivery.

Stier, fully admitting that MS. testimony is against him, yet argues strongly *for* the Doxology, on the ground of it being “in every view *inconceivable* that the LORD should actually have closed the prayer with “*Deliver us from evil.*” It *may* appear strange. Still it becomes us not to speculate what our LORD *should* have said, but to inquire what He *has* said.

It seems most strange to us that His first Sermon which opens with such words of peace, should yet conclude with such words of terror;—that His Public Ministry which was ushered in with an [519] octave of Benedictions should close with an octave of Woes;—that His later parables should all ring forth such notes of alarm. There may be some mysterious connection underlying all this. The Apostolic narrative terminates in a *shipwreck*. S. Paul disappears from view a prisoner in Rome. The last great event which marks the corporate history of the visible Church is “the Apostacy.” The last Apocalyptic Epistle speaks of haughty, self-dependent, faithless Laodicea, as about to be “*spued out* of CHRIST’S month.”

The Church’s daily Prayer *may* then contain in its still depths some hidden reference to Her Prophetic history. And it may be that as the gloomy twilight begins to fall, and “*evil men* and *seducers* to wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived,” and “the foundations of the earth” to be shaken and “out of course,” she will have some peculiar and appalling need for the anxious and agonized cry, “Lead us not into *temptation;*” “Deliver us from *Evil.*”

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 18. (Joseph Masters: London, 1856)
 [145] **WILLIAMS' RATIONAL GODLINESS.**

Rational Godliness, after the mind of CHRIST, and the written voices of His Church. By ROWLAND WILLIAMS, B.D., Fellow and formerly Tutor of King's College, Cambridge, and Professor of Hebrew at Lampeter. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, & Co. 1855.

This is a distressing book—distressing because it contains so much that is really good, many valuable and suggestive remarks, many indications of an earnest, inquiring spirit, an original, independent, and (at times) devotional mind; while all is so incurably mixed up with what is crude, questionable, and pernicious, that we feel constrained to give the book, as a whole, an unqualified condemnation.

Mr. Williams seems to imagine that he has a “call” to subvert the ordinary belief of Christians as to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, and undermine their traditional reverence for it. To this melancholy object he applies himself with a zeal not easily accounted for. Still we cannot but indulge a hope that the truer and better part of our Author is not so warmly enlisted in this sad cause as might at first sight appear. For his better self seems instinctively to shrink into the background, his very style to undergo a species of deterioration, whenever he approaches this subject. His thoughtful, religious tone seems to forsake him,¹ and he assumes an unpleasantly self-conscious, defiant, irreverent manner which is simply offensive.

We are not now proposing to write a treatise on the Inspiration of the Sacred Volume: neither do we feel qualified for so serious and responsible a task, nor would the short space at our disposal admit of it. We merely wish to point out, what appear to us, the dangerous tendencies of the teaching of Mr. Williams on this subject. As to examining his own theory, the thing seems next to impossible, because he has no fixed theory. The only legitimate inference to be drawn from his words appears to be (what we trust himself would be the first to disavow) that the Holy Scriptures have no sort of claim whatever upon our faith, save just as much as would be challenged by any other “good book,”² the constituents of this “goodness” to be determined by the “consciousness” of every individual Christian.

For what is the ultimate standard of appeal, according to Mr. Williams? How are we to test whether any dogma is, or is not, [146] according to the analogy of the Faith? The appeal is entirely *within*. Truth is simply that which, to our dim vision, seems true; goodness, that which appears to every man good in his own eyes. External standards there are none, because these in their turn have first to be submitted to the internal standard. To find any fixed standing ground of truth is a hopeless impossibility, it ever slips from under our feet,—*labitur et labetur*.

Now absurd as such a notion may appear, Mr. Williams (as far as we can understand him) deliberately adopts it. For instance,—he is apologising in one place (p. 311) for taking his text from the Second Epistle of S. Peter, an Epistle which he maintains was never written

¹ As a specimen of the writer's best style, we may perhaps specify (notwithstanding an objectionable statement here and there) the 16th Sermon, “GOD worketh hitherto.” It strikes us in parts as very beautiful.

² “We believe the Word of GOD recorded in the Bible; we also believe the Word of GOD recorded in the Book of Mormon, and in all *other good books*.” Extracted from the *Confession of Faith of the Latter Day Saints*.

by the Apostle. Why then take his text from it? The objector, he retorts, “thinks things are true *because they are written*, instead of being written *because they are true*.” He does not stop to inquire, “How are we to know that they are true?” but at once disposes of the matter in hand by the conclusive dictum, that *he himself* feels “no difficulty in adopting the sentiment of the text *whoever may have written it*.”

But further,—The words even of the SON of GOD Himself must be brought for their accreditation to this ultimate and *internal* court of appeal. They are not binding upon us because they come stamped with Divine Authority; rather, the Speaker is Divine because He utters words which have received the stamp of our approbation. According to Mr. Williams’ teaching, we are not to go to Him in Whom, *because He is GOD*, “are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge;” seeking from TRUTH Itself “What is Truth;” and while gazing in lowly adoration upon His perfection, be changed more and more “into the same image.” We are rather to believe CHRIST’S words “*because they are Spirit and Truth*,” (p. 393) i.e., because *we* happen to think them good and true. We are to embrace them, not because HE says them, but because they establish their claim to truthfulness before the infallible bar of our *fallen* reason; in short, we are not to believe that whatever He says, whether we can understand it or not, *must* be true, because He is our GOD. We are to invert the process, and infer that He is our GOD, from His teaching that which commends itself to our poor, finite, ignorant minds as true.

“This free allegiance from love and for the *excellence* of the Object [i.e., its conformity with our own private standard of excellence] is perhaps not exactly that of those who, starting with the Bible, or even with the Divine authority of our LORD, infer from thence dogmatically the excellence of His precepts; but it is more like that of the Apostles, who saw the super-human beauty of our LORD’S truth and patience. . . . and then reasoned upward, Surely this was the SON of GOD.” P. 396.

Now without entertaining the abstract question herein involved, [147] or investigating into the amount of absolute truth which underlies this passage, let us look at the practical application of this subjective process of discriminating truth, in the case of the Sacred Volume.

A great portion of the Bible (every one must determine for himself exactly how much) is confessedly human and fallible: out of this mass of the “letter,” it is the duty of the “man of GOD” to extract the “spirit,” to the essential truth of which his own spirit shall give its infallible responsive testimony; from the heap of useless dross he must separate the pure metal; out of the miscellaneous pile of material he must select such, as to quantity and quality, as shall enable him to rear a structure of “rational godliness” against which the rain and the flood shall beat in vain.

Mr. Williams lets fall several examples of the conclusions to which *his own* discriminating faculty, applied to the Holy Scriptures, conducts him.

E.g., It tells him that the history of the Fall of man, recorded in the Book of Genesis, is but “an “allegory,” not “a narrative of events which happened literally,” (p. 268); and the whole story is merely meant to give a vivid expression to this sad fact—which might *à priori* have been anticipated—that “when the human soul *became*¹ cradled in flesh and blood, liable to ignorance, and fettered by circumstances, it *must* often in *all probability* mistake evil for good,” and “often *fall*, in actual brutishness, from the likeness of GOD

¹ Mr. Williams fails to inform us where the “human soul” was “before it became cradled in flesh and blood.”

stamped upon it *in idea*" (!) (pp. 268-9)¹ By this profound solution, by this judicious substitution of the "spirit" for the "letter," our author proceeds to inform us, "we should have *several difficulties cleared up.*"

What these difficulties are, we will not stay to inquire. We merely add, Mr. Williams thinks the narrative of the Fall an allegory. Well, and Mr. Somebody else thinks that the narrative of the several processes of man's *recovery* from the fall, are a corresponding allegory. The one has every whit as much right to his opinion as the other. And the two opinions, we may add, are precisely of equal value.

[148]

Again, Mr. Williams thinks that "much of what is said of our LORD'S second coming" may after all be but "parable," (p. 284.) And how much of the history of His first coming?

In another place he pleasantly talks of "the allegory in Jonah *about the whale.*" At least let him reverently bethink him of his LORD'S words, "*As* Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale's belly, *so* shall the SON of MAN be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." If the one is a fable, why not the other?

Mr. Williams' spiritual intuition leads him to be very suspicious when mention is made of the supernatural.

When the prophet Elijah is miraculously fed in a cave, "he is sustained," says our author, "through the agency of the *Orebim*, (whether ravens or *Arabians*, it matters little.)" P. 68.

The miracle of the Red Sea seems to have been the effect of the "morning roll of the tide, and the stormy wind arising." P. 391.

The Angel of the LORD at the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite, is but the "disembodied pestilence ceasing to slay," p. 78. So that when "David lifted up his eyes and *saw* the Angel of the LORD standing between the earth and the heaven," or when Araunah and his four sons, on *seeing* the same dread Being, "hid themselves," (1 Chron. xxi. 16—20,) what they witnessed was but a gigantic *abstraction*.

But Mr. Williams refers us to another abstraction. We beg our readers mark his words: "That *one thing*," he writes," which is *diversely named*—the great enemy; *the devil*; disobedience; unbelief; *an evil heart.*"—(p. 143.)

The Devil merely another name for a man's own heart! Satan converted into a figure of speech—his personality ignored! The last new device of the Devil (says Mr. Kingsley, in one of his sermons) is, that he is "*shamming dead.*" Has Mr. Williams, we are constrained

¹ It appears to us that the whole of this passage trembles upon the verge of very deep heresy. We believe we might express ourselves stronger.

1. It is here intimated that man was not created in the image of GOD; this image was only stamped upon him in *idea*.
2. Any lapse of man from his primeval state is denied.
3. The current expression, "the Fall," is merely a sort of verbal recognition of the fact, that the pure human soul is linked to a feeble, peccable human body, it being the latter alone wherein resides the liability to sin,—therefore
4. "The corruption of nature" (as it is termed) is owing, not to the "*creature's defection*," but to the "*Creator's action.*" It is not that man's whole being has *become* disorganized, but that there is an *inherent* defect in one of its constituent parts. So that man was never "very good," and GOD is the author of sin. Is Lampeter to become a school for Manicheans?

to ask, been taken in by the feint? We sincerely trust however, that this sentence, though betraying culpable carelessness, does not really express the convictions of the writer.

Our author, further, in common with those who, like him, “*endeavour to discover the meaning*” of Holy Scripture, discredits the reality of the demoniacal possessions; and is therefore driven to hold that our Blessed LORD countenanced and uttered deliberate falsehood; and that the Evangelists, in the detailed and circumstantial accounts of these mysterious transactions, knowingly combined in propagating a wicked and most dangerous fable.¹

[149]

Here then, are a few passing examples of our author’s process of disengaging the ‘spirit’ from the ‘letter’ in the pages of Holy Writ. Let them go for what they are worth. But we must seriously ask, Where is all this to stop? Are there any valid grounds whatever, why this method of dealing with Scripture, if admitted so far, should not be indefinitely extended; and the fair system of Rational Godliness, have to retire before the irresistible logic of a Godless Rationalism?

But let us turn to the more immediate subject of this paper,—viz., Mr. Williams’ views respecting the Inspiration of the Sacred Volume: for it is to his loose notions on this important point that all his other “divers and strange doctrines” may be traced.

It appears to us that there are two cardinal errors which characterize his teaching on this head.

I. He denies the *peculiar, official* Inspiration of the Sacred Writers, and identifies the Influence under which they wrote, *in kind*, with that general, personal, guidance which is the common heritage of all Christians. And

II. He holds that the acknowledged indications of *human* agency which appear in every page of the Bible, must necessarily qualify (and that to a very material extent) its infallible authority.

Let us take these two points in order.

I. He ignores any peculiar, official Inspiration of the Sacred Writers. Nay, even Revelation, under him, entirely loses its objective side. It ceases to signify, either GOD’S *act* in communicating hidden knowledge to man; or the knowledge *itself* so communicated, (“The Revelation of JESUS CHRIST, which GOD *gave* to Him, and which He signified, by His Angel whom He sent, to His Servant,”) and sinks down into the merely subjective

¹ Williams may pretend that it is a matter of indifference whether we believe in the reality of demoniacal possession or not. We emphatically deny this. If his explanation is true, two inevitable conclusions follow:—

1. That our Lord give the whole weight of His authority to the propagation of a *Lie*: for He perpetually spoke of Possession as something *real*, and entirely distinct from any kind of disease; and that, not only in His public teaching, but in His private instructions to His disciples: He employed the fact of their possessing the power of expelling Devils, as the basis of solemn admonitions; and on the exercise of the same power by Himself, and His superiority to Satan thus evidenced, He grounds His claim to be the Messiah:—but

2. If the reiterated, positive, and definite statements of the Evangelists on this head, are to be quietly set aside as inconsistent with the “rational” belief of enlightened men, there is not one single fact or assertion in the Gospels which may not be similarly put away. To use Mr. Williams’ own significant words, We must “make up our minds to accept (the Evangelists’) declarations *as a whole*, or *reject them as a whole*.”—P. 245.

process whereby man puts aside his prejudices and the like, and so turns himself into a prophet.

“There must be put aside much natural prejudice, with all such local and personal predilections as acted upon the mind *like a veil* between its gaze and the true likeness of GOD; and the removal of such a veil is called in the language of the New Testament, *revelation*.”—P. 196.

Hence, as this process of internal purgation can never be but very imperfectly effected even in the best of men, the whole notion of the infallible authority of the Bible falls at once to the ground.

[150]

As for the Divine Inspiration under which we are told (2 S. Tim. iii. 16) that “all Scripture” was written, Mr. Williams considers it to have been a sort of “general Providence” which “permitted, rather than directed.”

“It may be that the composition of Scripture is attributed to the ALMIGHTY, *just as sowing and threshing are said to be taught by Him; for every part played by man comes from the Divine Disposer of the scene.*”—P. 292.

Now here again, we can only refuse to press the shocking conclusions which spring from this writer’s most reckless statements. If the Bible comes from GOD, only in the same way as “every part played by man comes from the Divine Disposer,” then do the Koran and Book of Mormon come from Him, and may be said, with no less propriety, to have been “given by Inspiration of GOD.” But it is idle wasting words on language so monstrous.

But even when Mr. Williams writes more soberly, we still find his views on Inspiration most misty and low. According to him, the Inspiration of Homer and Isaiah (for instance) though not equal in degree, was yet the same in kind. Throughout the whole of heathendom, he reminds us, we may find many traces of the Spirit’s operations: in fact, *nemo sine aliquo Afflatu Divino vir magnus unquam fuit*. Still, he admits that we stand in need of more “definite teaching” than the Records of Classical Antiquity will furnish. And

“If we seek such aid in the Hebrew Scriptures, we shall soon *find reason to believe* that He, Who nowhere left Himself without witness, yet gave the Spirit *in larger measure* to those who knew Him by His Name Jehovah.”—P. 47.

And after descanting on the general historical fidelity of these Hebrew Records, and their superiority to the fabulous writings of later Rabbins, he adds :—

“Nor *can any reason* be given for this superiority of the older books, more obviously true, than that the writers *conceived themselves* to be acting under a responsibility of a strictly religious kind.”—P. 48.

Not the barest recognition of the superintending Influence of the “Spirit of Truth!”

“Thus” (he writes in another place) “the *spirit* which runs through the literature of the Hebrews is eminently a *religious spirit*.”—P. 296.¹

[151]

And seeing the “spirit” which pervades these books is “eminently religious,”

“Why should not the devout sayings” and “noble deeds which they record, serve to the *same end in religion*, as the history of kingdoms in politics, and the strains of poetry in education,

¹ Mr. Williams’ careless use of this important word, is mystifying alike to his readers and to himself. He speaks in another place about “*believing* in the *spirit* of Moses and Isaiah,” (p. 395); about “grounding our faith mainly on the *spirit*” (p. 389); about “the *inspiration* of patriotism” as well as “that of religion” (p. 90.) When the subject of Inspiration is under discussion such language is alike objectionable and dangerous.

without our *presuming to assign to the writers an infallibility which they never claim for themselves*. We may read Moses, not for his physical geography, but for *his ten commandments* and his history. We may read the Book of Joshua, not for its astronomy, but for a tremendous example of the law by which GOD sweeps corrupt nations from the earth. . . . We may also fully admit the unalterableness of Scripture, *in the sense that deeds truly done cannot be undone*. [What *does* this mean?] Nor would it be *modest* to weigh the personal authority of even the most spiritual teacher now, *against that of the Apostles who followed CHRIST: but yet we need not suppose that the arm of the Eternal is shortened, or that the HOLY SPIRIT ever ceases to animate the devout heart.*”—P. 298.

Here is a specimen of the vague, offhand, careless way in which Mr. Williams thinks it becoming to write concerning the “Scriptures of Truth.” He may think his flippant allusions to “Moses’ physical geography and ten commandments,” “Joshua’s astronomy,” and the like, very smart: to ourselves they are simply distressing.¹

But this passage shows, further, (the point to which we are specially adverting at present) how entirely this writer ignores the peculiar, official Inspiration of the Sacred Authors. For (1.) he speaks of the Influence under which they wrote, as identical with that which “ever animates the devout heart.” (2.) He intimates that it is merely *modesty* which prevents himself or any other great Light of the present day claiming an Inspiration equal to that of the Apostles. For “they were men” he takes care to tell us, “compassed with infirmities like ourselves; and they professed only to know in part and to prophesy in part,” and it is only “on *this* ground, that they *generally* saw our LORD and had the best means of information as to His religion,” “that their writings seem to be properly added to those of the Old Testament, which they explain.” (P. 59.) But it is needless to point out how thoroughly inadequate and erroneous is this view. Nay, so far is the personal inspiration of the Sacred Writers identical with their objective Inspiration as organs of the HOLY GHOST, that we are told, the Prophets themselves in their private capacity “searched diligently” into the full import of what they officially announced. In the one case, they learn as men; in the other they “speak as the Oracles [152] of GOD.” But Mr. Williams steadily persists in confounding these two separate Influences, virtually insisting that, because “there is not a just man upon earth that *sinneth* not,” therefore it cannot be true that “*all* Scripture is given by Inspiration of GOD.”

The case of Balaam shows plainly that a man may be a wicked man and yet an official organ of the HOLY SPIRIT, and as such, and in that respect, infallible. For though there is but one Spirit, yet has He diversities of gifts and operations. Mr. Williams’ strictures seem based upon the identification of these various gifts. Thus he writes: “the Apostles’ Epistles were inspired *because their lives were full of the Spirit of GOD.*” Here then is a case in point: S. Barnabas “was a good man, and *full of the HOLY GHOST* and of faith;” why is not his Epistle included in the inspired Canon? why not S. Clement’s, “whose name was in the book of life?” The only answer is this, that the “One, self-same, Spirit,” divideth His gifts “to every man, severally, as *He will*;”—giving to one the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge; to a third faith; to a fourth prophecy; and that the extraordinary and specific Influence under which the Sacred Writers composed their respective works was vouchsafed but to a privileged few. A man may have one gift in plenary measure; may lack another. He may understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and have all faith, and yet be destitute of the great gift of charity. Hence, neither can S. Paul’s rupture with S.

¹ As we have considered the subject of Joshua’s Miracle, in connection with its general bearing on the alleged contradictions between Science and Revelation, in a former Paper (vid. *Eccles.* Feb. 1855); we venture to refer our readers to that.

Barnabas, nor S. Peter's dissimulation, a whit interfere with the absolute fidelity of their writings,¹ or their *infallible* authority as vehicles of that portion of Divine Truth which the HOLY GHOST selected, qualified, and inspired them to convey.

Compare S. Paul's language on these two heads. As a man he is 'nothing,' or 'the chief of sinners;' as an organ of the HOLY GHOST he is 'not a whit behind the very chiefest Apostle.' He makes no secret of his bodily infirmities, and yet claims for his writings Divine authority: "If any man think himself a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge that the things *I write* to you *are the commandments of the LORD.*" "We *command* and exhort by our LORD JESUS CHRIST." "If any man obey not *our word* by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him." "Which things we teach not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but *which the HOLY GHOST teacheth.*" "Though *we* (even *ourselves*, in our personal capacity,) or an Angel from Heaven, preach any gospel unto you beyond (or beside,' [Greek]) that which *we* have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

And as for what Mr. Williams further maintains, that the Inspiration of the Sacred Writers, if greater than that of the present day, merely arose from the fact of the better natural opportunities which they possessed of obtaining information respecting CHRIST and [153] His religion, let the same S. Paul answer him. He emphatically protests that he did *not* derive his knowledge of the Gospel through those ordinary channels here referred to. "I *certify* you, brethren, that the Gospel preached by me is *not* after man: for I *neither received it of man*, nor was I taught it, *but by the Revelation of JESUS CHRIST.*" So again, in his authoritative account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist: "I *received of the LORD* that which also I delivered unto you." And again, "I delivered unto you *that which I also received*, how that CHRIST died for our sins," &c.

We believe then, that each writer of the Sacred Canon, so far as his commission extended, whether his particular province was "doctrine, reproof, correction, or instruction;" whether himself a recipient of Divine Revelation and inspired to translate it, for the permanent benefit of the Church, into the language of men; or whether equally inspired to narrate faithfully, and as seen by the eyes of GOD, the historical basis of these progressive Revelations, and the chain of significant events which link them together,—we believe that each individual writer, in this his own proper domain, was guided into "*all truth*;" that his writings, though the work of erring fallible man, are no less truly and essentially the work of GOD: for, he whom GOD hath *sent* speaketh the *words of GOD*, *because* GOD giveth His Spirit unto him. It is the HOLY SPIRIT who thus qualifies His instruments for the work severally assigned them: it is as His organs for a specific purpose, that they are one and all *infallible*.²

¹ "Non inquire quid *fecerint*" (writes S. Augustine) "quid *scripserint* quæro."

² Into the question of the alleged discrepancies between the several writers of the Canon, our space forbids us to enter. We may merely remark, that it is at once suggestive and instructive to compare the language of our modern theological sciolists on this head, with that of the Saints and Fathers of old; to contrast the easy, self-confident, voluble manner in which the former pronounce upon the 'errors,' 'imperfections,' 'contradictions,' of the Inspired Penmen, with the thoughtful, reverent tone in which the latter allude to the subject. "If you think," says S. Justin Martyr, to his Jewish opponent, "to reduce me to the strait of confessing that the Scriptures contradict one another, you are mistaken; for I *never dare either think or say such a thing*: but if any Scripture is proposed which has the appearance of contradicting another, *since I am fully persuaded that Scripture nowhere contradicts itself*, I will rather confess that *it is I myself who do not understand* what it says."—(Dial. c. Tryph. c. 65.) This is but a sample of the deep conviction which universally pervaded the early Church on this head. And what is such an intuitive conviction on the part of CHRIST'S mystical Body, but the voice of GOD Himself? The *deep* harmonies of the SPIRIT
{cont.}

II. But this brings us to the second cardinal error of Mr. Williams' Theopneustic views,—the assumption (namely) that the human element which unquestionably pervades every page of the Sacred Volume, detracts from its plenary authority. He loses no opportunity of pressing upon us these various indications of *human* handiwork which every where abound, reminding us how the writings are absolutely unintelligible if we “refuse to see that they[154] are the embodiments of thoughts that have passed through the minds of living *men*” (p. 207); that the “mental horizon” of each writer is in exact accordance with the age wherein his lot was cast, &c. &c.

“Only,” he continues, “it must be added that all these proofs of *genuineness* are, also, equally proofs of a positive *limitation of the range of knowledge*. We cannot, in one moment, say, these books were written in such an age because they have the knowledge of that age, and in the next moment argue that they have a Divine *omniscience*.”—P. 293.

A word in passing, on this last expression. Mr. Williams is perpetually insinuating that the belief in the proper Inspiration of the Sacred Writings involves with it the absurd notion of the individual *omniscience* of the *writers*; and that there is no standing ground between his own sceptical opinions and this extravagance. This may be a convenient artifice to perplex the minds of the simple, and to give, by contrast, a favourable colour to his own views: it is questionable, however, how far such (virtual) misrepresentation is calculated to subserve the cause of truth. But this by the way. The argument now before us, stripped of all disguise, is simply as follows: here are certain writings, presenting unequivocal traces of human authorship, “embodying the thoughts,” speaking the language, of “living man:” a “deep religious spirit” undoubtedly “animates” them, but being confessedly human, they *cannot* be Divine.

The mystery of the HOLY INCARNATION utterly annihilates this argument. The human *has been* Divine. The words of man *have been* the very words of GOD. In the Incarnate SON, as Man, the HOLY GHOST dwelt without measure; and hence His every word was essentially Divine. For “He whom GOD hath sent speaketh the words of GOD, because GOD giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him.” Hence the Apostle tells us, that it was “GOD” who “*spoke in the Son*” ([Greek] Heb. i 1.) But here comes the important consideration, that the very same expression which the Apostle employs concerning the SON, he employs also concerning the Prophets, telling us that it was no less GOD who spoke *in them*: the same Inbreathing Spirit being the efficient cause in this latter case even as in the former. But to none of them was the Spirit imparted “without measure;” therefore they, one and all, “knew” but “*in part*,” “prophesied” but “*in part*,” the ALMIGHTY using each of them as the vehicle of transmission, not of His “whole Truth,” but of *one portion* or phase of His Truth. And this is what the Apostle means, in telling us that when GOD “spake in the Prophets,” He communicated His Revelation “*in many parts*” ([Greek]) as well as “*in divers manners*.” So that it is not any isolated writing in the Canon, but the combined aggregate of the [155] whole, which forms the one, complete, many sided, written Revelation of GOD—the [Greek],—the written “Word;” the full manifestation of the Being and Nature of GOD, in so far as It impinges upon and concerns *man*. For, not for the blessed Angels, but for *man* is the Scripture given; hence, so far from its human form vitiating the Divine communication, it becomes an integral and necessary part of it, being in fact the very channel of its conveyance.

will ever appear discordant to the mere intellectual religionist, and to the ear unattuned to the music of Heaven.

On the office of the HOLY SPIRIT in blending together the Divine and human elements in the Sacred Writings, we may quote the following from Mr. Lee's very valuable Treatise on Inspiration.

"The HOLY SPIRIT," he writes, "as the productive *principle*, embraces the entire activity of those whom He inspires, rendering their language the Word of GOD (1 Thess. ii. 13.) The entire substance and form of Scripture, whether resulting from Revelation or natural knowledge, are thus blended together into one harmonious whole: direct communications of religious truth, as well as the inferences which the Sacred Writers deduced therefrom; the lessons to be learned whether from exhibitions of miraculous power, or from the facts of history;— such matters, together with all the collateral details of Scripture, have been assimilated into one homogeneous organism by the vital energy of the Spirit."—*Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, p. 33.

With regard to the idiosyncrasies of the several writers, Mr. Lee expresses himself no less ably and carefully,

"The peculiar type of each writer's nature was even essential to the due *reception* of that particular phase of truth presented by his statements; his share in the great work was apportioned to the order of his intellect and the class of his emotions; while his characteristic form of expression was absolutely requisite for the adequate and complete *conveyance* of his Divine message. Without the moving power, man could not have grasped the Divine communications; without the living instrument those communications could not have received fitting expression."¹ *Ib.* p. 145.

It will be seen from what has been said, how utterly shallow and vain is this notion of Mr. Williams, that the human form, in any way, detracts from or qualifies the Divine message; that we are to rise above the "letter" in order to grasp the "spirit;" to discard the words, that we may lay hold of the essential truth of which they are but the empty symbol. Now all this may look very specious, and have a show of wisdom: in reality it is mere folly. How can we grasp the "spirit" but by means of the "letter?" How can we reach the truth without the words? It is only when clad [156] in human form, expressed in human language, that Divine Truth can be apprehended by men. We have no faculties for embracing abstract, essential Truth. Therefore this visionary and high-sounding talk about the 'spirit' versus the 'letter,' the 'religion' versus the 'book,' the 'truth' versus the words,' &c. &c., if not sheer nonsense, can only proceed on the supposition that we are *not men*; that we ourselves are "out of the body" and therefore stand in need of disembodied truth.

Take the first illustration that comes to hand.

Mr. Williams asks, When we read 'GOD *said*, Let there be Light,' must we understand the emission of a human sounding voice? We simply reply that we have no means of ascertaining; and hence, just because we *cannot* understand the *mode* of either this or any other Divine operation, we reverently adopt that translation of it into the sphere of our human conceptions, which the Almighty Himself has condescended to give us; convinced that it is, *to us*, the most adequate expression of the operation that either language could convey, or ourselves comprehend.

In connection with this subject, the important theological distinction between Revelation and Inspiration, so carefully traced out (and we believe, in the main, accurately) by Mr. Lee, claims a passing notice. The Divine Revealer, alike in the Old and New Testament, is

¹ And again (p. 234): "Even when acting *officially* as organs of the HOLY SPIRIT, the agents chosen exhibit styles quite dissimilar,—they pursue different paths of teaching,—they grasp the truth from different sides; such individual peculiarities being, in fact, the means which GOD has employed for the purpose of exhibiting and developing the different phases of Divine truth."

GOD the SON, the Personal LOGOS, the great Self-Revelation of GOD ;—for “no man knoweth the FATHER save the SON, and he to whom the SON will reveal Him.” But through what agency is this “Wisdom of GOD” brought within the bounds of human apprehension? Whose office is it to “take of the things of CHRIST and *show* them unto *men?*”

The same Eternal Spirit who, in the Womb of the Blessed Virgin, fashioned the Body of the Incarnate WORD, that thus “GOD might be *manifest* in the flesh,” and infinite Wisdom and essential Truth bold converse with men; He it was who inspired the Sacred Penmen to give human expression to the same incomprehensible WORD, that thus the mysteries of the everlasting Godhead might be exhibited to mankind,—exhibited too, not merely in their objective awfulness, but (their *practical bearing* on man being herein enunciated by precept and illustrated by example) so that they might subserve the purposes of “doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.” And as, in the case of the Incarnate WORD, the Godhead suffered no degradation, but the Manhood a supernatural exaltation; so, in the case of the written WORD, the Divine Revelation underwent no deterioration by its outward expression; but the human vehicle, *without ceasing to be human*, became Divine. It is the Blessed Spirit then, by whose all-vivifying transforming agency the Divine is introduced within the sphere of the human; is projected on earthly media, vested in human form, clothed in human language, rendered capable of being the subject [157] of human contemplation. And if, from any vain and presumptuous notion of grasping what we imagine to be *unadulterated* truth, we depreciate the Divine medium of its conveyance, we shall assuredly miss the Truth itself; and shall be found despising, *not man, but GOD*.

Mr. Williams thinks that in order to do full homage to the [Greek] it is necessary to show a lofty contempt for the [Greek] which convey it. CHRIST tells us exactly the reverse, assuring us (let Mr. Williams heed the warning) that he who despises *the words*’ ([Greek]), him the WORD ([Greek]) shall judge at the last day. And why? Because, in rejecting its Divinely-moulded outward expression, he must necessarily apprehend it erroneously, and will therefore be found to have embraced some counterfeit phantom of his own, and rejected that which was alone “able to save his soul.”

So uniformly, in fact, are the *spoken* and *written* vehicles of the WORD attributed in Scripture to the agency of the HOLY GHOST, that (as we have shown in a former paper¹) the [Greek] and the [Greek] are even occasionally personified, and identified with their Divine Author Himself²—the omnipotent *Breath* or Utterance of JEHOVAH. The HOLY SPIRIT is that “*Mouth and Wisdom*” promised by CHRIST which the adversary should be unable to resist; and His first miraculous manifestation in the form of an embodied utterance, affords an interesting illustration and confirmation of this.

We must reluctantly quit this subject. A word, however, to guard against misconception.

1. This peculiar gift of the HOLY GHOST, technically called *Inspiration*, pervading and vivifying the whole organism of Scripture, was *confined* to the writers of the Sacred Canon. No other writer has possessed it.³ This the Church has ruled; here is an end of the

¹ See *Ecclesiastic*, Dec. 1854, [ϕ Dykes’s review ‘Lee on the Inspiration of Holy Scripture’, pp. 131ff. *supra*.] where the distinction between the [Greek] and the [Greek], and their connection with the Second and Third Persons, respectively, of the Blessed Trinity, are entered into at some length

² The same is the case with the word [Greek]: e.g. [Greek] Rev. xi. 10.

³ And yet Mr. Williams, with no clear conception, evidently, of what he is writing, presumes to suggest an invidious comparison between the Song of Solomon, and the works of Leighton, accounting for the
{cont.}

matter. Other works may tend to individual improvement, “*ad ædificationem plebis*” (in the well known words of S. Jerome), but “*non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.*” Henceforward, this particular gift, *in so far as it has descended*, (as exhibited in the unerring apprehension and correct enunciation of doctrinal truth,) belongs to *no* individual, but resides only in the collective Church—the Body of CHRIST. An individual therefore, even with Scripture to guide him, may not frame [158] his faith for himself; nay, he possesses not the faculty to enable him to balance and adjust with accuracy, and according to the Divine “Analogy,” the Inspired statements of Revelation. The Faith he has to learn from the one only official. Organ of the HOLY GHOST. The gifts of the Spirit which he can claim are the “ordinary” gifts; personal guidance and direction, Communion with CHRIST, Comfort, and Holy Love.

2. But does the Church inherit the faculty of *Revelation* as well as the gift of *Inspiration*? No. This resides only in her Divine Head. She has *received* her Revelation “once for all.” Her office is that of the HOLY GHOST (whose Organ she is)—to “take of the things of CHRIST and show them to men.” It is in the “Scriptures of Truth” that she has these “things of CHRIST” stored up for her. Here is her material. She is “not to diminish aught from it;” she is “to add nothing to it.” She is merely to “teach *all things*—neither more nor less (and upon her so doing is CHRIST’S Presence with her dependent)—“whatsoever” CHRIST, by His own mouth, or by His Spirit in the Prophets, “*has commanded;*” to “hold fast *that she hath, until*” her LORD comes.

To her therefore, “have been committed the Oracles of GOD.” They are her possession. She is their witness, keeper, expounder. From her the individual has to learn “the Faith.” And then, for confirmation therein, for further “teaching,” for personal “correction and instruction in righteousness,” she sends him to the Inspired Page. And if he approaches these Sacred Oracles, humble and believing,—yes, “*believing* that he *may know;*” in a lowly, self-renouncing, and receptive frame of mind; will he ever doubt that the words he reads are Divine? As his own spirit, quickened by prayer, drinks in the “unutterable utterances” of the SPIRIT; as he listens in reverent amaze to the wondrous Harmonies of Heaven; as he hears the solemn and mysterious pulses thrilling through the whole compass of the Sacred Diapason, while “deep answers to deep,” the Old to the New, the Mystical to the Literal, the Law to the Gospel, and his innermost soul is made to vibrate in sympathetic response; as he feels, with a feeling only the more intense because defying analysis, that he is upon Holy Ground—that above, below, around him are the Breathings of GOD,—that he must “loose his shoes from off his feet,” that he must “open his mouth and draw in his breath,” and “hearken what GOD the LORD will say;”—will his deep calm *certainty* in the Divinity of the Sacred Volume, his absolute assurance that “*All Scripture* is given by *Inspiration of GOD*” be shaken by whole tomes of cold, sceptical, critical, intellectual rationalism? impossible. The Church told him, this Book was from GOD. He believed her. But his faith has now expanded: he believes no longer “because of her words” alone. He “*knows it of a truth*” himself. Nay, he finds but an additional ground for this conviction in these very books written [159] to upset that conviction. Their appearance has been predicted. He is prepared for them. For what is their object?¹ To unsettle the Christian in

superiority of the latter on this ground, that “if CHRIST has improved the world, and the Church is better than the ancient Jerusalem, the indwelling SPIRIT *being better (!) must speak better words.*” p. 398. And this is the way a Christian author dares to express himself with regard to the “HOLY GHOST, *who spake* by the Prophets!”

¹ We mean of course their virtual object: GOD forbid that we should say (at least with regard to the book under notice) their intentional object.

his belief in the Divinity of the Bible and the authority of the Church: to undermine, thus, the two great pillars of *the Faith*, and effect that the Faith shall repose on the crumbling basis of every man's opinion; and so to upset it. Many "unstable souls" shall be beguiled. Not "rooted and settled" they shall be allured by the seductive advances of a "Godliness" which grounds its claims on being "Rational:" devoid of Mysteries, and not repugnant to the *natural* instincts of man, and that "*all embracing wisdom which is scarcely other than CHRIST;*" (p. 213.)—a Godliness too, which thinks more about piety than orthodoxy, inasmuch as it is the "spirit" only which "giveth life," while the "letter killeth;" which holds that "no man is really better or worse for framing his religion into formal propositions;" (p. 249.) and "the stereotyped rigidity" of "formularies" is not "so healing to the mind as those devout feelings" of which the other are "the moulded expression," (p. 278.) The "Man of GOD" heeds not, hearkens not. He is forewarned, forearmed. [Greek]¹

It is impossible however, to witness the rapid spread amongst ourselves of this modern rationalistic School of Divinity without serious alarm; or without acknowledging, at the same time, the far-penetrating and malignant subtlety of the Great Enemy. He well knows that the Church is invincible so long as she remains clad in the Armour of Light. So all his energies are directed (S. Paul gives a terrible hint² as to the eventual success of his schemes) to induce her to undervalue or misuse her Celestial Panoply, to lay aside "the shield of *the Faith*" and the "Sword of the Spirit," or perhaps to try and refashion them according to the improved standard of modern times, and thus leave herself exposed to his sleepless advances. Passing strange too, that the *first words* ever recorded to have been uttered by the Tempter, are precisely those [160] with which he is now insidiously plying the second Eve: "*Yea hath GOD said?*" darting envenomed doubts into the minds of the "wise and prudent" whether GOD *has* really spoken or not; urging that "Religion" does not consist in "propositions," nor Divine Truth in a congeries of statements which may after all be but of human origin; and thus, whatever be the doctrine which a man happens to find unpalatable, Eternal Punishment, the Atonement, Sacramental Grace, Original Sin,—rendering the denial of it easy by this plausible but poisonous insinuation, "*Hath GOD said it?*" How can we be sure that it is not but a human perversion of Truth? Is it not merely S. Paul adopting the ordinary but erroneous phraseology of his time? Or Moses indulging in a little harmless play of fancy?

Too well does the Adversary know the keen edge of the "Sword of the Spirit," not to fear it. He has not forgotten the three terrible thrusts himself received from it, those three Old Testament [Greek]. He has often experienced its irresistible power. He sees the Church is invincible so long as she keeps firm her grasp of it. He *must* delude her into loosening her hold. He has his emissaries hard at work spreading disparaging opinions as to its efficacy; representing it as old fashioned, as well enough for days of intellectual childhood; but not

¹ 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21. It is interesting, as evidencing the Catholic character of these Epistles to S. Timothy which lies hid in their particular form, to notice that the [Greek] is exhorted to "contend for the Faith" and "keep the Commandment, *until the Appearing* of the LORD JESUS," (I. vi. 11-14); and that it is with special reference to the "*last times*," and the perplexities and heresies which shall then arise, when men "turning their eyes from the Truth shall be turned to fables"—when the question, "what is Truth?" shall be pronounced unanswerable,—when Scripture itself shall be, by some denied in toto, by others in part; the Old Testament superciliously depreciated by many, both Testaments by more;—that it is a merciful provision for the special needs of these times that the Solemn Dictum is pronounced: *All Scripture, whether Old or New, is Divinely Inspired. All alike is profitable* for doctrine, instruction, &c. *All alike* has its part to perform in the thorough and perfect equipment of the "Man of GOD."

² [Greek] (2 Thess. ii. 3). Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1; S. Luke xviii. 8

for the full grown maturity of man's reasoning powers. It is *old*, and "old things ought to pass away,"¹ and the Indwelling Spirit now in the Church "*being better*," and having advanced with the age, "must speak better words." To what extent he will ultimately succeed, GOD only knows.

In taking leave of the melancholy book which has suggested these remarks, we find ourselves compelled to ask, whether it is fitting that a writer entertaining and propagating views so loose, so uncatholic, so supremely dangerous, should continue to occupy the place of trust which Mr. Williams now holds. A writer who formally denies the Inspiration of Holy Scripture; a writer who so far ignores the Prophetic Element in the Sacred Volume as to question [161] the existence of any *direct predictions* concerning CHRIST, either in the "Law of Moses, or in the Prophets, or in the Psalms;" a writer who insists upon the *utter abrogation* of the Moral Law, even of "the ten commandments;"² who loses no opportunity of speaking disparagingly (or with a patronizing approbation worse than dispraise) of those Old Testament Scriptures which our Blessed LORD never mentioned but with the profoundest respect, proclaiming them again and again to be the very words of GOD, insomuch that sooner could Heaven and earth pass, than one jot or one tittle of them fail; a writer who denies the Church's teaching on the solemn doctrine of Original Sin, proclaiming the Mosaic account of the Fall an "allegory," and seeking to lessen the force of S. Paul's startling statements on this head by the apologetic insinuation that "due allowance" must be made "for the *language of his school*," (p. 270); who teaches that "such texts as "There is none other Name given but One," &c. are to be clearly interpreted in a spiritual, not in a *grossly nominal* sense" (p. 36) in other words, to be pared down so as to square with a certain theory of his own; a writer whose private Sadduceean notions lead him to call in question the most positive assertions of our LORD and His Apostles on the subject of Spiritual Manifestations and operations, if not to ignore the existence and personality of Satan himself; who is ever insisting that Holy Scripture abounds with "imperfections," "transparent errors," "discrepancies," "contra-dictions;"—is such a writer, we repeat, a fit person to be intrusted with the Theological training of the Clergy of the

¹ Mr. Williams' elaborate exposition of S. Peter's celebrated saying, (2 S. Pet. i. 21.) "Holy men of GOD spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST," &c., is far too characteristic to be passed over without notice, (p. 294, &c.) He begins with the words, "*Holy Men*."

1. "The writers after all are men; and the condition of mankind is imperfection."

2. "They were *holy men*," but "all human holiness is *comparative*."

3. "They *spake*; but speech is the organ of thought; therefore there is *nothing in Scripture but what was first in the mind of the scribe*."

4. "They. spake *of old*; but all old times represent as it were the *childhood* of the human race and therefore *had childish things, which we must put away*."

5. "The *Holy Ghost* was their teacher; but the province" of the HOLY GHOST "is not to give knowledge," . . . but . . . "rather to quicken our conceptions of things otherwise known."

6. The important word[Greek], telling us of the Divine [Greek] or Impulse under which these ancient Seers wrote, is unnoticed in this edifying exposition, and

7. Our Author reminds us that, after all, S. Peter never wrote these words! We need not add any comment!

² We wonder whether Mr. Williams has ever signed or read the VIIth Article. [ϕ 'VII. **Of the Old Testament:** The Old Testament is not contrary to the New: for both in the Old and New Testament everlasting life is offered to Mankind by Christ, who is the only Mediator between God and Man, being both God and Man. Wherefore they are not to be heard, which feign that the old Fathers did look only for transitory promises. Although the Law given from God by Moses, as touching Ceremonies and Rites, do not bind Christian men, nor the Civil precepts thereof ought of necessity to be received in any commonwealth; yet notwithstanding, no Christian man whatsoever is free from the obedience of the Commandments which are called Moral.']

depressed Church in Wales? It must not, it cannot be. Mr. Williams appears to be a learned man, an accomplished scholar, a man too of personal piety, and with a high-minded earnestness of character, (at least, so his book seems to indicate—for we know nothing of him beyond); nay, even his present work, as we have fully admitted, contains many really valuable thoughts and suggestions; but *he is in the downward road to positive heresy*. And is it to be, that a teacher, himself pursuing that perilous path, should hold the position of accredited guide to those who have in their turn to be teachers of thousands? that we are to have our Theological neophytes in Wales indoctrinated, at the most critical period of their lives, with opinions and tendencies of thought which, if legitimately developed and not corrected by the Omnipotent Grace of GOD, *must* lead them to “make shipwreck of the Faith?” GOD forbid it. Our Author tells us, with regard to himself, how his views have advanced within the last few years, (p. 60.) And unquestionably his worst sermons are his latest; especially the two preached before the University of Cambridge. May a Good LORD arrest any further *advance* in the same direction!

If Mr. Williams will *really* make progress in Theology, and render that true service to the Church which his natural endowments [162] warrant her in expecting at his hands; he must learn to postpone his individual opinions to that teaching of the HOLY GHOST of which Holy Scripture is the depository and the Church the authoritative exponent; he must learn the difficult lesson, that the receptive faculty whereby alone Divine Mysteries can be apprehended, is not natural reason, but supernatural Faith; he must bethink him of the Apostles themselves, whose ‘reason’ led them all astray as to the meaning of the Oracles of GOD, who merely groped in the dark, till the Risen SAVIOUR “opened their understandings that they *might understand* the Scriptures;” he must realise the profound depth of truth involved in that old Catholic dictum to which he himself refers, though only to except against it—“*Believe that thou mayest understand;*” above all, he must reverently meditate on those solemn words: [Greek].

ϕ Fowler records: ‘In his letter, written to his brother-in-law, the Rev. John Cheape, who was then laid aside from active work, he alludes to his review of a book which at the time was famous:—

DURHAM, 1856

I have just been sending to the press a review of Rowland Williams’ “Rational Godliness.” He is an ex-fellow of King’s, Cambridge; and vice-principal and Hebrew Professor of Lampeter Theological College. Some of his sermons are striking and beautiful.

Unfortunately, he has most loose notions on the subject of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. It strikes me these notions are spreading fearfully. The devil seems to have a great many “irons in the fire” at present. There is a great movement going on in the English Church, and he evidently wishes to meet it, and to thwart it somehow.

He seems at present to be instituting a series of experiments in different quarters, in order to test the assailable [60] points, and to collect data, to enable him to elaborate some more definite and concentrated mode of attack. It behoves us all to be prepared, holding fast to the “Shield of Faith,” and the “Sword of the Spirit”—the two great weapons of defence and offence—

“praying always with all prayer.” I fancy this last great spiritual engine is too much underrated by all of us. Preachers and Controversialists, and Reviewers, go on fighting the Battle of the Lord, and if the cause of Truth seems to triumph, they are apt to think it is their own arm which has prevailed to subdue Amalek; forgetting, perhaps, many a retired, unnoticed, unheeded Moses, whose Prayers in the Mount are the real cause of the success of the Combatants.’¹

¹ φ Fowler, pp. 59—60.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 18 (Joseph Masters: London, 1856)

[245] **LORD A. HERVEY ON INSPIRATION:
LAMPETER THEOLOGY.**

The Inspiration of Holy Scripture. Five Sermons preached before the University of Cambridge, in the month of December, 1855. By the Rev. LORD ARTHUR HERVEY, M.A., Rector of Ickworth with Horringer. Cambridge: Macmillan. 1856.

Lampeter Theology exemplified in extracts from the Vice-Principal's Lectures, Letters, and Sermons. London: Bell and Daldy. 1856.

It is a fact deserving attention, that the minds of churchmen seem to be directed in many quarters towards a reconsideration of the important subject of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. If the Church would "continue" grounded and settled "in those things which she has learned and been assured of," she must be fully certified "*from whom* she has learned them," whether from GOD or man. And it is hardly possible to possess even a cursory acquaintance with much of the current theology of the day, especially of the 'broad' Anglo-German school of divinity, without the persuasion that its whole tendency is to suggest doubts on that fundamental and deeply momentous question. Many will remember the warning offered some years ago, by one, himself an acute observer of the tendencies of thought which characterized the age: "I wish to declare what I think will be found really to be the case, viz. that a battle for the canon of Scripture is but the next step after a battle for the Creed; . . . and that if we were not defending the Creed, we should at this moment be defending the Canon. Nay, I would predict, as a coming event, that minds *are to be unsettled* as to what is Scripture, and what is not."

Already the truth of this warning is being seriously realized. We are beset with writers, not only external to our own communion, but even amongst ourselves, who are disseminating opinions utterly annihilative of any real belief in the Inspiration of Holy Scripture; drawing arbitrary distinctions between the 'letter' and the 'spirit;' accepting just as much of the Canon as commends itself to their individual intuition, boldly rejecting the rest; utterly unsettled in their minds as to the nature and extent of the authority of either Holy Scripture or the Church; and eagerly parading their own melancholy doubts, and spreading the spiritual infection.

The sermons which head this article have been written under a serious sense of the dangers above alluded to, and with the view of offering a sober check to the spread of such opinions; they were delivered before that university before which some of the most [246] reckless of the recent attacks upon the plenary Inspiration of the Bible had the accidental distinction of being preached.¹

Lord Arthur Hervey is favourably known as an accomplished scholar, and as a devout student of Holy Scripture. He writes too under a sufficiently becoming sense of the responsibility which the propagation of opinions on such a subject and in such a place entails; and generally, in a religious, sober, and earnest tone. Still we must at once confess that his sermons have strangely disappointed us. In fact, it appears hardly necessary to look farther than these very discourses, delivered with the distinct purpose of upholding the plenary Inspiration of the Written Word, to see how widely disseminated are views on this subject absolutely fatal to any consistent idea of Inspiration whatever. The writer appears to labour carefully and religiously in establishing the reality of the Divine Influence pervading and penetrating the whole of Scripture: he rears the edifice diligently and discreetly, and then at the last has the questionable satisfaction, by means of a number of fatal concessions and limitations, of overturning it to the very ground. He "buildeth his house," and then "pulleth it down with his hands." Let us briefly show this.

¹ See Williams' "Rational Godliness," Sermons xix. and xxiv [ϕ p. 198 *supra*.]

Lord Hervey commences with a detailed examination of S. Paul's famous declaration, 2 Tim. iii. 14—17; taking it clause by clause. After some remarks on verse 14,¹ he proceeds to the expression [Greek] of verse 15, where he truly reminds us, our English Version misses the particular shade of meaning conveyed.

“[Greek] means simply ‘to know letters,’ to be educated,’ or ‘learned,’ . . . e.g. S. John vii. 15; Acts xxvi. 24, &c. . . . When therefore S. Paul says ‘From a child [Greek] and that too in connexion with his having *learnt* such and such things, ([Greek]) it is manifest that he is using, so to speak, educational language. He reminds Timothy, that in his youth he had not learnt merely letters, but ‘sacred letters;’ his studies had been in the literature of heaven; he had been conversant with Divine books. And then, keeping up the metaphor, he adds, still in the same professional language, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation,’ &c. [Greek] ordinary learning, letters, are intended and adapted to make men wise with earthly wisdom. But the sacred letters in which Timothy had been taught were able to make him wise unto salvation.’ Thus the whole verse acquires point and elegance, and we have not to affix a meaning to [Greek] which they nowhere have in Scripture; for though in the passage before us they indirectly mean the Scriptures as being the sole repository of sacred learning, yet it is, I conceive, only *indirectly* that they do so.”

[247]

Still it should not be overlooked that [Greek] was a phrase in ordinary use among the Jews as designating the Books of the Old Testament. Both Philo and Josephus employ it in this sense.² And this should be fully borne in mind in reading the above extract.

In the succeeding verse, however, the technical word [Greek] occurs, and this of course can only be rendered by our corresponding expression “Scripture.” We need not follow our author in his discussion of this verse: the conclusion at which he arrives (in which we perfectly agree with him) is, that our English Version adequately and accurately expresses the sentiments of the Apostle.³

“Nor can one fail to be struck with the perfect consistency of S. Paul's language, who speaks of the instrument by which the ‘man of GOD’ is to be thus thoroughly furnished as given by ‘inspiration of GOD.’ By his office the ‘man of GOD’ has Divine work to do, and therefore GOD has furnished him with a Divine instrument to do it. And oh! . . . if all those who are called to the office and work of the ministry would betake themselves to the study of the holy Scriptures in a spirit correspondent to what the Apostle here says of their power and excellency and Divine origin! if they would seek wisdom from them as from a fountain not of human but of Divine intelligence; and study the ‘sacred letters’ with that mixture of earnest curiosity and deep reverence which lessons breathed by the breath of GOD seem to demand at the hands of an

¹ Lord Hervey has wisely reconsidered (note p. 9) the interpretation of [Greek] offered in his first Sermon. The reference of [Greek] to GOD, which he there advocates, strikes us as forced and untenable (Cf. [Greek] ii. 2.)

² See *Lee*, p. 256

³ Our readers will be aware that against this rendering there is urged, i. The absence of the article before [Greek]. But to this it is to be answered that [Greek], being a technical word used in reference to one exclusive and peculiar object, comes under the category of a proper name, and, as such, may omit the article; e.g. [Greek] not “*every* house of Israel,” but “all the house of Israel;” so [Greek], &c., &c. ii. The omission of the copula. But this is of most ordinary and constant recurrence in S. Paul's writings, e.g. [Greek] “Every creature of GOD is good,” &c.

The Vulgate translation, “Omnis Scriptura divinitus inspirata utilis est,” &c. doubtless arises from the fact of the omission of the [Greek] after [Greek] in the Greek text employed; as appears to be the case in certain old MSS. The ordinary reading, however, [Greek]. is unquestionably the true one [vid. Lachman in loc.]: and this being the case, the suggested translation, ‘Every inspired Scripture is *also* useful,’ &c. can only be designated as awkward and unnatural in the extreme, and we believe, quite without parallel in the New Testament.

Our English Translation is that adopted by S. Chrysostom, S. Athanasius, S. Gregory Nazianzen, Ecumenius, &c. Among later writers we may mention C. à Lapide, Estius, Bengel, Beza. It is the translation of almost all the versions, including the modern Greek. S. Athanasius' quotation of this passage (*Ep. ad Marcellin.*, see *Lee*, p. 476.) is worth noticing. [Greek]

intelligent creature like man I verily believe that neglect of the Scriptures is one of the great sins men will have to answer for when they stand before the Judgment seat of CHRIST.”—Pp. 3, 4.

This passage presents a fair indication of the feeling of sincere and unaffected reverence with which our author himself regards [248] the Inspired Volume. He truly urges, that as “*All Scripture is of Divine origin and animated with the breath of GOD’S Holy Spirit,*” “*every part*” of it “has its proper use and profit;” that it is “an inexhaustible treasury of wisdom to which we may resort for guidance and instruction on every occasion” (p. 18); that we should cultivate the habit of “minutely criticizing” even “particular expressions,” “not *thinking any criticism too minute*, provided it be true, by which the exact force of particular expressions can be ascertained:” and, advancing from general assertion to particular proof, he proceeds to indicate what are the “broad lines of argument,” whereby, as he conceives, the [Greek] or Divine Inspiration of ‘*All Scripture*’ “may be demonstrated with all the force which a moral demonstration is capable of” (p. 48);—himself meanwhile bearing in mind that he is speaking, not to doubters or cavillers, but “as a Christian minister to a Christian congregation; to those who possess, who study, who believe and love the Scriptures as the [written] Word of GOD.” (ib.)

All we can say is, so far so good.

Our author now advances to the alleged objections urged against Inspiration; reminding us *in limine* that “many of them are altogether of our own creating;” and that “others will also disappear as larger and juster views of Holy Scripture in general, and particular portions of it, are admitted into our minds.” (p. 50.)

After dealing concisely but fairly with the difficulties introduced by Scripture statements which appear to invest immoral actions with Divine sanction; or which seem to militate against the discoveries of science, the truth of history, or general probability’ (pp. 52—71); he proceeds to the further difficulties springing from particular expressions, seeming contradictions, and other traces of mere *human* authorship (Serm. v.). And here we must confess that his mode of dealing with these objections appears to us most inadequate and unsatisfactory. One concession is made after another, till he has unconsciously abandoned the high ground occupied in his earlier sermons, and virtually resigned all he fought for. He has guarded all the great outworks of the castle, its visible battlements, and defences; and now leaves exposed a secret portal through which the enemy may effect an entrance into the very heart of the fortress. He commits himself to that most treacherous and delusive hypothesis, that in many cases “while the *substance* or message was from GOD, the writer was *left* to clothe it in *his own words*,” for thus only, he thinks, can we account for the contrast between the sublimity and beauty of many parts of Scripture and the “*needless coarseness* of expression” of other parts.

In other words, (for it cannot be too frequently urged that the case comes to this) *part* of the Bible only is Divine and part human. And who is to apportion their respective extents of territory to the [249] two elements? Once admit this theory; admit that the Sacred Writers were occasionally *left to themselves*, allowed to clothe the germ of truth in their own language, allowed to fall into *slight errors and inadvertencies*; and the peculiar infallible authority of Scripture is gone. For as each person is to decide for himself what is the germ of essential truth, and what but the verbal covering, the inevitable result will be, that whatever any individual finds distasteful or inexplicable will be at once consigned to the latter category. We saw in our April number the perilous extent to which this same theory is developed in Mr. Williams’ “Rational Godliness.” But so it must be. Let it once be assumed that “*All Scripture*” does not really mean “*All*,” and that the Holy Spirit occasionally withdrew His superintending Influence and “left” the Writers to themselves—it only remains for every man to apply this theory according to his tastes and predilections, to recognize so much of Scripture as Divine which commends itself as such to his limited faculties; to disregard as “human” whatever fails so to establish its claims.

Lord Hervey may say that it is merely in “*insignificant* details” and “*minutiæ*” that he considers the Holy Spirit to have deserted¹ the writers. But what are “*insignificant* details?” What are *minutiæ*? Who dare pronounce? Moreover, how can a writer so express himself who has solemnly admonished his readers to “consider no criticism too minute” which may enable them to arrive at the exact force of the “particular expressions” of Holy Writ? For of course the number and nature of the “insignificant details” will vary in exact proportion to the individual prejudices, the intellectual or spiritual attainments of each individual. One reader will find most Divine “significance” in “details” which to another appear barren and trivial. Nor can any more effectual means be adopted to extinguish that “earnest curiosity and deep reverence” which Lord Hervey so truly commends, and which is due to every word and phrase of the Inspired Volume, than the disheartening suspicion that after all, such labour may be but in vain; a waste of time; a bootless search for “foot-prints of the CREATOR” where none are to be found. Is it likely that men will ever apply themselves with hearty zeal to the “minute criticism of particular expressions,” if, renouncing the ancient belief that “*every word* of Scripture (to quote a saying of Origen’s) rightly understood, has *some special purpose* to effect,” and that, as in nature, the closer the examination, the more abundant will be the harvest of beauties disclosed, the more glorious the proofs of Infinite Perfection; —they are to content themselves with the notion that *much* of the language (how much they cannot say) is but that of ordinary mortals? Is it probable that any solid advance will be made in Scripture exegesis if this dangerous opinion, in all its various stages of development, spreads; if the student is to be encouraged, when arrested by any difficulty or seeming contradiction—instead of ‘searching diligently’ for the Divine Mystery enwrapped in the verbal ambiguity, for the real and profound agreement underlying the apparent discrepancy—to pass it by, content with the miserable comfort that it is but the “infirmity of human eyes, human ears, human memories, [‘HE shall guide you into *all* truth, and bring *all things* to your remembrance,’ &c.] and human intellect,” which “produces these varieties” and difficulties, and that “it was *not part of the purpose of GOD* to interpose” and correct them? (p. 80.)

We trow not.

Lord Hervey has taken up that vague and ensnaring notion that there exists some solid standing ground between the absolute truthfulness of Inspiration, and the fallibility and uncertainty of ordinary human diction. Will this estimable writer define for us the limits and extent of this unexplored border territory, and assure us who is really the owner of it; whether it is held by man and GOD conjointly, or alternately; whether absolute truth and partial error are here supposed to tabernacle side by side. We confess to feeling a strong suspicion of these unappropriated tracts. But, says our author, such a region plainly *does* exist; for (i.) in many cases a “reconciliation” of the Sacred Writers one with another is “*hopeless*,” hence there *must* be imperfection somewhere; and (ii.) “it is *obvious* that such a complete overbearing of the individual minds of the Sacred Writers as would have been required to produce the unanimity wished for [i. e., we suppose, to enable them all to relate with perfect truthfulness] would have *entirely destroyed* the value of their separate testimony and *reduced it to the single testimony of the one Spirit*.” (P. 80.)

It is with unfeigned regret that we find a pious and accomplished writer like Lord Hervey lending his countenance to crudities such as the above.

A word on each of these two points.

¹ “The disagreement” *commences* at the *minutiæ* before named. Is not the conclusion naturally resulting from this, that the direct *inspiration did not extend* to such *minutiæ*, but that in them the writers expressed *in their own words the thoughts of their own hearts*? And these observations apply equally to the Old and New Testaments.” (P. 81.)

I. The Sacred Writers so manifestly contradict one another in certain places, that any attempt at reconciliation seems “hopeless.” That is, Lord Hervey has not yet discovered the clue to unravel certain complex and conflicting statements of the writers; he has not yet been led by the Spirit to discover the central and consistent truth wherein these verbal divergencies have their point of meeting; to grasp the solid reality, of whose several sides the other form the *necessary* outward projections or expressions; so he pronounces that no such interior unity exists, and reasons accordingly.

[251]

He does not say, Here are certain writings: the Church of GOD has ever pronounced them Divinely Inspired. As such, they must infinitely transcend all mere human composition. Being, like “all the works of the LORD,” “perfect,” they must to our limited apprehensions present many difficulties, many things “hard to be understood,” incentives to faith (“to be *sought out* of them that have pleasure therein”), as well as occasions of unbelief. In them I find certain ambiguities, apparent contradictions and the like, which evade all my sagacity. How am I to account for them? Is it that the expression, “*All Scripture*” does not include these particular passages, that positive error (be it never so small) has crept in, that the Divine Records are really inconsistent with one another? Or is it perchance that for some cause or other I misapprehend them? It *must* be the latter. I will with patience wait. In GOD’S good time, if such be His pleasure, He will make this seeming difficulty plain to me.

Our Author however rather argues as follows:—All Scripture is doubtless inspired; but then *we see* in certain places it contradicts itself; *we see* in it occasional unimportant errors and misstatements. Hence the word “Inspiration” must obviously be accepted with such qualifications and limitations as will give scope for the existence of such observed and acknowledged imperfections. And this conclusion it is further urged, is the result of “sound induction.” Were we infallibly certified that *we see* either correctly or fully, and that what appear to our finite capacities contradictions, appear so to the eyes of GOD, the “induction” would be “sound;” as it is, it is futile and visionary. But secondly,

II. Our Author seems further to maintain that these slight discrepancies and errors are in a measure *necessary*, as vouchers for the independence of the testimony of the several writers to those great doctrinal verities to which they severally bear witness; i.e., that a certain admixture of falsehood is necessary in order to establish truth.

We do not profess fully to apprehend Lord Hervey’s meaning. “Absolute unanimity” between the writers, he says, “would have entirely destroyed the value of their separate testimony.” Does “*unanimity*” here mean. *absolute coincidence* of narrative and expression? If so, the sentence is intelligible, though somewhat trite. Or does “unanimity” mean strict adherence on the part of all to truth? Does our author mean, that in describing different scenes, or events, or different aspects of the same event, had not the several writers slightly deflected, one or all of them, from the line of perfect truthfulness, the value of their several testimonies would be gone? If so, we can only marvel at the strange confusion of thought betrayed.

It appears in fact, to be here intimated that the Blessed Spirit [252] could not have guided His human instruments into “*all truth*” without some consequent detriment to the truth itself. Had the writers maintained an undeviating verbal accuracy in matters of detail, such inerrancy would have involved the “*substitution* of the One Omniscient Mind of GOD as the sole Author of the Books of Scripture, *instead* of the many *minds* of Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists;” it would have “entirely destroyed the value of the separate testimony.”—(Pp. 80, 79, 76.) Such remarks can only be based on a complete misapprehension of the idea of Inspiration; on the hypothesis that it must necessarily involve the suppression of the individuality of its subjects. But this cannot be admitted for a moment. There is no *substitution* of the One Mind for the many minds, but rather a combination or co-operation of the two. It is not the Mind of the Spirit “overbearing” the several minds of His human instruments, but acting *through* them; first elevating them, then employing them. For *gratia non tollit sed perficit naturam*. Nature is not obliterated

but perfected by grace. Selected, as each several writer doubtless was, in *consequence* of a certain natural capacity for apprehending and expressing some one particular phase of Divine Truth, and a certain inherent affinity, as it were, to it; such personal features would not be suppressed but *employed*, and illuminated and exalted while employed; the ordinary human sources of information at the writer's disposal, his particular endowments, his style, his acquirements, educational or other, his memory, his modes of thought and expression, all enlisted, sublimated and illumined, to subserve that specific purpose, and convey that particular message, Doctrinal, Practical, Historical, for the transmission of which he was originally chosen and qualified.

The same breath through different instruments gives forth tones perfectly dissimilar; the oneness of the former does not "overbear" the individuality of the latter. And who can fail to perceive how infinitely the beauty of the divine strains of Scripture is enhanced by reason of the symphonious combination of the various human instruments through which the Breathings of the One Spirit are borne to our ears ?

But we considered this whole subject at considerable length in our recent notice of Mr. Williams' "Rational Godliness," so that we need not further enlarge upon it.

We find however that we have omitted one of Lord Hervey's arguments. He tells us that we have distinct Scripture authority not only for the border-territory of doubtful Inspiration, but for a third region also where there is no Inspiration whatever. S. Paul, he tells us, makes this three-fold distinction. "We find him," he writes, "in his Epistles *carefully distinguishing* between precepts given by direct commandment, precepts given on his own *human* [253] authority, and precepts in which he *thought* he also had the Spirit of GOD."—(P. 82.) So that in the case of certain of the Apostolic injunctions we *know* that they come to us simply with *human* authority, as the advice of an ordinary man; while in others, as S. Paul himself *could not decide*, still less can we, whether his words express the mind of the Spirit of GOD or not. It is really disheartening to find a pious and learned writer, like our author, having recourse to arguments so miserable and so often refuted, against the reality and *universality* of Scripture Inspiration.

Here are certain 'cases of conscience' proposed (1 Cor. vii.) for Apostolic adjudication. They are treated in various ways. S. Paul begins by offering certain inspired "*counsels*:" "I speak this [Greek] by way of counsel ['secundum indulgentiam:' Vulg.], not by way of command" (inasmuch as "every man hath his proper gift of GOD;" and the Apostle, like his Divine Master, would not cast stumbling-blocks before the consciences of any.) Further on, a case presents itself, (ver. 10, 11,) which had already been solemnly pronounced upon by our LORD Himself, (vid. S. Matt. v. 32; xix. 6, 9.) Here, therefore, the Apostle adds nothing beyond, but simply refers to what "the LORD" had already spoken, ("Not I, but the LORD.") The following cases had not been specifically noticed by "*the Lord*." Here, therefore, S. Paul brings his own inspired authority to bear, (ver. 12, 25,) as being himself "one who, through GOD'S mercy, was worthy of confidence."¹ And so little did he regard his own words as mere "*human*" suggestions, that he challenges for them implicit obedience throughout Christendom: "*So ordain I in all the churches.*"

But the Apostle, says our author, in other cases only "*thinks* he has the Spirit of GOD. Lord Hervey might surely have informed himself as to the patristic and Scriptural use of the word [Greek], before he employed it to bear the burden of so perilous a conclusion. As he alludes to Mr. Lee's volume, it will be sufficient to refer him to the extract from Montfaucon in p. 295. That learned patristic scholar speaks of this, as one of the words in which "non pauci interpretes labuntur;" adding that, instead of being used ordinarily to express doubt, it commonly "*nihil minuit adfirmationem.*"

¹ It must be remembered that [Greek] is one of the peculiar titles of the [Greek] Cf. Rev. xix. 11, 13; 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; iv. 9.

“In this verse,” writes Corn. à Lapide, “the Apostle gently suggests the *authority* with which he spoke, lest it should be supposed that these decrees and counsels were uttered by him *as man*, and *not by the Divine Spirit*.” “S. Augustine,” he continues, “remarks (Tr. 37 in Joh.) that this word [Greek] *non dubitantis esse, sed asseverantis et increpantis*.” [Vid. S. Aug. Op. t. iii. p. 400, b. Ed. Ben.]

In conclusion, we can but express the hope that Lord Hervey [254] will reconsider this important subject. His present theory, we are convinced, will fail to satisfy either himself or any one who fairly tries to realise and apply it: it does not the less strike at the very foundations of Inspiration, because it comes to us commended, as in the present instance, by the advocacy of one, himself a devout believer in Inspiration, and by whose personal piety and reverence its inevitable tendencies are constantly corrected and kept in check. It is a serious thing to admit the existence of carelessness of execution, imperfection in detail, error, inadvertence, (be it *never so little*,) in the ‘Scriptures of Truth’ and ‘Oracles of GOD.’ For who, as we have urged, is to regulate the application of this admission, and to define where ‘insignificant’ merge into significant ‘details;’ ‘minutiæ’ into facts; history into doctrine?

Lord Hervey so truly tells us that “difficulties connected with Inspiration are continually disappearing, as juster views prevail; and that, whatever may at last remain incomprehensible to us will be found to result from our own ignorance.” (P. 14.) We are intimately persuaded that this is the true account of Scripture ‘errors’ and ‘contradictions.’ Our author will be the first to confess how many, that once appeared as such to himself, appear so no longer; and how often he has caught glimpses of Divine significance, and design where once he could see nought save human confusion. Let him not think he has exhausted these discoveries. For ourselves, we know no study so intensely interesting and *satisfying* as the so-called ‘discrepancies’ and ‘inaccuracies’ of the Gospels. That they have all a meaning (could we but discern it); all alike bearing witness to a deeper, a Divine, harmony and *purpose* pervading the entire Records, extending even to the veriest minutiæ; far transcending any which the wit of man could have conceived, and so much more convincing than a mere naked, verbal coincidence, because so much less obvious;—of the truth and reality of this we have the most profound and earnest conviction. In these Sacred Enclosures there is nothing without meaning, nothing without mystery; the whole, as well as its minutest parts, bearing alike the impress of the Great Designer. Each Record is infinitely self-consistent; the respective details of each harmonising, as to nature, form, and colour, with that great central Idea round which they cluster, and to the complete exhibition and embodiment of which they severally contribute. Hence arise the Gospel ‘variations.’ Hence we meet, now with a whole narrative recounted, now only a fragment of it: one Evangelist records a complete discourse, another but an isolated saying: now we see events grouped together in historic, now in deep moral order: here we find one slight but characteristic feature introduced, there another: here one face of an event portrayed, one meaning of a Divine utterance elicited, there an opposite one:—all, as well what is omitted as what is inserted, combining to illustrate that particular phase of [255] the Redeemer’s perfect character which each several Evangelist was guided by the HOLY SPIRIT specially to delineate and develop. But our space forbids us to enlarge.

We will only add (we gladly avail ourselves of the pious language of our author) that “if the Scriptures are given by Inspiration of GOD, it is natural that some measure of inspiration should be required to understand them. ‘For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him?’ and ‘Even so the things of GOD knoweth no man, but the SPIRIT of GOD.’ Let us ever pray, therefore, that we may receive, not the spirit of the world, but the SPIRIT which is of GOD, that we may *know the things* which are freely given to us of GOD.” (P. 80.)

Since the above was in type, we have received, through the courtesy of Mr. Williams, the pamphlet the title of which is given at the head of the present article. Its object is twofold: (1.) to defend the writer against the unscrupulous attacks of certain of his reviewers; and (2) to present a true picture of what really are his sentiments on certain points whereon his

teaching has been most canvassed, and, as *he* conceives, “cruelly” misrepresented. With the former of these subjects we are thankful to have no concern, as the pamphlet seems to have preceded our April article. Mr. Williams appears to feel keenly the harsh inferences as to his general orthodoxy which same, especially of his Welsh brethren, (“Silurian Shimeis,” as he quaintly designates them,) have gratuitously drawn from his sermons. It is to be regretted, however, that he should have suffered himself to be betrayed into an asperity of tone which his better judgment will hardly approve. For an author who writes feelingly on the evil and danger of detraction, to characterize certain of his reviewers as men who “having *no other moral quality, make a virtue* of crying him down,” strikes us as inconsistent. But this by the way.

The contents of the pamphlet are as follows: I. The preface; II. Mr. Williams’s opening lecture to his Divinity class at Lampeter, written in a manly, earnest, religious spirit, and containing (though we cannot commit ourselves to all its statements,) some valuable counsel; III. a letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, which we pass over; IV. A series of propositions, purporting to express accurately the writer’s views on those subjects with regard to which he has been most assailed; V. An additional series of propositions, further developing the same views, each several proposition being confronted on the opposite side of the page by a counter-proposition, supposed to express the opinions, on this particular head, of Mr. Williams’ critics: the series on the one side of the page being entitled “Rational Godliness;” that on the other, “Modern Judaizers;” the latter being merely a congeries of wearying extravagances, the point and drift of which we confess to have entirely [256] escaped us. This fragmentary and disjointed document terminates with (VI.) a few extracts from various writers, sectarian and “orthodox,” who appear to have expressed themselves with more or less freedom on the subject of Scripture Inspiration.

Our only concern is with Mr. Williams’ restatement of his own opinions. And here we are bound at once to add, (and we do this with very sincere regret,) not only that we find nothing to retract in the unfavourable verdict we have already had occasion to express concerning them; but that our convictions as to their most dangerous tendency have gained strength by this supplementary evidence. Our limits plainly forbid any detailed examination of the propositions contained in this pamphlet: nor would such examination be other than tedious and unedifying. Much of the ground we have traversed before. We notice many pointless platitudes, for the insertion of which we are unable to assign any possible reason,¹ and much *dim verbiage*, whose chief use appears to be, to conceal the indistinctness of thought which it clothes. We observe, however, that Mr. Williams still deliberately maintains that the gift of Inspiration was not a specific endowment² of the

¹ e. g. “Holy Scripture . . . is to be regarded with veneration But it is by *no means our paramount source of secular knowledge!* we none of us go to the Bible *to learn practically any trade or art.*” (p. 36.) “The books of the New Testament were not *dictated in words audible from the clouds.*” (p. 39.) “We use Scripture best when we turn it to our own edification and devotion. We use it *ill if we make it a vehicle of malicious passions and false imputations.*” (p. 29.) “S. Paul calls himself the ‘chief of sinners,’ though *probably he was not so sinful as Simon Magus,*” &c., &c.,—with many other equally edifying and novel remarks.

² We should be nearer the truth perhaps, were we to describe the gift of “Inspiration” not as *one* specific endowment, but as a particular *combination*, in one individual, of *several* (mutually completing and correcting) *charismata* of the Spirit. We find in the early Church that the possession of certain isolated spiritual gifts did not ensure to the individual immunity from error; as the “treasure was committed to earthen vessels,” was liable to be affected by the medium of its transmission, and, like natural endowments, abused. One possessed the gift of Prophecy, or prediction; another, of Knowledge; a third, of Interpretation, i.e. of clearly apprehending and correctly communicating the knowledge imparted to others; a fourth, of testing and discriminating the prophetic utterances;—the harmonious combination and confluence from different sources, of these several gifts, (like the joint action, as the Apostle adds, in the one body, of the energies and functions which belong to its many distinct members,) being necessary to ensure that the result should be in *perfect* accordance with the analogy of the Faith, and should express fully the mind of that One SPIRIT Who inhabits the one Body of CHRIST.

sacred writers, but the common property of all Christians. He tells us that when S. Paul and S. John claim Inspiration for their writings, [257] they allow the *same gift* to their hearers also, (p. 40,) and that “Whatever individual dignitaries may say, *our Church* seems to hold that Inspiration was *not* confined to the Apostles.” And in order to bring ourselves the more readily to acknowledge this obvious truth of the universality of Inspiration in the Church, and get “clearer ideas” on the all-important subject of the peculiar authority of Holy Scripture, our author recommends a very simple process. We should gain much, he thinks, by “habitually translating the words, Bible, Scripture, Inspiration, into *book, writing, animation, or inbreathing!*” (p. 41.)

Our only question here is, Can Mr. Williams really mean what he says?

Mr. Williams, as we regret further to notice, loses no opportunity of reiterating his assertions respecting the errors and imperfections of the Bible. The fallibility of Scripture, he assures us, may be *proved*, “*morally, scientifically, historically, and critically.*” As an illustration of the *critical proof*, he adduces the mode of *reasoning* employed by the Apostles, the poverty of which offends him: referring us, as an example, to S. Paul’s argument “*about ‘seed’ and ‘seeds,’*” (Gal. iii. 16,) of which he superciliously remarks, that though an argument “*adapted, perhaps, to the age,*” yet it is one of which *we* cannot discover the “*philological cogency.*” (p. 71.)

In reading a sentence of this kind, we feel quite at a loss whether to marvel more at the quiet presumption, or the entire absence of all theological *instinct* displayed.¹

The writer, however, strangely argues, that neither by its moral scientific, historical, nor critical errors, is the authority of the Bible in the least compromised.

“Neither the *numerous discrepancies* in the Bible, nor the *evident shortcomings* of the writers’ knowledge, nor their participation in *human passions and prejudices*, nor, in short, *the limitation of their horizon in every way* can properly affect the value of the Bible as a book of religion and devotion.” (P. 38.)

[258]

That which specifically characterised the Apostles and sacred writers, appears, then, to have been a peculiar *combination* of these miraculous (and ordinarily separated) *charismata*; such as would *perfectly* equip them for the particular work severally assigned them, and so actuate their entire being, that the words which they officially spoke and wrote would be really and truly “the words of GOD.” (S. John iii. 34.)

It is worth noticing, in passing, how this subject incidentally illustrates the importance of joint action of the *whole Church* at the present day, for obtaining any trustworthy enunciation of doctrine. The *whole* Body must be represented, and give forth a *corporate* utterance: the “*revelations*” of one branch, must be subjected to the “*discernment*” of another branch: else the promised aid of the HOLY SPIRIT can never be realized. Had *all* the Church been represented,—the independent testimonies of the several co-ordinate branches compared,—the gifts of one portion of the body balanced and corrected by the completing gifts of all the other portions,—that recent monstrous doctrinal decision at Rome *could never* have been arrived at.

While on this subject, we cannot withhold from our readers the marvellous process by which Mr. Williams accounts for the language of Holy Scripture. “*The gift* (!) of the HOLY SPIRIT” (he writes—as if there was one gift only) “is *mental truth*. And through the working of Providence in nature and in society, this mental truth *becomes embodied in books*, as does also record of experience.” (p. 61.) We wonder if our author himself has any definite notion what this means. We have not.

¹ We must entreat Mr. Williams to examine diligently all the peculiar phraseology, the arguments, the modes of thought, adopted by our Blessed LORD Himself. Let him for a moment waive the consideration that the speaker is the Omniscient JEHOVAH; and let him pronounce upon the numerous indications of “fallibility,” critical, scientific, &c., which his discriminative sagacity discerns. We are intimately convinced that if this writer’s strictures upon the language of the Apostles and Evangelists be sound, they must be extended to the utterances of Him Who “spake as never man spake!” He will find there no lack of that “foolishness” in which the Divine Wisdom ever loves to clothe itself when addressing the intellectual, half-doubting, religionist.

That is, having proved the messengers unworthy of reliance in every particular, where we have the means of testing them, it does not follow that our faith in their veracity need be in the least degree shaken when they tell us of facts, the truth of which it lies out of our power to ascertain. Verily, Mr. Williams must think his readers and pupils marvellously simple.

As an illustration of the practical benefits accruing from the disparagement of the text of Scripture, Mr. Williams instances the Quakers, “who of all sects¹ have laid least stress upon the letter of the Bible,” and yet “have most of all justified the Gospel by their works.” (p. 46.)²

We have alluded to the absence of theological *instinct* betrayed by Mr. Williams. Thus, in one place he gives it as his opinion that the “Book of the Revelation was *fulfilled* in the *fall of Jerusalem, or of Rome, or of both.*”

In another, he incidentally notices that glorious Psalm, the 18th, the Psalm “of the servant of JEHOVAH, the Beloved, who spake unto JEHOVAH the words of this song in the day that JEHOVAH delivered Him from the hand of all His enemies and from the power of Hell,” [Horsley]—a Psalm which, though it received, doubtless a germinant and precursive fulfilment in the person of David, and again, a more triumphant one in the Resurrection and Victory of CHRIST, still *awaits* its final and exhaustive accomplishment, when the whole Mystical Body shall rise, shout its shout of triumph, tell its glad experience, and proclaim aloud the everlasting truth that ‘Righteousness alone is the path of salvation.’ Of this Psalm Mr. Williams warns us to remember that it is only ‘poetry,’ and that “things originally poetical” must not be “taken too literally as prose;” and it “becomes the critic’s duty to *distinguish the spheres wherein the faculties play.*” So that our author has to assume the attitude of critic towards the “words which the HOLY GHOST spake by the mouth of David,” by way of pronouncing authoritatively how far they have any definite meaning,³ and how far the glowing language is to be put down to the score of mere poetic imagery.³

[259]

¹ Is the Church included among these, “Sects?”

² We commend to our author’s notice, Mrs. Greer’s *Quakerism, or the Story of My Life*. He will there learn something concerning the interior life of that frigid, sanctimonious, worldly-minded, self-indulgent, semi-infidel community.

³ Mr. Williams’s apparent desire to evacuate such a Psalm as the 18th of any definite meaning, on, the score of its being poetry,³ is only a single manifestation of one particular feature of his theology, which is to ignore the *prophetic* element in the Bible. The prophets, according to him, merely predicated or recounted the events of their own time of which they were personally cognizant; although their words very frequently “*acquired*” a new meaning from the fact of the recurrence of events *analogous* or similar in spirit, and from the “identity of principle which GOD repeats in His works.” Now although this theory doubtless contains important elements of truth; yet as a complete or sufficient explanation of the phenomena of Scripture prophecy, nothing can be conceived more demonstrably fallacious. Of what character, we would ask, were Balaam’s predications respecting the future fate of Amalek; Moses’, respecting the siege of Jerusalem; Isaiah’s, concerning the doom of Tyre and Babylon; Malachi’s, relating to the advent of John the Baptist, and, perhaps, of the still coming Elijah;—the utterances respecting David, Josiah, Cyrus, Sennacherib; the descendants of the three sons of Noah, and the Patriarchs; the kingdoms of Egypt, Assyria, Chaldea, Persia, Macedon, Rome; the birth place of our Blessed LORD, and every circumstance of His Life and Death? But it is vain to continue. It is for Mr. Williams, however, to show how all these and similar instances of pure prophecy accord with his favourite maxim, “*Nihil est in Scriptis quod non prius in Scriptore.*” We will only add, with regard to the accumulative fulfilment of Prophecy, that of all indications afforded us in Scripture of the constant superintendence and Inspiration of the Omniscient Spirit, few are so striking as the glimpses herein manifested of the *pregnant* character of the language;—how that it is ever teeming with new and hitherto unnoticed significance; continually developing; ever casting new and Diviner lights as the history of the world is progressively evolved, and new cycles of GOD’S providential dealings introduced.

Again, in another place Mr. Williams, with a temerity which nothing can justify, pronounces a considerable portion of the prophetic part of the Book of Daniel, to be mere *history* written after the events predicted. The idea has not even the poor merit of originality. It is due to the Apostate Porphyry, and was triumphantly refuted 1500 years ago. Still, it commended itself to Dr Arnold. So Mr. Williams, without a word of explanation and as though he were making the most ordinary and indisputable statement, mentions as one of the elements for ascertaining the date of the Book of Daniel, the fact of its containing “a *minute history down to Antiochus Epiphanes.*” (P. 45.)

With regard to our author’s churchmanship, a passing remark here and there will help us at arriving at a tolerable estimate of it.

E.g. He considers it “desirable that such a *relaxation of our formularies* should be granted as might have enabled men like Baxter to conform to the Church;” and suggests that “the principle of *option*, or *allowing a choice of prayers at discretion*, affords the easiest way out of such difficulties.” (P. 47.)

He would have the clergy permitted to “choose the lessons at their discretion;” and leave out the Athanasian Creed if themselves or their flocks object to it. It is due to him, however, to state that he earnestly repels the imputation of either holding or teaching any error as regards “the ancient symbols and authoritative conclusions of the Church, or what may be called scientific theology.” But here again we consider the qualification he appends to this important disclaimer most grave and significant.

“True,” he proceeds, “I *generally* teach (and *more so latterly*) that *these things are not of the essence of that faith* which saves the soul alive. They are partly of human development and may be handled with respectful *discussion*. Still I am always careful to state them accurately; and acknowledge their authority to be *about as binding* on the Churchman as ‘the law of the land upon the citizen.’—(Pref. p. viii.)

[260]

And he goes on to show how far his tentative suggestion, as to a more rational explanation than the Church has given, on the “*ecclesiastical dogma* of original sin,” may be considered to accord with this assertion of orthodoxy.

But this reminds us of another of Mr. Williams’s opinions on which we are bound to add a word. It appears from the pamphlet under consideration that others besides ourselves have charged him with questioning, if not denying the personality of the Tempter. Our suspicions were but too well founded. As far as we can discover the meaning of his studiously indistinct, and oracular phraseology, he admits the charge and with an elaborate feebleness endeavours to justify it.¹

We are not now about to attempt to *prove*, what no one who really reverences the ‘Oracles of GOD’ and the ‘faith once for all delivered,’ will venture to deny. But we do seriously ask, where is this wanton habit of insinuating doubt, this unhallowed licence of speculation, to stop? Are we to question or *disbelieve* our LORD’S emphatic words respecting ‘the Tempter,’ ‘the Father of lies,’ ‘the Evil one,’ who ‘*abode* not in the truth,’

¹ Thus he writes: “Since our LORD called Peter *Satan* . . . and since the hortatorily personal is often speculatively abstract, while at least evil works and the spirit of evil are not always nicely distinguished; it cannot be a fatal heresy to call the disturber of the world *either sin or the devil*; even if from a hostile point of view it *might be twisted into an inaccuracy* . . . The war in heaven between Michael and Satan may be a highly figurative picture of the conflict of *moral principles.*”—(P. 77-9.)

Again: “‘Personality’ is a metaphysical rather than a Scriptural term . . . If good persons think that by *intensifying such an idea* in reference to the spirit of evil they are enabled to fight, *as it were, more vividly against the hosts of darkness*, I say nothing to disturb them. But, if any one without authority imposes on me a metaphysical term, he must *first define it clearly*, and then prove his definition.”—(P. 48.)

It must be fully noticed that our author speaks (as above) of Satan as the *spirit* of evil. But after observing the vague and indefinite sense in which he employs this word throughout his book, we fear we cannot derive much evidence as to his orthodoxy from that.

and to whose personality (if indeed human language is intended to convey any idea whatever) HE has given most positive, unequivocal and reiterated testimony? Are we to regard the history of the temptation in the wilderness; the awful scene in Gethsemane's garden—that mysterious conflict between the “Prince of this world,” (S. John xiv. 30,) and the Incarnate SON, the terrific intensity of which wrung from the Human Sufferer a sweat of blood—are we to regard these dread realities as mere allegory ?

We are absolutely at a loss to conceive on what grounds Mr. Williams believes anything. Child-like, implicit faith in whatever GOD has revealed and the Church of GOD taught—this to him is unhappily unknown. He must bring the most solemn verities of Revelation before the bar of his feeble reason; he must try to substitute a more rational terminology for the mysteries of the faith, than that which the HOLY SPIRIT has provided and the wisdom of [261] ages reverently accepted; he must question, hesitate, speculate, instead of believing; and thus, vainly endeavouring to be ‘wise,’ falls short of that which alone is true wisdom.

There is nothing more hopelessly irrational than what is falsely termed rationalism; i.e. the irreverent intrusion on the part of individual reason into subjects which all right Reason has antecedently pronounced to be quite external to her province. The phenomena of the unseen world, the nature and operations of spiritual essences, and all the various matters which combine to form, explicitly or by implication, the one consistent complex of “The Faith”—these, Human Reason (whereby we mean the collective Reason of mankind—the intuitive convictions of our common humanity—the *Vox DEI*—as it has from time to time found utterance) has confessed to lie quite beyond her domain. And yet, individuals will ever be found giving rein to the licence of their own private reason within these Sacred Precincts; and then—because the intruding faculty is dazzled, staggered, perplexed; all seeming strange to it, inconsistent with it, beyond it—proceeding to pronounce upon these mysteries; to explain away one; reduce another to a more intelligible shape; deny a third; to treat the seeming incongruities which everywhere abound, as ‘folly,’ suitable to a state of intellectual childhood, but not to these enlightened days—in awful forgetfulness that this very ‘foolishness’ is part of “the unsearchable Wisdom of GOD.”

We feel a strong repugnance to speak harshly of a Clergyman who is devoting himself in earnest, and according to his conscientious convictions, to the good of his Church and fatherland; who is no mere self-indulgent talker, but a laborious *worker* in the vineyard of his LORD; who possesses varied and important talents, all of which seem to have been dedicated, with simple unreserve, to the cause of GOD; and who, moreover, appears already to have been subjected to a full share of calumnious misrepresentations by some (it may be) who are rather shamed by his zeal than shocked by his heterodoxy. The painfulness of the duty, in joining in a severe expression of condemnation of his teaching, is infinitely enhanced by these considerations: the duty itself is only more paramount.

So long as Mr. Williams continues to entertain and propagate the opinions for the advocacy of which he has obtained a luckless notoriety, and which reappear in all their dangerous potency in the pamphlet before us, he cannot, without infinite peril to the souls of his pupils, and of the thousands hereafter to be committed to their charge—without inflicting a deep and positive injury on the Church in the Principality—occupy the position of solemn trust now committed to him at Lampeter. If the seeds of heresy are permitted to be sown, they *must* spring up. Not all the personal excellence, and self-devotion, and piety of the teacher, not [262] all his unexceptionable and even admirable instructions on other matters, can hinder that. The corrupt seed will bring forth *evil* fruit. Deep reverence, implicit reliance on authority, cordial, unquestioning acceptance of *everything* which Scripture and the Church teach—*because* they teach it—these we are convinced are the true habits to instil into the theological student. “Continue in the things which thou hast learned and hast *been assured of; knowing of whom* thou hast learned them.” A foundation of doubt, hesitation, speculation, or even “respectful *discussion*,” when the subject is GOD's clear Revelation, and the “faith once delivered,” is too often completed by a superstructure of positive infidelity.

Until Mr. Williams is “fully persuaded in his own mind;” until he is able to embrace with *perfect sincerity*, and teach in all its fulness and integrity, that body of Catholic doctrine which the Church. (whose representative he is at Lampeter) holds, and of which he is the official exponent, he should withdraw from his present position. He *must be*, either unconsciously compromising his own convictions by inculcating what he does not cordially receive, or compromising the plain teaching of the Church by imparting it with faltering lips, and a questioning reserve. But enough of this.

A word in conclusion to Lord Hervey. Mr. Williams in a postscript to the present pamphlet adduces him¹ as an authority for the views on Inspiration advocated by himself; adding that *if Lord Hervey’s Sermons are innocent, his own cannot be very guilty*. We trust his Lordship will not neglect the warning; for Mr. Williams is undoubtedly correct. The difference between the theories of the two writers is only one of degree, not in kind. The fundamental error of both is the same, though its consequences have been more fully developed and recklessly expressed in one case than in the other; and the one writer has been restrained by feelings of humility and reverence, which the other, we regret to say, has yet to learn.

Both writers have yet to be brought to acknowledge the proper *Divinity* of the Holy Scriptures: they will then cease to hint at the possibility of their containing any admixture of error, any inconsistencies or contradictions; and will confess, with the great Augustine, that though they exhibit “*multa diversa*,” yet “*nulla adversa*,” though “*multa varia*,” yet “*nulla contraria*.”

¹ Mr. Williams alludes also to the Bishop of Melbourne as giving some countenance to his peculiar views. We have referred to the Bishop’s Sermons (University Sermons, 1856, p. 17). We find, however, that he merely professes to abide by the teaching of “that excellent commentator Scott.” Now as we do not profess to any deep acquaintance with the writings of Mr. Scott (and the Bishop favours us with only a single harmless sentence from him) we are unable to say whether the Lampeter school of theology meets with any real countenance from this quarter or not; though we very strongly suspect not. Bishop Perry appears merely to object to the naked *dictation*, or *mechanical* theory, though his words are culpably vague and open to misconception. The fault of his Sermon (and it is a singularly poor one) lies quite in an opposite direction.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 19. (Joseph Masters: London, 1857)

[170] AUBERLEN ON DANIEL AND THE APOCALYPSE

The Prophecies of Daniel, and the Revelation of S. John; viewed on their mutual relation. With an Exposition of the principal Passages. By CARL AUGUST AUBERLEN,¹ Dr Phil., Licentiate and professor Extraordinarius of Theology in Basil [*sic*]. With an Appendix, by M. FR. Roos. Translated by the Rev. ADOLPH SAPHIR. Edinburgh: Clark. 1856

Of the manifold endowments bestowed on the Catholic Church, by virtue of her inhabitation by the One SPIRIT—endowments which are severally developed within her or withdrawn, as they are faithfully employed or misused—few would appear more necessary for her at the present day, than the “spirit of *understanding*,” we mean, in so far as this gift would comprehend an insight into her true position with respect to GOD and the world—an intelligent apprehension, as to the measure of her *present* conformity with her *original* “Pattern,” the general direction in which she is advancing in her several branches, the specific nature and source of her most imminent dangers, and the final issue of the many conflicting tendencies and activities now stirring within her.

True, it may be rejoined—and this is the commonly received view of the matter—that as knowledge is the offspring of obedience, so long as she applies herself heartily to the fulfilment of her plain duties, there is no need for her to waste her energies in dreaming upon the mysteries of her abstract position, her condition and prospects; for such knowledge is rather speculative than practical: and not only will there be time enough to think about her dangers when she finds herself confronted by them: but, doubtless, when they arise she will be intuitively forearmed against them.

Now much of all this is true. Active obedience, practical work, *is* unquestionably the best safeguard for the Church. Still, not to press such obvious considerations as the following: that there is such a thing as self-deceptive unenlightened ‘obedience,’ and ‘work’ which GOD will never recognise as His, and which will but enervate and injure, rather than invigorate; that, as a matter of fact, what is deemed ‘holy obedience’ and GOD’S work’ in one section of the Church, is not unfrequently esteemed in a very different light in other sections; and that such perverted or defective obedience, wheresoever existing, can but deaden, instead of quickening, the Church’s spiritual perceptions; not to press, we repeat, obvious considerations of this character, there remains this paramount fact, that GOD has given His Church copious and detailed Revelations respecting her future career and the several cardinal [171] temptations she will have to encounter, with particular warnings against them, and intimations, all significant, as to the extent to which she will be thereby affected; and that to this His ‘sure Prophetic Word,’ as to a guiding light through a

¹ φ Jackson, S.M. (ed.) *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* Vol. 1 (Funk and Wagnalls Company: New York and London, 1908) at p. 359 provides the following information: ‘Auberlen, Karl August: Theologian; b. at Fellbach, near Stuttgart, Nov. 19, 1824; d. at Basel May 2, 1864. He studied in the seminary of Blaubeuren 1837-41, and theology at Tübingen 1841-45; became repentent in theology at Tübingen 1849, and professor at Basel 1851. As a young man he was attracted by the views of Goethe and Hegel and enthusiastic for the criticism of Baur; but he later became an adherent of the old Württemberg circle of theologians—Bengel, Oetinger, Roos, etc. He published *Die Theosophie Oetingers* (Tübingen, 1847); *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis* (Basel, 1854; Eng. transl., by Adolph Saphir, *The Prophecies of Daniel and the Revelation*, Edinburgh, 1874; 2d German ed., 1857); *Die göttliche Offenbarung* (i, Basel, 1861; Eng. transl., with memoir, Edinburgh, 1867). A volume of his sermons appeared in 1845; a volume of lectures on the Christian faith in 1861.’

trackless wilderness, a ‘Lamp shining in a dark place,’ He has straitly bidden her to “take heed.”

Nay more: to that one mysterious Book, which treats specially on these subjects, the great Prophetic Manual of the Church, wherein her history is mirrored forth, her trials and disasters foretold, the ‘cunning craftiness’ of the enemy ‘whereby he lies in wait to deceive her,’ and its terrible success exposed to view—there is affixed a solemn invitation by God Himself to its earnest perusal and diligent study—a special ‘blessing’ to all who ‘hear and read it.’

But strange to say, this Divine admonition seems deliberately set at nought. And the very Book, to the earnest meditation of which God has been pleased to invite and allure us as it were beyond all others, is precisely the Book which Churchmen study less than all; of the very contents of which, to say nothing of its meaning, there is the most widespread ignorance and indifference.

It may be as regards our own Communion that there is something in the English mind uncongenial with studies of this character. Our restless practical habits are ill-accordant with the slow, patient processes of investigation, the cautious, self-restrained diffidence, the unprejudiced and reverent teachableness, which the successful prosecution of such investigations imperatively demands.

Nor is it to be concealed that, in some portions of the Church, there may possibly be a lurking uneasiness with regard to the disclosures which the Apocalypse really has to make—a dimly recognized suspicion that it is charred with messages hard and unpalatable, and inconsistent with dreams of Churchmanship fondly cherished but never to be realized—messages, therefore, which there is no desire honestly to face, and of which it is deemed more convenient to remain in undisturbed ignorance.

Whatever be the cause, the fact is certain, that Apocalyptic study meets with but little encouragement; that it is not unfrequently regarded as giving evidence of some false Churchmanship, if not of mental imbecility in those who pursue it. And thus it has happened that—for the very reason, no doubt, that the Holy Spirit has so specially invited attention to the Book—the Evil Spirit has set himself, and with malignant success, to seduce men from it; blinding their eyes to its Divine beauty, straining to convert its mystic wisdom, through the extravagance of carnal-minded interpreters, into very foolishness, and its guiding light into the deepest darkness.¹ [172] The difficulties of the Book are no excuse for its neglect: nay, they constitute one weighty reason why its elucidation should be again and again reverently attempted. It is by ‘reason of use’ that the Church’s ‘senses are exercised to discern’ meaning and significance of the rich Prophetic Treasury that has been bequeathed to her. Surely one special end of these seeming difficulties—while they doubtless serve the same purpose as the parabolic covering of many of our Lord’s sayings

¹ Mr. Maurice hopefully anticipates the day when the true character of the Apocalypse (which the Church, it appears, has hitherto entirely missed) shall come out, and it shall be demonstrated to be, after all, but an *historical* record, a “summary of Christian politics.” “I do not despair of seeing this Book come forth out of the hands of prognosticators, as a real lesson book respecting the dealings of God with the nations. The craving there is in the minds of men for a *faithful history of the past*, which shall be also a faithful guide to the future, will surely be satisfied some day; this Book may teach us how it shall be satisfied.” (See *Discourses on the Gospel of S. John*.) It will be, doubtless, considered in some quarters an instance of the profound wisdom and far-penetrating sagacity of Mr. Maurice, that he has been able to put the whole Catholic Church right on an important point of this kind, and to make the discovery that, in regarding this Book for 1800 years as a Prophetic Book—(“write the things which are, and the things *which shall be*”)—the Church has been labouring under a delusion.

of old, namely, to veil the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven from the thoughtless and undevout—is to stimulate the holy curiosity of the humble and prayerful Christian; to teach those who, with simple unreserve and patient self-surrender, desire to be taught.

If we would see an example of the manner in which the mysteries of the Prophetic Word should be pondered, we have such an example furnished us in the case of one “greatly beloved,” and selected to be himself the great Apocalyptic Seer of the Old Testament Dispensation. Daniel “understood by books,” i. e., by a diligent study of the Prophetic Records, among which he specifies the Prophecies of Jeremiah—the ‘number of the years’ which the Babylonian Captivity would last. He treats the prediction not as a matter of barren speculation; but makes the fulfilment and further elucidation of it the basis of one of the most earnest and intensely pathetic prayers that Holy Scripture has recorded. “I set my face,” he tells us, “unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplication, with fasting and sackcloth and ashes; and I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession.” And in answer to this the mystery was unravelled. The Angel Gabriel is commissioned to give him skill and understanding. The interpreter of Prophecy at the present day will assuredly be successful only in proportion as he realizes in himself something of the deep, inquiring earnestness, the intense sympathy with his subject, which characterised the privileged interpreter at the Court of Persia.

The work which heads this article is one of the latest contributions to the study of Apocalyptic Prophecy. It is one of very high order, and which must command attention. It is rather exegetical than critical. Its aim is mainly to settle the fundamental symbolism of the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of S. John, to [173] trace their mutual relation, and to penetrate into the central scope and design of certain of their leading visions. Professor Auberlen appears to us to possess in no ordinary degree those faculties of head and heart so absolutely necessary for the prosecution of that most difficult branch of sacred exegesis to which he has devoted himself. Nor do we feel that we can more truly convey our estimate of the general character of his attempt, than in his own words, descriptive of certain writers whom he seems anxious to take for his patterns.

“These men,”¹ he writes, “must be regarded as true models . . . in the simple, clear, and docile position which they occupy to the teaching of Holy Scripture; in the delicacy and persevering diligence with which they search its mysteries; in the discipline of truly scientific thought, and spiritual and devout tone of their theology. Hence the depth and fulness of their knowledge, the solidity and abundance of their theological fundamental ideas, their clear insight into GOD’S ways and the plan of His kingdom. In reading the works of these men we feel as if we had entered a temple.”—P. xii.

The former half of the volume is occupied with the Book of Daniel. Thence he proceeds, at once, to the twelfth and following chapters of the Revelation, passing over its earlier chapters, and devoting his chief attention to the elucidation of the Great Vision of the ‘Woman and the Beasts.’ It is not long since we discussed the leading features of this vision in these pages; and we are gratified to find that the views we then advocated with respect to its general scope and interpretation are those which commend themselves to the present author.

His treatise has convinced us that we were in error in one or two points of detail; while, as regards certain others, we shall have occasion to express dissent from him. In his main

¹ He is referring to certain of Bengel’s school of interpreters to whom he confesses his great obligation, and with whom, though differing in many important points of detail, he yet has a general and fundamental accordance.

principles of interpretation we agree entirely. His work has a valuable appendix containing a brief survey of the leading modern expositions of Rev. xii.—xx. These are compared and criticized; and a very important service rendered to the student of the Apocalypse. The representative of our English school of Apocalyptic exegesis is unfortunately Mr. Elliott, according to whose system of interpretation, adds our author, “*all* the chief symbols” of the Book “refer almost exclusively to the Papacy.” (p. 386.) We need hardly say, such a shallow and monstrous system of misinterpretation finds little countenance with so thoughtful and sober-minded a writer as Professor Auberlen. It is a matter for regret that he had not met with Mr. Isaac Williams’ work when he published the present volume; as we believe there is no commentary extant which (leaving out of [174] consideration Rev. xx.) has so much in common with his Own. We feel bound to add, however, that in certain important respects, the present work has the advantage over that of Mr. Williams. It is, on the whole, more systematic and scientific, and is characterized by greater independence and originality of thought, and has the advantage also in definiteness and distinctness of conception; although as regards reverent handling, Catholic-mindedness and real unction, Mr. Williams’ must ever remain a standard and model.

But in order to put our readers in possession of the general features of the present work, we must glance hastily at the two important Books which the writer proposes to elucidate.

The Book of Daniel, as we are reminded, occupies the same position in the Old Testament Canon, as the revelation of S. John in the New. The former was the Apocalypse of the Israelitish, the latter of the Christian Church; the latter forming the natural continuation and supplement of the former. Our author designates the Book of Daniel as the Old Testament *Apocalypse*, from the fact of its being impressed with that peculiar character which discriminates the Apocalyptic from the Prophetic Word. The prophets of the Old Testament, like the epistolary writers of the New, write primarily and specially for their own times, for the present emergencies of the Kingdom of God. The prophetic element intervenes only when the elucidation of *then*-existent circumstances seems to demand it, or when the present or imminent crises of the Church are themselves typical, precursive, or suggestive of mightier future events. The ‘Word’ or ‘Hand’ of God comes upon them always for a *particular* purpose. They utter it—a ‘Word’ deep and pregnant, and too large as it would seem for the contracted sphere of its immediate application; but instinct with life, and, as expressing part of the *abiding* thought and truth of God, hereafter to develop itself, when its sphere has enlarged and expanded, and It finds a stage ample enough for its operation.

But ‘Apocalypse,’ on the contrary, is not given, primarily or specially, for present, but for future times. It is not the immediate product of any particular present emergency. Its primary object is to serve as a guiding lamp for the people of God during those dark periods when there is no revelation.

Thus the great Israelitish Seer, independently of the comprehensive *world*-historical prophecies wherewith he was charged, was commissioned to reveal to his countrymen a continuous narrative of the career of the ‘Kingdom of God’ from his own time to that of the first Advent of Christ, and the rejection of Israel. The Christian Seer takes up the history at the “times of the Gentiles,” and pictures the gradual development of the same “Kingdom of God”—the secret growth of progress, side by side, within her borders of the ‘Mystery of Godliness’ and the ‘Mystery of Iniquity’[175]—from the destruction of Jerusalem till the period of the second Advent.

The very position of both writers is in accordance with the peculiar character of their Revelations.

“Far from being in immediate contact with the congregation, we find them isolated; the one at the court of a heathen power, the other on a lonely island rock. They are alone with GOD.”—(Pp. 23, 70, 71.)

Daniel is a captive in Babylon. Here then with his own times does his prophecy open. Nor is there any important event which befell the Kingdom of GOD from that era to the final destruction of the Jewish polity, which does not find place in his narrative. He discloses to us the downfall of that haughty power under which the Church was then enslaved; the rise of the Medo-Persian kingdom, to which Israel was next in subjection; the restoration of his people from captivity; the “troubulous times” of the rebuilding of the desolated Temple and city; the re-establishment, under Ezra, of the Theocracy. He glances at the culminating point of Persian history in the times of Xerxes, and its subsequent decadence; the victorious career of Alexander, the sudden efflorescence and rapid decline of the Grecian empire, and its fourfold dispartition among the generals of the conqueror. To two of the partitions of the dismembered empire he next turns his prophetic eye—Egypt and Syria,—because in their long-protracted struggles the Jewish nation was deeply embroiled. The one kingdom lying to the ‘north,’ the other to the ‘south’ of Judea—and the unhappy people alternately subjected to the one and the other, and reduced at times to the most distressing extremities—there seemed peculiar need why the consoling light of prophecy should irradiate the gloomy season. Here therefore we are introduced to the most minute historical prophecy which is to be found in the whole Inspired Word—the detailed succession of the Syrian and Egyptian kings, the dynasties of the Seleucidæ and the Ptolemies—conducting to the culminating point of Israel’s distresses in the times of the Old Testament Anti-Christ, the monster Antiochus Epiphanes, the last hideous representative of the expiring third empire, and most terrible shadow of the still future Anti-Christ of the fourth empire. The prophet foretells the Apostasy of Israel which prepared the way for this ‘Man of sin,’ the glorious successes of the Maccabean heroes, and Antiochus’ miserable end. He reveals the rise, greatness and unprecedented military successes of the Roman Empire; the birth of the MESSIAH; His Holy Baptism; His Ministerial career; His sacrificial and atoning Death, and the cessation thereupon of the sacrifices and oblations of the old Law; His introduction of a New Covenant, of the terms of which ‘many’ should avail themselves, but which the nation as a whole would reject; Israel’s renunciation of the offers of mercy made through CHRIST; GOD’S renun[176]ciation of Israel; the translation of the Kingdom of God from Israel to the gentile world, and the desolation and destruction of the whole Jewish state.

At this point the history is taken up by the apocalyptic Seer of the New Testament.

But does Daniel’s prophecy look no further than the first Advent of Christ, and the destruction of Jerusalem? Written as it is to serve as the Apocalypse for the people of Israel, does it tell of no distant dawn after the dark night of the desolation? Has Israel, as a nation, no bright future? does its political history for ever cease with the ‘dispersion?’ Has He whose ‘gifts and calling are without repentance’ *no* national hopes for His scattered sheep of the house of Israel when the “times of the Gentiles” which form the subject of the New Testament Apocalypse have been fulfilled?

The inspired patriot leaves not his countrymen, and ‘kinsmen after the flesh,’ thus without comfort. He tells not of that second captivity—so far more abiding and terrible than that of his own day—without pointing to a still future glorious Restoration therefrom, of which the post-Babylonian restoration was but a dim type and figure.

But of this anon.

The prophecy of Daniel, as is well known, admits of division into two main Sections, the leading subject of which is not obscurely indicated by the very language employed. The

former Section, extending to the close of ch. vii. is written in Chaldee,¹ the language of the ruling world-power; the latter in Hebrew—the language of the people of God. Hence it is natural to anticipate that the central subject of the former division is the development and career of the world-power; of the latter, the fortunes of God’s ancient Church and people.

A word or two on the contents of these two Sections; as they have, both of them, an important bearing on the interpretation of that portion of the Apocalypse which has to come under examination.

The *first*, or Chaldee Section, contains a sketch of the history of the world-power from the period of the Babylonian captivity until the time when the “kingdoms of the world shall have become the Kingdom of our God and His Christ.”

The second, or Hebrew Section, recounts the fortunes of the people of God, from the time of Daniel till the destruction of Jerusalem.

Our author points out that the subject matter of both Sections is arranged in the form of an ‘inverted parallelism,’ an arrangement frequently recurring in Holy Scripture, as we showed in a recent number.²

[177]

Thus of the six chapters, (ch. ii.—vii.) which the Chaldee Section embraces, the first three are inversely parallel with the last three. The 2nd chapter answers to the 7th, the 3rd to the 6th, the 4th to the 5th.

The subjects are as follows.

Ch. ii., vii. The development of the five world-monarchies; four of earth and one of Heaven; exhibited (1) in the four parts of the “Great Image,” and the mysterious “Stone;” (2) in the four *Beasts* and the Son of *Man*.

Ch. iii., vi. GOD’S protection of His people when they seem crushed by the world-power; exemplified in the preservation (1) of the ‘three children’ in the fiery furnace; (2) of Daniel in the lions’ den.

Ch. iv., v. Instances how GOD suddenly humbles the world-power in the midst of its arrogance and pride; exemplified in the judgment (1) on Nebuchadnezzar; (2) on Belshazzar.

These two intermediate pairs of chapters form practical comments on and illustrations of the great subject of this whole Section—as given under two aspects in its two extreme chapters (i.e. ch. ii. vii.)—viz. the history of the world-power; its seeming strength, inward weakness, gradual decay, and final destruction by the LORD the King.

The *second*, or Hebrew Section, consisting of three divisions, exhibits the same arrangement: the central division standing out by itself; the first and last being parallel.

The central division, ch. ix., contains Daniel’s great intercessory prayer, and the revelation concerning the ‘seventy weeks,’ the Advent and sacrificial Death of Messiah, and the destruction of the Jewish polity.

On each side of this (i.e. in ch. viii., ch. x., xi.) we meet with a somewhat detailed account of the second and third monarchies, Persia and Greece, (which had been hastily passed

¹ We should except the introduction, which is in Hebrew. The Chaldee commences ch. ii. ver. 4. “Then spake the Chaldeans to the king, in Syriack,” &c.

² φ Vol. 18 ‘The Symmetrical Structure of Holy Scripture’, see pp. 167ff *supra*,

over in the Chaldee Section,) as introductory to the disastrous conflicts between Syria and Egypt, and the manifestation of the Old Testament Antichrist, Antiochus. The two visions, of course, present this portion of history in different lights. In each, the account of Antiochus adumbrates a particular phase of the history of his monstrous Antitype¹ not yet revealed; the detailed and *direct* account of whom occurs in the Chaldee Section.

[178]

To this Section (ch. ii.—vii.) we must now again return.

We have seen that it comprises a history of the powers of the world. An unusual subject, it would seem, for Scripture prophecy, but not without a peculiar and distressing significance for GOD'S ancient people.

The Church of GOD had arrived at an important crisis and turning-point in its history. It was in captivity. The Theocracy was now subject, nay more, was *henceforward to remain in subjection*, to the powers of the world. It had lost its independence. Hitherto there had existed a *visible kingdom* of GOD on earth, independent of all other kingdoms. It was the high prerogative of GOD'S Israel not to acknowledge the rule of any other nation or kingdom whatever. Doubtless, as a punishment for its sins, the Theocracy was occasionally permitted to be in temporary subjection to other nations. Yet this was but an exceptional and abnormal state. On Israel's repentance deliverers appeared; and the Church immediately rose to its true, independent, and lofty position. At last ensued the great schism; the apostasy of the northern kingdom of the ten tribes, and its final destruction by Assyria. Subsequently followed Nebuchadnezzar's attack upon Judah, and then the Babylonian captivity. And with this, the independence of the Theocracy ceased. Henceforward the national glory departed. The Kingdom of GOD was doomed to remain in subjection to the successive powers of the world, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome. Here

¹ Dr. Auberlen is certainly in error in limiting the prophecy of Dan. xi. xii. to the times of Antiochus, and in not recognizing—what is so abundantly apparent, and has been universally admitted in the Church, (we may particularly specify S. Jerome, who argued this very point at length against Porphyry,)—the important *ulterior* reference it contains to the times of Antichrist.

Our author accordingly sees in the allusion to the resurrection (ch. xii.) merely a solemn warning to GOD'S people during that time of distress, with regard to the eternal retribution awaiting them according to their faithfulness or unfaithfulness under this terrible season of temptation. And doubtless the noble confession of the Maccabean mother and her sons, (2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, 23,) apparently in reference to these words, and S. Paul's mention of the "better resurrection" in connection with this same incident in Maccabean history, (Heb. xi. 35,) show that there is some ground for regarding the account of the resurrection (ch. xii.) in conjunction with the previous description of the times of Antiochus, and that at least these words of Daniel produced practical fruits in that period of tribulation. Still, the reference to the general Resurrection is far too unambiguous to be explained away, and must therefore have an important bearing upon the interpretation of the preceding chapter. It makes it clear in fact, as S. Jerome maintains, that this is one of those double prophecies, like Ps. 72, descriptive at once of Solomon, and the "greater than Solomon," and, we may add, like our LORD'S celebrated prediction with regard to the destruction of Jerusalem, and His second advent, wherein the type and antitype are combined together in one continuous narrative. "In this prophecy," (writes Mr. C. Maitland,) "we are shown a picture representing with an accuracy that defies criticism the history of the Greeks from Alexander to Antiochus. Suddenly, and without warning, this picture grows faint, the likenesses vanish, the figures fade from the canvas; but out of the dissolving shadows there springs a new creation: in place of Epiphanes stalks Antichrist; and in the distance, seen through the glare and havoc of the great tribulation, are the deserted sepulchres and the eternal blessedness of the risen saints."—*Apostolic School of Proph. Int.* p. 23].

It will be observed that in the first Section of the Book of Daniel, we see the career of Antichrist as bearing on the world-power; in the second Section we see (under the type of Antiochus) his career as bearing upon the people of Israel; and in the Revelation of S. John, as bearing on the Church of CHRIST.

therefore arises the necessity for a new Revelation to teach the people of GOD the light in which to regard the several earthly kingdoms whose yokes they were to feel. Hence

“The prophet must needs take a different stand-point from his predecessors. For the Divine Word has always a starting-point, and its [179] organ is made fit to receive the Divine Revelation Thus Daniel’s prophetic watch tower was erected beside the throne in Babylon; and standing here, in and yet above the first monarchy, he looked out into the farthest future, and discerned with prophetic eye, which GOD had opened, the changing shapes and events of coming kingdoms in their relation to the people of GOD.”— Pp. 20, 21.

Now the first thing worthy of notice in this Chaldee Section of Daniel is this, that, though extending from the Seer’s own time until the consummation of all things, there is no mention therein made of the first coming of CHRIST, and the establishment of his Church.

The reason is obvious. The *subject* of this Section is the course of the successive kingdoms of the *world*. But the present phase of CHRIST’S Kingdom, as it was inaugurated at Pentecost, is “*not* of this world.” It is yet a hidden and suffering Kingdom. “The Kingdom of GOD is within us.” CHRIST rules, by His Great Vicegerent the HOLY GHOST and through the agency of His Church, by spiritual and unseen processes; not in manifested power and glory. The secret principle is now working *within*: it shall hereafter develop itself, from within, *outwardly*. And its august manifestation is yet in the womb of the future. In its present stage, therefore, the Kingdom of CHRIST does not enter “Daniel’s horizon:” it does so only “at that point where it begins to be a real and *external* power of the world” (p. 22), when “the kingdoms of the world *become* the Kingdom of our LORD CHRIST.” “The mysterious ‘Stone’ has no *visible significance* till it smites the mundane Image, dashing it to powder, and Itself becoming ‘a mountain’ majestically fills the whole earth.”

We learn then, nothing in this section respecting the present aspect of the Christian Church; that is all reserved for S. John’s Revelation.

We here read of the successive falls of Babylon, Persia, Greece: then, with deeper emphasis, of the rise of the Roman Empire. We read of its formidable strength, its firm iron solidity; then of its disintegration, and the intermixture into its iron groundwork of the plastic material of the Germanic and Slavonic tribes, through the migration of nations. We learn that these elements shall never thoroughly cohere and amalgamate. ‘They shall not cleave together.’ And in the incoherence of these two elements, our author tells us, we see the moving principle of modern history.

“The Romanic element strives towards universal empire; while the Germanic represents the principle of individualization, division. Hence we see ever renewed attempts to establish world-monarchies, e.g. The Papacy”—(which he maintains is capable of being viewed in this light)—“Charlemagne, Charles V., Napoleon. ‘But they shall not cleave to one another.’ The different nationalities assert again and [180] again their right. Romanic, Germanic, Slavonic, oppose each other in political and religious questions. ‘Nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, till Anti-Christ succeeds in producing a demonic union.’”—P. 222.

To this dreadful consummation does the Seer hasten on. He mentions the subdivision into divers smaller kingdoms of the Romano-Germanic Empire, adding that, in its final period, these kingdoms shall be ten in number; that from small beginnings an eleventh shall arise which will subdue three of the existing ten, and receive the prostrate allegiance of the remaining seven; that this kingdom, now become “an *eighth*,” shall rise suddenly to an unprecedented height of power; that, in it, the long cherished dream of earthly potentates, a

universal mundane empire, shall be actually and terribly realized; that its Head, energized by Satan, shall reign the manifested God of the world, till judgment suddenly overtakes him; his kingdom is scattered to the four winds of Heaven; the “stone” shivers the “Image;” the rightful Ruler and Heir of the world appears in glory; and “the kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole Heaven is given to the saints of the Most High” (Dan. vii. 27).

At this portion of their prophetic histories, the Revelations of Daniel and S. John run parallel. Each describes this glorious consummation; but from different points of view and with a different aim. The one writes for the natural Israel, the other for the spiritual Israel. One tells of the mundane aspect of the coming Kingdom of glory, and of the exalted position therein, among the “nations of the saved,” of “Israel after the flesh,” the “holy people” of Daniel: the other treats concerning that spiritual community where is neither Jew nor Greek, but only CHRIST, and tells of the unutterable glories of the Bride, the beatified, glorified, Deified Spouse of the LORD the King whereof the royal and exalted position of Israel on the regenerated earth is still but a type and sublunary transcript.

Another question demanding notice, here presents itself.

Why is it that in Daniel’s prophetic survey of world history, such peculiar stress is laid upon the fourth monarchy; and still more, upon the final stage of that monarchy, which, as is universally admitted, will not extend but over a period of a very few years—“a short space?”

First. With regard to the Roman Empire. One of its very striking peculiarities, contrasted with its predecessors, is its long continuance. It is to be well observed that the “whole of the lower portion of the Image is referred to it;” nor must it be forgotten that, even at the present moment, dismembered though it be, mixed up with foreign elements, it is still essentially existing; only awaiting the time when its scattered fragments shall be gathered up and united under one Head—that “Coming Man,” [181] of whom the godless world has even now a sort of undefined and intuitive anticipation.

It is interesting to bear in mind that one of the greatest shadows of Anti-Christ, of modern times—Napoleon—quite took up the idea of the Roman Empire.

“His universal monarchy was essentially and avowedly Roman: his son was called ‘King of Rome:’ his nephew, in order to found his power, distributed among the French army ‘Roman eagles.’ The Roman empire is the ideal which exerts fascinating power on the rulers of the world, which they are ever striving to realize, and *will doubtless succeed in realizing*. Of all phenomena of history, none bears more essential resemblance to Anti-Christ than this demonic Napoleonism, which from the outset identified itself with the idea of the Roman empire. In like manner it is the Czar’s policy to surround his throne with the splendour of Constantinople and the eastern empire.” P. 221.

It will at once be acknowledged that the real and secret reason of the long continuance of the fourth monarchy, in comparison with the preceding ones, is this, that “the planting and spread of Christianity has brought new vital elements also to the world power” (p. 224). Hence, as its opportunities and privileges have far surpassed those of any former kingdom, so will its fall be infinitely more terrible.

Its external Christianization, we shall find, has not altered its real character. But it is the *fact* of this Christianization—of the kingdom extending from the first till the second Advent, and thus, of the whole career of the Christian Church in its militant state running parallel with, and being as it were included in its history—which gives it this peculiar and special significance already noticed. It is a fearful thought, however, that it is after the

world has been penetrated for centuries by Christianity, that it reaches its deepest depth of degradation, and finds its deified “Image” and Representative in the “*Vile Person*.”

Descending from its original “gold,” it passes through the stages of ‘silver,’ ‘brass,’ ‘iron,’ and finally terminates in the ‘miry clay.’ It travels down from the ‘Image of God’ in Paradise, to the ‘Image of the Beast’ ripe for judgment. It becomes intensely civilized and intellectual, and yet in God’s eyes only more intensely abominable; until at last its real essential nature, which consists in alienation from God and proud self-assertion, comes into full and open manifestation.

In alluding to the *Bestial* nature of world power, we have touched upon a subject of paramount importance in the present investigations; and upon which Dr Auberlen offers many admirable and profound observations:—we allude to the fundamental difference between the *human* and the *bestial* symbols both in the Book of Daniel and the Revelation of S. John. The former Book clearly [182] settles the question, revealing to us that the proud “nature-strength” of man, unregenerated by the Spirit of GOD, is *not* of a *human* but of a lower character.

The only possible condition for the attainment of true humanity, a gift unattainable save in the kingdom of GOD—is humility. If proud man will not stoop down before his Creator and empty himself that he may be filled with the Spirit of GOD, which alone differentiates him from the brutes, he must be content to take his position in the creation of GOD among the “brute beasts which have no understanding.” For so says the Psalmist: “Man raised to honour hath *no understanding*”—loses that which alone constitutes him *man*—“and is compared unto the beasts that perish.” The exaltation of man must commence from above, not from beneath. He that exalteth *himself* is abased—abases and degrades himself in the scale of GOD’S Creation by the very act of, and in exact proportion to, his self-exaltation. The whole parable was visibly enacted in the case of the old world king; in whose humiliation—so important as fixing this fundamental point in Apocalyptic symbolism—we see an *outward* exhibition of the interior spiritual change that came over him when, in GOD-defying self-assertion, he began to prate about the “great Babylon which *I* have built, by the might of *my* power, for the honour of *my* majesty;” and in whose restoration, so beautifully recounted in Dan. iv. 34—37, we learn what it was that really made him *man* once more.

These considerations will help us to answer the *second* question—Why is it that, notwithstanding its very brief duration, such infinite stress is laid upon the reign of Anti-Christ, the last representative of the world power?

“It is a characteristic of prophecy,” writes Dr Auberlen, “to put into the clearest light those phases in which the essence of things is revealed, *and their true and innermost nature comes into fullest manifestation*. Prophecy dwells chiefly on the *end* of the powers and factors about which revelation is given, because it is then that a long-preceding development reaches its consummation, and for the first time unfolds its true nature.”—P. 38.

And this is the reason, he tells us, why the first three monarchies are passed but rapidly over; and why, even in considering the fourth, we are led almost at once to its final shape; for here we find the true bestial nature of ‘worldliness,’ and the real characteristics of that nature, fully exposed to view.

The subject, already referred to, of the progressive deterioration of the world-power, notwithstanding its ever-increasing refinement, culture, and civilization, is one of the deepest interest, and meriting the most serious attention. We have seen that it is based upon

the simple fact that, the development of its natural powers has [183] the effect of making it esteem itself ever more and more self-sufficient, and independent of the supernatural aids of GOD the HOLY GHOST, and thus, of sinking it ever lower and lower in the scale of moral being. And, in truth, who that looks thoughtfully around can doubt but that the world, notwithstanding its respectable exterior, is advancing farther and farther from GOD, that society is becoming more superficial, less genuine, “the world decreasing not in external power but in internal worth and solidity.” Philosophers would view “the development of man as having taken place from a lower to a higher state.” It is a hard truth for such men to find the inspired statesmen placing our age, with its culture and science, far below the Oriental kingdoms, “under the fourth kingdom, and towards the end of it, when the mystery of iniquity, of the GOD-opposed beast-nature is beginning to unfold itself with ever-increasing vigour.” (P. 203.)

“Herein,” proceeds our Author, “consists the gigantic lie, and little narrow-mindedness of our generation, that civilization is looked upon as the highest thing, and as a substitute for Regeneration by the Spirit of the Living GOD. . . . What Daniel represents in his four world-kingdoms is in reality, nothing else but the development from a natural, vigorous, solid mode of existence to a life of refinement and intellectualism.”—P. 204.

“It is clear,” then, “in what manner Prophecy places the ancient kingdoms of the world over the modern, those of the East over those of the West. In outward civilization, refinement; in political institutions, arts, sciences, there is doubtless an immense progression. But there is something much higher than these goods of life. . . . the invisible, vital root of nations and kingdoms. This is *the original, tender, mysterious connection between man and GOD in the conscience*; ‘Pietas,’ the natural and almost instinctive reverence for the divine fundamental institutions of life. ‘Righteousness exalteth a nation.’ This righteousness shows itself principally in man’s reverence for things Sacred, in obedience of subjects to rulers, in respect of children to parents. These are the fundamental pillars of man’s life; upon these religion, the family, the state are built. Let these be shaken or destroyed, and all arts and sciences will be found unavailing; the most refined civilization will prove ineffectual to save such a nation, as is clearly proved by the times of the decline of Greece and Rome, and the history of our own day.”¹ Pp. 209, 210.

But far the most startling thought in connection with this view of the gradual deterioration of the world-power is this, already referred to, that it reaches its lowest point of degradation in that very kingdom which alone has been brought under the influence of Christianity. For we have seen that all Church history lies [184] within the times of the Roman empire; that this, though dismembered and mixed with foreign materials, is yet the empire which exists until the Second Advent; even as Daniel in another portion of his prophecy, and S. John in the Revelation clearly represent Anti-Christ’s kingdom, in some peculiar way, as a resuscitation of the old disintegrated empire of Rome. And yet this very empire has as a *whole*, been Christianized. Nay, it is emphatically the home and earthly guardian of the Catholic Church. *This* “world” is pre-eminently the *Christian* world. It is the “kingdom of the world” outwardly “become the kingdom of our LORD and of His CHRIST.” And yet it is *this* which, notwithstanding its transcendent privileges, its long protracted term of probation, is sinking and about to sink deeper than all previous powers

¹ We have been compelled to abridge this paragraph from want of space. The whole passage however, pp. 198—213, is profoundly suggestive and well worthy of attention.

of the world in shrewd, refined, respectable alienation from GOD; in which the “mystery of iniquity” is secretly striving; whose deep seated enmity is but preparing—when once the faithful “Witnesses” of the Most High have really begun to reassert their true position and spiritual powers, and boldly to maintain before High Heaven the eternal truths committed to them—to burst forth in avowed antagonism to GOD. Yes, Christendom itself is that “great City,” whose streets which have seen such mighty works as no other kingdom has seen, shall yet reek with the warm life-blood of the martyrs of JESUS; and which is preparing to do, what the heathen world did not and could not—to commit the sin against the HOLY GHOST, and give birth to the Anti-Christ.

But where—for this, after all, is the question for Churchmen—where, during all these hundreds of years, has been the “Light of the world?” Has it been shining in the firmament brightly and steadily? Where has been the “Lamp in the house,” has it been burning pure and unsullied? Where has been the Divine “Salt” whose function it was to season the world, to correct the tendencies to corruption, to arrest and retard the processes of deterioration? These questions come not within the scope of Daniel’s Revelations. Of the *spiritual* history of Christendom he tells us nothing, this he leaves to his evangelical successor. The Statesman reveals to us the mundane aspect of the fourth empire, the Apostle the spiritual aspect. Daniel gives us the history of the world; S. John discloses the hidden sources of that history. He adds something further—the secret history of the *Church*. To this we must return.

[206]

In reviewing the able treatise of Dr Auberlen in our last number, we confined our remarks to the Book of Daniel. We gave a general outline, drawn chiefly from the work before us, of the contents and structural arrangement of the Book. We noticed its two cardinal divisions, the Chaldee Section and the Hebrew; the one treating of the career of the successive powers of the World, the other recounting the fortunes of the Israel of GOD. The former of these principally engaged our attention, introducing us to a subject of no slight interest—the secret history, resistless advance, indomitable might, decay, disruption, and still future mysterious reintegration [*sic*] of that particular phase of the World-power with which the destinies of the Visible Church are so intimately associated; that fourth or “iron” Empire which witnessed the birth and was instrumental in the death of the SON of GOD; which persecuted the nascent Church with rabid fury; which, at last, broken, humbled, revolutionized, submitted its neck to the Yoke of CHRIST; and which, after professing for centuries the faith of the Crucified, shall yet, as Jewish and Christian seers alike testify, rise in sevenfold malignity against the REDEEMER, “Crucify Him afresh” in His Members, and “put Him to an open shame.”

[207]

Ere we proceed to bring to bear on this subject the additional light afforded by the Revelation of S. John, and to touch upon the practical considerations, especially in reference to the Church of CHRIST and our own branch of it, which it involves, we propose to turn for a short time to the second or Hebrew Section of the Book of Daniel, and glance at its great central prophecy of the “Seventy Weeks,” a prophecy claiming our attention not only on the ground of its own peculiar interest and importance, but also from the fact of its having a considerable incidental bearing on the subjects more immediately under consideration.

It is evident, in S. John's history of the mystic Woman, that the numerical and chronological references which occur in it form an important constituent of the symbolic clothing of that history, and hence, that a right understanding of their import must be essential to the correct interpretation of the remaining portions of the vision.

Now the prophecy of the "Seventy Weeks" appears to us to possess this peculiar significance (in reference, that is, to this portion of the Revelation of S. John)—that it furnishes the fundamental basis of its *chronology*; and hence, that it is no less necessary to the perfect apprehension of the vision of the "Woman and the Beasts," than the parallel history of the "Beasts and *Man*" in Daniel, is to the elucidation of its symbolism.

To this prophecy, without further preface, let us turn.

Its history is as follows:—

One year before the expiration of the seventy years foretold by Jeremiah as the duration of the Captivity, the aged Daniel set himself with prayer and fasting to consider the future prospects of his people in connection with this revelation of GOD (Jer. xxx. xxxi.) and the now-approaching restoration. It was a time of deep interest and thrilling expectation. Glorious things had been spoken of Zion, the city of the Living GOD, and of His own people. MESSIAH had yet to come. "The kingdom" was yet to be "restored to Israel." (Cf. Acts i. 6.) The Theocracy was to be re-established and the temple re-built, though after a more glorious fashion than had ever hitherto been realized. Prophecies of peace and prosperity, of everlasting forgiveness and reconciliation to Israel, had been solemnly given by GOD: and the prophetic records *appeared* to connect these blessings with the redemption from Babylonian exile. Seventy years was the predetermined time: Sixty-nine had now run their course: was another year to bring with it these good things which GOD had promised? Moreover, was the nation itself fitted to *receive* and make a good use of such transcendent blessings: was it sufficiently humbled for its past sins? had the corrective visitation worked in it a "godly sorrow unto repentance," given it a "new heart and new spirit?"

Fasting, prayer, and meditation, earnest confession and intercession are the resources of the "man greatly beloved." Nor did [208] they fail. An Angelic Messenger is at once commissioned to communicate the coveted information.

The Angelic response we are about briefly to consider.

And first, we learn from it something as to the comprehensive and pregnant character of the prophetic Word, and the difference between Divine and human modes of computation. We learn, moreover, somewhat of the nature of prophetic *perspective*; how that future events which seem placed in immediate juxtaposition in the inspired records, may yet be separated by long intervals of time, and the prophecies which relate to them meet with numerous protracted periods and stages of fulfilment.

Thus Daniel discovers, that although a return from captivity is assuredly about to ensue at the time foretold, and the city and temple be rebuilt, yet this, after all, will be but a feeble type and earnest of the real proper fulfilment of the prophecy of Jeremiah. For he learns that this prophecy of the seventy years enfolds within itself an ulterior prediction of "seventy weeks" of years yet to run out, in order to "finish" Israel's "transgression," "to make an end of sin, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting Righteousness, to seal up the vision and prophecy and to anoint the Most Holy."¹

¹ For convenience of reference we will give the passage at length. Dan. ix.

To enter into any minute and critical analysis of this much controverted chronological prophecy, or bring in review the multitudinous interpretations it has received from Jews and Christians, ancients and moderns, is quite beside our purpose.¹ The prophecy comes before us mainly for one specific object; and in referring to it we shall chiefly content ourselves with that solution of its principal portion which is most generally accepted, and which, it is but right to add, is most ably and fully vindicated in the work before us.

The first question started by the prophecy is, of course, the following:—What is the *terminus a quo* of the “seventy weeks?” From what point are they to be calculated? The Angel says they are to be reckoned “from the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem.”

Now Holy Scripture mentions four edicts of the kings of Persia in favour of the Jews.

1. That of Cyrus. (Ezra i. 1.)
2. That of Darius Hystaspes. (Ezra iv. 6.)
3. The decree of Artaxerxes Longimanus in the *seventh* year of his reign. (Ezra vii.)
4. A second decree in the *twentieth* year of the same monarch.

The first two of these may be disposed of at once; inasmuch as they have no reference whatever to the restoration or building of Jerusalem, but solely and exclusively to the rebuilding of the temple. The question then lies between the last two decrees; the former granted to Ezra, the latter to Nehemiah. And of these the former appears unquestionably to be the decree referred to. It is the original and fundamental edict, and virtually *includes* the second. The latter is merely supplementary to, and confirmatory of it. It is an edict of great importance and of most comprehensive character, and is transcribed entire in the sacred narrative—(the subsequent decree, granted to Nehemiah, is *not* transcribed—an indication, surely, of its secondary importance).—It gave the solemn sanction of the court of Persia to the restoration of the Jewish constitution, civil as well as ecclesiastical: making full provision for the re-establishment of the Public Worship of the Most High; granting immunity from taxation to the priesthood; and arranging for the administration of government, of justice, and judgment, according to the law of Moses.

24. “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting Righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy.

25. “Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the MESSIAH the Prince, shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks; the street shall be built again, and the wall even in troublous times.

26. “And after threescore and two weeks shall MESSIAH be cut off, but not for Himself; and the people of the Prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined.

27. “And He shall confirm the Covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week He shall cause the Sacrifice and the Oblation to cease; and for the overspreading of abominations He shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate.”

¹ Corn. à Lapidè alluding to the difficulties which beset the prophecy, tells us of an estimable divine of his acquaintance who, after devoting many years to its elucidation and becoming only more and more perplexed and confused, ended his investigations by insanity. We trust none of our readers will expose themselves to the risk of sharing the same fate.

Well might it force from Ezra the devout ascription: “*Blessed be the Lord God of our fathers, which hath put such a thing as this the king’s heart!*”¹

From the issuing of this edict, says the Angel, (i.e. 457 B.C.) to Messiah, that are to elapse 7 + 62 (= 69) prophetic “weeks,” or 483 years; which bring us down to the *very year* of our LORD’S Baptism, when He was anointed by the HOLY GHOST and visibly inaugurated to His mediatorial office.

But ere the Angel enters upon the *seventieth* or sabbatical week, he proceeds to deal with this preliminary period of sixty-nine weeks, extending from the seventh year of Artaxerxes to the Baptism of our LORD. He instructs us [210]

1. What is to take place *during* this period.
2. What is to take place *after* it.

1. And *first*: What is to take place *during* it. We have already seen that he divides it into two unequal parts, 7 weeks and 62 weeks. The reason of this is plain. The 7 weeks, or 49 years, embrace the time during which the work of restoration was *being carried on*, the streets and walls being rebuilt; the interval comprehending the final period of the Old Testament revelation, and bringing to a close the lives and labours of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Malachi. After this, the work of restoration, political as well as material, having been effected, revelation having ceased, the second part, or 62 weeks of years, ensues, a period of trouble, (minutely described in the other chapters of the Hebrew Section—the distress reaching its climax in the days of Antiochus,) terminating, as we have said, the very year of our Lord’s Baptism.

2. But what is to take place *after* these 69 weeks? The seventieth or sabbatical week alone remains to be accounted for. But the Angel does not proceed to this immediately. He has an important disclosure to make to Daniel ere he enters upon this final period. The aged seer had originally hoped that the seventy years of exile now expiring would usher in the glorious reign of Messiah, the “restoration of the kingdom to Israel,” and the joyful times of the Prince of Peace. He had already learnt that these hopes were not to be realized; that the seventy years were but a type of, and about to expand into, 70 long weeks of years; that the partial redemption and restitution at the close of the former was but an earnest and faint shadow of the full redemption, and the “restitution of all things,” to be effected by Messiah at the close of the latter; that the “times “ of the *coming* restoration were not to be times of *peace*, but emphatically “troublesome times;” and that, instead of Messiah appearing at once, 69 ‘weeks,’ or 483 years, had to elapse ere He entered upon His gracious office. But a more strange disclosure has yet to be made. Even after Messiah *has* come, instead of swaying His regal sceptre on the throne His Father David, over a loving and loyal people, he learns that He shall be “*cut off*,” and by that very apostate people;² instead of bringing peace, His advent should be succeeded by terrible and fearful “*wars*;” instead of reigning

¹ It is but right to add, that the margin of our Bible refers to the later edict, in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, as the *terminus a quo*; probably from S. Jerome, who to account for the chronological discrepancy of 13 years thereby introduced, assumes that the years are ‘*lunar years*,’—each of which is 11 days shorter than a solar year. However this computation has been very generally and deservedly rejected. It is carefully discussed and disposed of by C. à Lapide, who gives his verdict strongly in favour of the view we have advocated in the text.

² “Messiah shall be *cut off*, but *not for Himself*.” This reminds us of Isaiah’s words. “He was *cut off* out of the land of the living; *for the transgression of My people*.” It is perhaps hardly necessary to add, with regard to the expression (v. 26) “*After threescore and two weeks*,” that it is to be counted *from the expiration of the seven weeks* already mentioned; making up sixty-nine weeks in all.

Israel's "*Prince*," in the glorified city and sanctuary, another Prince would appear, even the ruling head of the world-power, who would "*destroy the city and sanctuary*;" after which would follow, not Israel's consummated restoration and exaltation, but Israel's consummated desolation, destruction, degradation.

[211]

This fearful disclosure having been made, the Angel is able to proceed intelligibly to the "seventieth week." This he does in v. 27.

It is to be a week of mercy and grace to "*many*." For "through His knowledge shall My Righteous Servant justify *many*." Messiah shall establish His covenant of peace; for He is the "Messenger of the Covenant;" nay, Himself *the* "Covenant," ("I will give Thee for a Covenant of the people,") i.e. He in Whom the covenant between GOD and man "finds its personal expression." His Blood is the "Blood of the New *Covenant*, which is shed for *many* for the remission of sins."¹ Hence the Angel describes in these few characteristic words the great work of the seventieth week, "*He shall confirm the covenant with many for one week*." He shall bring His people into a nearer and *firmer* covenant with GOD. But "in the midst of the week," he adds, "He shall make the Sacrifice and Oblation to cease." That is, by the "full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice, Oblation, and Satisfaction," made on the cross, He shall put an end to the offerings of the old law. "Sacrifice and Offering and burnt-offering and Offering for sin Thou didst not require: then said I, 'Lo, *I* come.' He *taketh away the first*," (i.e. the legal sacrifices and oblations,) "that He may establish the *second*," i.e. the perpetual, continuous, and all-prevailing Offering of the BODY of JESUS CHRIST.

Thus the first half of the seventieth week extends from the Baptism to the Death of CHRIST, embracing a period of 3½ years.

Where are we to look for the second half of the week, and the close of the whole prophetic era? On this point the Angel is silent: He gives us no definite information whatever. After alluding to Messiah's death—describing it, as we have seen, from an Israelitish point of view, as causing the cessation of the old shadowy ritual of the law—he merely proceeds to recount the tremendous consequences which this BLOOD-guiltiness would entail upon Israel; adding that the nation should sink deeper and still deeper in sin and apostasy, abomination heaped upon abomination, till vengeance could no longer tarry; the rejected KING should come in judgment, send forth His armies, destroy the murderers, and burn their city. ("And for the overspreading of the abomination HE shall make [the city] desolate:") and this desolation shall continue even "*until* the consummation," till judgment has expended itself, "and that which is determined has been poured out upon the desolated ones."

"*Until* the consummation." We are at once reminded of our LORD'S words, "Jerusalem shall be *trodden down* of the Gentiles *until* the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled;" and of His solemn farewell to the nation and city, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, . . . your house is left unto you *desolate*. For I say unto you, Ye shall [212] not see Me henceforth *until* ye shall say, Blessed be He that cometh in the Name of the LORD:" and of S. Paul's parallel, saying, "Blindness in part is happened unto Israel *until* the fulness of Gentiles be come in: and so all Israel shall be saved." "For if the *casting away* of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the *receiving of them* be but life from the dead?"

¹ So "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of *many*." "By the obedience of One, *many* were made righteous."

“For thus saith the LORD, which giveth the sun for a light by day and the ordinances of the moon and the stars for a light by night; *if* those ordinances depart from Me, then the *seed of Israel also shall cease from being a nation before Me for ever. If* heaven above can be measured, and the foundation of the earth searched out, I will also cast off the seed of Israel for all they have done. Behold, the days come, that *the city shall be built* to the LORD, . . . and the measuring line shall yet go forth against it. It shall be holy to the LORD: *It shall not be plucked up nor thrown down any more for ever.*” (Jer. xxxi. 35—40.)

Here then we arrive at the great difficulty in the Prophecy of the seventy weeks. The Angel first announces that *after* this period has run out, the iniquity, transgression, and sin of the people and holy city of Daniel shall be finally “*taken away,*” (cf. Rom, xi, 27;) everlasting Righteousness brought in; a seal set on the Prophetic Vision by its complete fulfilment; and the “Holy of Holies” consecrated. The Prophecy, we see, has a specific reference to the people and city of Daniel (“*thy people,*” and “*thy holy city:*”) it looks forward to the final reinstatement into GOD’S favour of “*all Israel*”—not merely the “Remnant according to the election of grace,” or yet the “wild” Gentile “olive tree,” which, when the “natural branches were broken off,” was “grafted in among them, and with them partook of the root and fatness of the” old “tree”—but the original stock and family of Abraham, the very “natural branches which GOD is able,” and has solemnly pledged Himself “to *graft in again* into their *own* olive tree.” Well, then, has the Prophecy yet been fulfilled? Unquestionably not. But has not the period elapsed? The prophetic era included only seventy weeks. But it is admitted that the *last* of these weeks *commenced* with our LORD’S Baptism, and was *broken in half* at His death. Where are we to look for its remaining half?

That this question should sorely have perplexed commentators in all ages is no wonder. Dr Auberlen, in common with many interpreters, supposes the seventieth week to terminate with the calling of the Gentiles and the final rejection of Israel, which took place, it appears, about 3½ years after the death of CHRIST. But, independent of the fact that we have no certain chronological data for fixing this precise period, it is obvious to remark that the events which were to follow the close of the seventieth week, were *not* the final *rejection*, but the final *restoration* of Israel; not the [213] destruction, but the glorious reconsecration of the Temple; events which notoriously have not yet taken place.

Does Holy Scripture then afford us *no* clue to discover the position and duration of this final half week?

We dare not presume to speak positively; but we confess it appears to us that this period is abundantly accounted for.

In no less than five passages in the Revelation, (not to refer, here, to two additional passages in the Book of Daniel,) do we find mention of this very period of half a prophetic week. It is divided into days, and months, and years; it is mentioned as “1260 days,” “42 months,” and 3½ years, “time, times, and a half;” the difference in the manner of its calculation doubtless indicating different *aspects* of the same period. Nor must it be deemed strange if we discover that this final half week, which is so variously expressed, is to be subjected to a mode of chronological computation different from that of the other portions of the “seventy weeks.” In fact, *if* we are right in fixing the middle of the seventieth week at the Death of CHRIST, (on which point there is no reasonable doubt;) and *if* the close of the whole period of 70 weeks is to witness events which, as yet, have not taken place, (which seems to us most incontrovertible,) we appear *driven* to the adoption of some such hypothesis as that already referred to.

Nor is there any antecedent improbability in the suggestion.

(i.) Rather, the fact of the 70 years' captivity having, just at its close, been found pregnant with, and about to expand into a prolonged era embracing hundreds of years, is in itself eminently calculated to prepare us for a similar development at the seeming close of this latter period. Such an expansion and unfolding of times is in strict accordance with the whole analogy of Scripture Chronology, and the law of Prophetic perspective.

(ii.) Again we must remember that this last half-week has fallen into a New Dispensation. It is, therefore, subjected to new rules, It expands with the Dispensation. The LORD'S days may now be "as a thousand years." He measureth not after the measure of man.

(iii.) Further. The work of the *whole* of the last week is thus described: "He (MESSIAH) shall confirm the covenant with many for one week." But is this work yet accomplished? Is it not still progressing? Is not the "BLOOD of the Covenant, shed for *man*." still daily offered and pleaded at His altars in memorial of the One great Blood-shedding? Is not the covenant, originally made with "Abraham and his seed," and confirmed by GOD in CHRIST, being still made good to the "many"—the true "seed?" Is not the LORD still daily adding the saved of His Church? During the former half of this 70th or jubilee week, He carried on His work of mercy in His Own Person: during the latter half He performs it through His Church.

[214]

(iv.) And this suggests an additional reason for concluding that the present Dispensation is but the continuation and progressive unfolding of the last week. For the first half of the week comprises the Personal ministrations of the Head, the second half, of the Body. The Body has but to *fill up that which remains* of the suffering, life, and work of her Divine Head.

As the "Complement" of Christ her work and time of work is complementary to His. She fills up that which remains of the jubilee week. The broken week is her allotted period of work even as it was His.

And this S. John distinctly shows in the Revelation, where we find the Church of God—the "Woman clothed with the Sun"—after the ascension of her Divine Firstborn, supernaturally conveyed into the wilderness of heathendom, the Gentile world, where she is nurtured and sustained by God during this very period of half a week, 3½ years, or 1260 days.

Hence, we repeat, we cannot but think that Holy Scripture distinctly identifies the present Dispensation, or day of grace, with the concluding half of the last of Daniel's seventy prophetic weeks.

This subject opens out several questions of considerable interest, to some of which we will briefly refer.

1. How are we to account for the fact that, when this final half-week is referred to in the Apocalypse, it is expressed in such a variety of manners in months, days, years? There is doubtless some mysterious reason. Mr. Isaac Williams thoughtfully suggests that *evil* is indicated by *months*, and *good* by *days*.¹ Thus when the profanation of the holy city is

¹ "Months are of evil or of travailing in pain, and days are of good, and the year and a half is of suffering persecution; and all three founded on deep, analogies of Scripture. The Jewish festivals were regulated by moons or months; the expression of months, of keeping new moons, and the like, is of frequent occurrence in the Law; the moon rules the night of the Law, in distinction from the Sun of Righteousness which rules the day; and therefore the Holy City trodden underfoot, and the reign of Anti-Christ is computed by months. And this apostasy has moreover some secret connection with Judaism. But 'we are of the day,' 'we are not of the night, nor of darkness;' and therefore the Christian Witnesses and the
{cont.}

spoken of, (Rev. xi. 2,) which is to continue during this period, the time is expressed in months, “they shall tread it under foot forty and two *months*.” In the very next verse, the same period is referred to as embracing the time of the preaching of the “two Witnesses,” and here the terms are changed, and we read, “They shall prophesy 1260 *days*.” So the Woman is sustained in the wilderness by God 1260 *days*, (c. xii. 6); whereas the Beast (xiii. 5), or ‘world,’ which holds sway during all this time, reigns for “forty and two *months*.”

The division of the period into *years* (i.e., “time times and a half,”) appears added with respect to the wilderness sojourn of the [215] [215] Woman, (xii. 14,) to connect the half-week in some manner with the reign of Anti-Christ, which, according to Daniel, is to extend over this period, and thus to indicate that it is from Anti-Christ that she flies.

2. And this introduces another question.

What relation does this long-protracted dispensational half-week bear to the literal half-week, or 3½ years of Anti-Christ’s reign? Does the literal interpretation of the period militate against the symbolical and *un-chronological*? By no means. The one rather supports the other. And here we must in the first place bear in mind what is the fundamental idea conveyed by the number *seven*. We showed it, in a former paper,¹ to be that of a *Covenant between God and man*. It is emphatically the *Covenant number*. Hence the half or broken seven, 3½, is the signature of the *broken Covenant*. Thus the three and a half years drought in Elijah’s time, under the apostate king of Israel and his idolatrous wife, was in token of the Children of Israel having “forsaken God’s Covenant, and cast down His altars.” Now Daniel’s 70th week may be regarded from two points of view, in respect to God and His goodness, or in respect to man and his unfaithfulness. From the divine standing point it is seen impressed with the sacred Covenant number *seven*. “He shall *confirm the Covenant* with many for one *week*.” For as regards God and the “seed to whom the promise was made,” i.e., the “many,” or “Remnant according to the election of grace,” the Covenant standeth sure. Here is no break: one uninterrupted act of mercy. “All that the Father hath given” the Son, come to Him; not one is “cast out.” But regarded from a human standing point, this same glorious “week” consists of two broken periods—two *half-sevens*. It consists of two epochs, both characterized by a covenant broken and mercy rejected. In both, Messiah “comes to His own, and His own receive Him not:” first, in Person, to His brethren after the flesh, who crucify Him; then, through the Spirit, to His Gentile flock who “crucify Him afresh” in His members.

In both half-weeks we find the streets of His Jerusalem bedewed with His Blood. (Cf. Rev. xi. 8.) It will be observed that wherever the number 34 occurs in Scripture we always find it in connection with a “faithful and true *witness*,”—whether Elijah, our Lord or the Woman in the wilderness—and this Witness oppressed, resisted, persecuted, not only by the world, but by the professing people of God, the carnal children of the Covenant. Now, as the whole of the present Dispensation, or “last time” of S. John, bears upon it these characteristic features, of which the broken seven is the recognized numerical signature, we find it impressed with this symbolical mark. But as, just at its close, all the essential characteristics of the era shall reach their highest development, and burst forth into open and intense manifestation, [216] and the real true nature of the activities now working secretly reveal itself—hence this short culminating period shall be impressed *visibly* with

Apostolical Bride are numbered by days and years.”—*Williams on the Apocalypse*, pp. 187, 188. φ See Dykes’s review ‘Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse’ in *Ecclesiastic* Vol. 15 (pp. 56ff *supra*).

¹ φ ‘The Symmetrical Structure of Holy Scripture’ in *Ecclesiastic* Vol. 18 (p. 167 *supra*).

this same mystic signature, it shall last literally 3½ years. And this consideration at once explains any ambiguity as to the duration and discriminating features of this present era (the “last hour,” “night far spent,” “little time,” “short season”) as foretold in Scripture. For Prophecy hastens at once to its close, and describes the whole era in the strong language which shall only then be fully and intensely realized when its secrets are discovered, and its final consummation shall disclose the “depths of Satan” and “mystery of iniquity” which are as yet concealed. If the Church of Christ at the present day fails to recognize herself as the persecuted “Woman in the wilderness,” “in perils from the *heathen*, in perils from *false brethren*,” it can but be because she herself has ceased *fully* to utter her “*testimony*.” It is the “faithful and true Witness” that is persecuted. If the Church sleeps, or corrupts the Word of her testimony, the world will seem also to sleep. Being “of the world,” “the world will love its own.” It will not persecute. But let there be a *thorough awakening*, doctrinal and practical, in any individual Christian, or in any branch of the Church, and the truth of S. John’s assertion that “even now there are many Anti-Christ” will be assuredly and abundantly proved.

3. Let us proceed to another question.

We have already spoken concerning the *natural* Israel, Daniel’s *own* “holy people.” Does this last week, and the prophecies relating to it contain *no* word of covenant mercy for them? Apparently *not*. During its progress Israel has *no religious significance* whatever. It is but drinking to the last dregs the bitter cup of national punishment. Hence, as the *positive* work of the period lies out of Israel’s horizon, Daniel, as we have seen, is not inspired to speak of it, but leaves it for his Christian successor. We merely learn from him that the half-week is to extend “till the consummation” of Israel’s distresses, and that the *final close* of Israel’s trouble will coincide with the conclusion of the period itself. “When He shall have *accomplished the scattering* of the holy people, ([Greek]) all these things shall be finished.” (Dan. xii. 7.) That the nation will ere this, have regained some sort of political existence, and for political purposes have been reinstated in their own land, and will play some very important part in the final Anti-Christian tragedy, is abundantly evident, as from Daniel, so from other Scriptures.

4. We turn to another point.

The seventieth week brings before us two Consecrations, the one marking its commencement, the other its consummation; the one indicated in the words, “messiah the Prince,” i.e., the Prince, the *Anointed One*, (Dan. ix. 25.) the other, the words, “to *anoint* the Most Holy,” lit. the “Holy of Holies,” (ix. 24.) [217] Now these two Consecrations must not be identified, as they continually are. The Consecration which closed the 69th week, or (which is the same,) *introduced* the 70th, or jubilee week, was that of our Blessed Lord in the Jordan, When “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost.” The Consecration which ensues on the *termination* of the week is that of the Perfected Christ, the [Greek] and the [Greek], the Head and the Members, the Bridegroom and the Bride, the whole *completed* Temple of the Living God. This solemn Consecration is yet being deferred—the “Living Stones,” hewn and prepared in different quarters, being silently added one by one to the spiritual structure—until at last the “Head Stone”¹ once rejected by the builders, now adoringly recognized, shall be brought forth with shoutings and Hallelujahs, and the glory of the Lord fill the House.

¹ See Zech. iv. 7. “And He shall bring forth the Head Stone with shoutings, crying, Grace, Grace unto It.” The Chaldee Paraphrast thus expounds the words, “His MESSIAS shall come forth, who was named from all eternity, and shall obtain the empire of all the kingdoms of the earth.”

But are we justified in *entirely* overlooking the primary and local allusion contained in this last expression? Doubtless the greater and more spiritual reference, already admitted, may well seem to transcend and eclipse the other; still, we cannot think the lesser and literal interpretation should be quite passed over. For we must remember the specific subject of Daniel's prayer. His *own* people and city, the holy mountain, and the desolated sanctuary. When, therefore, the Angel alludes, in connection with the close of the 70 weeks and the end of the "indignation," to the reconsecration of the "Holy of Holies," we cannot be justified in quite losing sight of that *one particular meaning* which the words must have conveyed to Daniel himself, and which receives illustration and confirmation from numerous parallel passages in the Prophetic writings.

And here we are necessarily reminded of that most mysterious vision which closes the prophecy of Ezekiel, in which we find a detailed reference to that very event which the Angel seems here to predict. The seer is "brought in visions of God into the land of Israel," and set upon a very high mountain, where he beholds to the south the framework of a city,—that very city, the description of which is borrowed by the evangelical prophet to serve as the basis of his picture of its spiritual counterpart, the heavenly Jerusalem. In a former vision the Israelitish seer had been solemnly assured by God that the time had to come when his dispersed people should be gathered from all the nations where they are scattered, and brought into their own land, and made "one nation in the land, upon the mountains of Israel;" that they should "defile themselves no more with any of their *transgressions or sins*," (cf. Dan. ix. 24,) but be a holy people to the Lord.

[218]

"And David My servant shall be king over them, and they shall all have one shepherd, and they shall walk in My judgments. And they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob My servant, *wherein your fathers have dwelt*;¹ and they shall dwell *therein*, even they, and their children, and their children's children for ever. Moreover, I will make a covenant of peace with them; an everlasting covenant; and I will set *My sanctuary* in the midst of them for evermore. *My tabernacle* also shall be with them. Yea, I will be their God, and they shall be My people. And the nations² shall know that I the Lord do sanctify

¹ Cf. Gen. xiii. 14—18. "And the LORD said unto Abram, Lift up thine eyes, for *all the land* which thou *seest*, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed for ever." And again, xvii. 6—8. "I will give unto thee and thy seed after thee the land *wherein thou art* a stranger, *all the land of Canaan*, for an everlasting possession."

The cool and presumptuous way in which these and hundreds of other equally distinct predictions, respecting the literal Israel and their future national reinstatement in their own land and exalted position amongst the nations of the renewed earth, are put aside, has been clearly foretold and sternly denounced by the inspired 'Hebrew of the Hebrews,' in the Epistle to the Romans, cap. xi. It was a supercilious unbelief in GOD'S purposes of mercy to the Gentile world which led to Israel's rejection; a similar unbelief in GOD'S gracious promises still outstanding to Israel shall be *one* mark (S. Paul clearly intimates) of the Gentile apostasy of the latter days. "Boast not against the branches If GOD spared not the natural branches, take heed lest He also spare not thee." "Behold the goodness of GOD to thee *if* thou *continue* in His goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be *cut off*; and *they*, if they continue not in unbelief, *shall be grafted in*." And to prove that this shall really be the case; that the 'natural branches shall be grafted into their own olive tree,' their "partial blindness" removed, so soon as the Gentile complement is made up; and that, when received again, they shall be, under CHRIST and His Saints, the great instrumental source of blessing to the now haughty Gentile world, he refers us to the magnificent 60th chapter of Isaiah, which is well worthy of study in this connection.

² It is part of GOD'S eternal and unalterable promise that Israel shall be the first of the nations of the earth. That promise must be literally realized. "The gifts and calling of GOD are without repentance."

Israel, when My *sanctuary* shall be in the midst of them for evermore.” (Ezek. xxxvii. 21—28.)

Now the *tabernacle* and *sanctuary* here spoken of is in the preceding vision minutely described. But, in particular, the seer witnesses the very thing referred to by Daniel—the Consecration of the Holy of Holies—the reappearance of the Shekinah in the temple—the visible return of the glory of the Lord and the sacred Presence.

“He brought me toward the gate that looketh toward the east. And behold, the Glory of the Lord came by the way of the east. And it was according to the vision which I saw when I came to prophesy that the city should be destroyed.¹ And the Glory of the Lord came into the house by the way of the gate towards the east. So the Spirit took me up and brought me into the inner court; and behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house. And He said unto me; Son of man, the place of My Throne, and the place of the soles of My feet, where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel for ever: [219] and My holy Name shall the house of Israel no more defile, . . . and I will dwell in the midst of them for ever.” (Ezek. xliii. 1—9.)

Now we maintain that we cannot disconnect the statement of Daniel as to the consecration of the Holy of Holies, from the obviously parallel and explanatory words here uttered by his contemporary and brother captive Ezekiel.

Into the mysterious questions opened out by these passages we have neither space nor ability to enter. We can only add that this sacred sanctuary and tabernacle here alluded to is obviously *not identical* with the “Tabernacle of God,” the glorified Body of Christ, in the Revelation; but the earthly counterpart of this ineffable Heavenly Reality. That same hallowed spot in this our earth, which once witnessed the awful scene of the Crucifixion of the Lord of glory, whose soil was everlastingly consecrated with the “Blood of God,” is now the local seat of His manifested and glorified Presence—the central point where the united worship of the nations of the renewed earth culminates, whence it ascends on high, where earth and Heaven meet, and the Angels and Saints of God ascend and descend, where the King and glorified Bride hold converse and visible communion with this loved province of their boundless dominions.²

5. One additional point yet remains here to be noticed.

This present Dispensation, or day of grace, is as we have seen, represented in the Apocalypse, as but *half a week*: it is but the ‘little time’ while our Lord is absent, ‘a night far spent,’ a ‘short season,’ during which the faithful Church is persecuted by Satan and the “many Anti-Christ,” and sheltered and sustained by God in the wilderness. In marked and striking antithetical contrast with this we read of a second period, not of 3½ years, but of a *thousand years*, the term of its duration being six times emphatically repeated; not of suffering, but of *reigning*; not of dying, but living,—“they lived and reigned with Christ;”

¹ See margin. We see that whatever this city may be, the prophet speaks of it as *that same city* whose destruction and desolation he had already foretold.

² Cf. *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xvii. pp. 377—381. φ ‘The Interpretation of the Psalms’ see pp. 162ff. *supra*.

Dr. Auberlen truly remarks, that “the doctrine of the future glorious restoration of Israel is such an essential and fundamental idea of all prophecy, that the difficulty is not so much to find passages in which it is taught, as to select from the *great number*.” (P. 346.)

In the coming Kingdom, he says, “converted Israel shall stand at the head of humanity. The Israelitish priest-kings are upon earth what the transfigured Priest-Kings are in heaven. There shall be a blessed glorious chain of giving and receiving—GOD, CHRIST, the Transfigured Bride the Church, Israel, the world of nations.” P. 344.

not of weakness, but of *manifested* power; not of oppression under the Beast, but of joy and triumph after *victory* over the Beast *has been achieved*, and the Beast itself cast alive into the pit. And more fully still to mark the contrast between these two eras, we are told, that during the *former*, (i.e. the half-week,) Satan, who had been cast down from *heaven*, at our Lord's ascension, is still all-powerful [220] *on earth*, 'walking about as it roaring lion seeking whom he may devour,' deceiving and destroying the nations; whereas that during the latter, or thousand years, he is cast down from off the *earth* into the *abyss*, "that he should *deceive the nations no more*" till the era is concluded.

And yet, strange to say, it is one of the received and peremptory canons of orthodox exegesis, that these two eras, thus strongly and pointedly contrasted, as well by their numerical signatures as by every possible feature which characterizes them, are to be identified, and regarded as one and the same era; the sole result of the process, as it appears to us, being to introduce inextricable confusion into the interpretation not only of the Apocalypse but even of our Lord's parables, and, in fact, of the whole cycle of Scripture prophecy. We sincerely rejoice that Dr Auberlen has expressed himself with such great clearness and sobriety on this important subject. The following quotation from Ebrard's work on the Apocalypse will at least show that this question is engaging the thoughtful attention of biblical students elsewhere.

"The thousand years must be considered as a mystical number. When the whole long period, from the ascension of Christ to His second coming is represented symbolically, as half a prophetic week of 34 years, and the period of the visible existence of the Kingdom of God upon earth, as a thousand years, we have therein an indication that the period, after the result of the preceding ages has been gained, will be very much longer than the period of conflict. The time when Christ's kingdom will exist on earth, will be the true New Testament time, in the strict sense of the word; the present period of the oppressed and militant Church is of a duration which appears insignificant when compared with it. And this corresponds also spiritually with the dignity of Christ, whose way it is, not to gain great results by long struggles, but by short conflicts to achieve victories extending through æons."

(Quoted by Auberlen, p. 419)¹

And here it should at least be borne in mind by those who oppose what are commonly called "millenarian views," how universally they were held in the early Church. S. Justin Martyr, for instance, claims them not only for himself, but "for all Christians who are really orthodox." (Dial. c. Tryph. § 80.) S. Jerome testifies to their being maintained by a "very great multitude;" and Eusebius to their being embraced by "far the greatest number of Church writers." Doubtless from their gross abuse they [221] sunk into disfavour. During the middle ages they naturally disappeared, as the whole series of predictions which spoke of the future Kingdom of glory, and the earthly dominion and exaltation of Israel, were pressed into another service, and by a complicated process of misinterpretation, employed in defence of a universal, temporal, and spiritual autocracy in the capital of Christendom. However, on all sides, we are beginning to find the ancient

¹ The following passage ought perhaps to be added from Dr. Auberlen. "Not even the millennial kingdom is the final end of the development of GOD'S Kingdom. For even during the millennium there is a separation between heaven and earth—between humanity transfigured and humanity still living in the flesh. Hence it is possible that an apostasy should take place at the end of the millennium. The Kingdom is more glorious than the Church, but it is not yet the New World. It is a time of refreshing after the time of warfare, but not yet the time of Perfection in the strict sense of the word." P. 356.

interpretation of these prophecies reviving; in England, Germany, America, not in our Communion alone, but in the Church of Rome also, is it gaining ground and finding advocates. That it will extend we cannot doubt.

But here we must close for the present. We will reserve our concluding remarks on Dr Auberlen's interesting volume till a future number.

[269]

THERE is no portion of the Revelation of S. John which has so much engaged the attention of students of prophecy, of which such varied and conflicting interpretations have been given, as the mysterious vision of the Woman and the Beast, contained in the 12th, 13th, and 17th chapters.

It is, perhaps, the most important section in the whole of the Apocalypse in an exegetical point of view, inasmuch as upon the explanation given to the symbols therein contained, the interpretation of the whole Book very materially depends. Although we have ventured some remarks on this portion of the Revelation on a former occasion in these pages,¹ we make no apology for returning to it. And we do so the more readily from the fact that the general views we have already advocated, with regard to its scope and interpretation, (which we rejoice to find ably maintained by Professor Auberlen,) have not been commonly received as yet, are in certain quarters violently opposed, and may therefore well demand a little further consideration.

Let us turn to the vision itself, (c. xii.) without further preface. In the "Woman clothed with the Sun," it is universally agreed that we see a symbolic representation of the Church of the living GOD. But is it the Christian or the Jewish Church? It is neither one nor the other exclusively; it is the Church in her abstract universality—GOD'S faithful and true Witness throughout all times [270]—that is here depicted. "The Woman," says Victorinus, (in loco) "is the ancient Church of the Fathers, and of the Prophets, and of the Holy Apostles:" she is the mystical Sion: and she is represented to us at a particular crisis of her history—labouring with, and in pain to bring forth the promised Seed. "She being with child cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered." It was of Israel, says S. Paul, that "CHRIST came, who is over all GOD blessed for ever:" and here we see the mystical Israel, the daughter of Sion, on the point of giving birth to her Divine Firstborn, 'the Man, the LORD;' 'the Child born,² the SON given:' and malignantly watching her, we espy her old Enemy the Devil, "standing before her to devour her child as soon as it was born." Of this implacable Foe it was originally said, "I will put enmity between thee and the Woman, and between thy seed and her Seed." Here, then, in the symbolic encounter between these mortal antagonists, we descry the secret background of all Church history; the ceaseless conflict between the dragon and his seed, and the Woman and her Seed. The primary and

¹ Vol. XV., pp. 375, 500, 529. φ 'Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse' See pp. 56ff *supra*.

² Although the historical reference to the birth of our LORD is plainly the *immediate* allusion in this passage, and the basis of all other interpretations, yet it must not be pressed *exclusively*. Thus, S. Hippolytus conceives the birth and rapture of the Man-Child to be a *continuous* act. "The Church will *never cease* bringing forth the Word, which is persecuted in the world by the unbelieving: 'And she brought forth a Man-Child.' For the Church teaches all nations, *evermore bringing forth* that male and perfect Offspring, CHRIST, the SON of GOD." Nor can it be doubted, that the whole passage has a further particular reference to the time "when He bringeth *again* His First-begotten into the world," (Heb. i. 6,) to the periods of distress preceding the second Advent, the birth throes of the perfected CHRIST, and the rapture of the saints.

immediate reference in the birth of the Manchild is doubtless to our LORD Himself; the organs, for the time, of the great Dragon, being “Herod, Pontius Pilate, the Gentiles, and people of Israel.” However the mystery of the Holy Incarnation could not be frustrated. “She brought forth her Child—a male¹—who is to rule all nations with a rod of iron.” He did the work His FATHER had given Him to do; and then “was caught up to GOD and His throne.”

But what became of the Woman, the second Eve, the spiritual “Mother of all living?” “She fled into the wilderness,” adds S. John, “where she hath a place prepared of GOD, that they should feed her there” (v. 6); or, shortly afterwards (v. 14), “To the Woman were given two wings of the great Eagle, that she might [271] fly into the wilderness into her place where she is nourished.” This mystical history of the Woman, we plainly see, is based on the personal history of our LORD. She is borne into the wilderness on the wings of the great Eagle, even as “JESUS was led up of *the Spirit* into the wilderness;” the eagle’s pinions symbolically representing the operative Energy or Spirit of GOD, the “rushing mighty wind,” the Life-giving ‘Breath’ of the ALMIGHTY.

The Great Eagle is GOD Himself. For thus does He address His ancient Church: “As an eagle fluttereth over her young, beareth them on her wings, . . . so the LORD did lead thee;” the fundamental passage referring to Israel’s miraculous deliverance out of Egypt, and transport into the wilderness; “Ye have seen what I did to the Egyptians, and how I bare you on *eagle’s wings*, and brought you to Myself.” Thus the picture represents to us the Church of GOD supernaturally conveyed from out of the mystical Egypt,—that “city spiritually called Sodom, and Egypt,” which had crucified its LORD, even the carnal Jerusalem; which had hitherto, like Gideon’s fleece, been alone blessed, while all the world beside was dry, but which having forfeited its blessings was now to be left barren and dry in the watered earth,—and about to be located in the wilderness of heathendom, the desolate Gentile world; placed in the very seat and centre of the power of the world, the old Roman empire, “where she has a place prepared her of GOD.”

But “whence can she be satisfied with bread here in the wilderness?” S. John merely tells us, “she is nourished,” (v. 14,) or, “They feed her,” (v. 6.) *Who* feed her? Our LORD’S history explains it. “The angels came and ministered unto Him.” “*They* are the ministering spirits sent forth to minister to them who shall be heirs of salvation.” As Israel of old was miraculously sustained in the wilderness; as the prophet Elijah was daily nourished through Angelic ministrations; as our LORD, without earthly sustenance, was supernaturally supported, teaching us that man doth not live by bread alone, but by the supersubstantial Word; so is the Church sustained: she is made to eat “angel’s food;” taught day by day to pray for that ‘daily Bread’ which “cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world,”—that “Flesh which is Meat indeed, that Blood which is Drink indeed.”

But something else befell our LORD in the wilderness. “He was tempted of the devil.” S. Mark adds, “He was with the wild Beast.” In mysterious correspondence we find the Woman, in the present vision, first assailed by the devil, the great Red Dragon; and then in company with wild beasts, the Beast from the *sea*, and the Beast from the *earth*.

¹ “The characteristic of *woman*,” writes Dr. Auberlen, “in contradistinction to that of man, is her being *subject*, (Eph. v. 22—24,) the surrendering of herself, her being receptive . . . It is this receptive, womanlike, position of man towards GOD and Divine things which the Bible calls faith, and on which according to its teaching all reception of Divine life depends . . . Humanity, in so far as it belongs to GOD, is the *woman*; therefore it is said emphatically of CHRIST the Son of the Woman, that He is a *Man-Child*, a *Son*, ([Greek]) . . . Besides Him *no man* dare call himself ‘*male*,’—no man dare deny his receptive woman-like position.”—Pp. 241, 242.

Yes, she is “tempted and proved in the wilderness.” This is her period of probation. The Dragon will persecute; and if that fails to injure her, he will *seduce*. He will strive to make her forget her hidden life in heaven, whither in spirit she has been raised; [272] and tempt her to regard with too great affection and complacency her wilderness lodging. He will seek to persuade her to look for *maintenance* there; to convert the ‘stones’ of the wilderness into ‘bread’ for herself, and thus strive to sustain a heavenly life with the barren unrealities of earth.

Her position is one of infinite blessing, and yet of extreme peril. For though admitted “in the *spirit*,” into the “heavenly places,” whence Satan, (who till the Atoning Blood had been shed had still access to the courts above as the “accuser of the brethren,”) has been eternally ejected; yet in the flesh she is still upon earth, and subject to his sleepless machinations. Hence it is always *possible* that her lower life should be stimulated to the detriment of her higher life; that she should be led to cast her desires downwards, to cherish an illicit curiosity after the things of sense and time, and lose her chaste spiritual-mindedness; that she should forget the one only reason wherefore she has been placed in the world, viz. to influence it, not to be influenced by it; to *act*, not to be acted upon; to subdue, not to be subdued; to attract it heavenward, not to be attracted by it earthward; to transform it, not to conform to it.

Satan, we have seen, was judicially expelled from heaven at our LORD’S ascension, the Archangel Michael being the executioner of the sentence against him. The cry therefore is heard, “Rejoice, ye heavens, and ye that dwell in them; for the accuser of the brethren is cast down.” His incessant and inexorable claims upon JEHOVAH’S justice, for the punishment of sin, had been triumphantly recognized and satisfied. He is everlastingly silenced. “Who is he that condemneth? It is CHRIST that died, yea rather, that is risen.” But “woe,” continues the heavenly voice, “woe to the inhabitants of the *earth* and the *sea*; for the devil hath come down to you, having great wrath.”

Cast down from heaven, and not as yet consigned to the eternal “lake of fire and brimstone,” (as at the final judgment, xx. 10,) nor yet locked up and chained in the *abyss*, (as during the millennial period, xx. 2, 3,) his malignity and subtlety are concentrated upon the two intermediate regions, the *earth* and the *sea*,— the latter signifying the restless agitated mass of the nations, the unregenerate waste of mankind; the former, the dry land reclaimed from the turbid waters of heathenism, the civilized, consolidated, outwardly Christianized earth. Here lies the sphere of the devil’s power. From each does the Apostle behold a Monster emerge, the Beast from the sea, the Beast from the earth; the representatives and organs of Satan in these separate regions; the one, an embodiment of the power, dominion, brute-force of the world; the other, of its wisdom, civilization, and intellectual culture. So that, as the Woman is the visible representative of CHRIST in the world, these monsters constitute the visible representatives of Satan.

[273]

Through these he approaches her whose real home is in heaven; striving to seduce her, either by the dazzling dreams of earthly dominion and *power*, or by the specious advances of earthly *wisdom*,—that “wisdom which descendeth not from above, but is earthly, natural, of dæmon origin.” His *persecutions* hurt her not. Does she remain equally scatheless under his *seductions*? Alas! well might the eating of the “little book,” containing the secret history of the Church, so sweet at first to the taste of the Apostle, make his very “heart of hearts” sad—“My belly was bitter.” The Spirit conveys him again into the “wilderness;” and ah! what a change! No marvel at his poignant exclamation, “when I saw her I *wondered with great admiration!*” For “as the Serpent beguiled Eve by his subtlety,” so has the second Eve been allured from the simplicity of her faith in Christ. “The virgin,

the daughter of Israel hath done a very horrible thing.”—“How hath the faithful city become an harlot !”

But let us examine each of these symbols somewhat, the Beast from the sea; the Beast from the earth, or False Prophet; and the Harlot.

I. And first: the Beast from the sea, or as it is usually designated by eminence “*the Beast*.” That this is a symbolic representation of the “*world*,”¹ there can, we conceive, be no possible doubt. The expression “the *world*” is quite characteristic of S. John. Whereas it occurs but 9 times in S. Matthew’s Gospel, 3 times in S. Mark and S. Luke, it occurs 79 times in S. John’s Gospel alone, and very frequently also in his Epistles. He employs it moreover, in a distinct manner; representing it, throughout, in some peculiar way, as the visible, personal, Antagonist of the Father. The Beast in the Revelation is unquestionably the very same power. In the one case we learn, that “all that is not of the Father is of the world:” in the other, that “all whose names are not in the Book of Life worship the Beast.” When we find the Woman therefore allured by this ten-horned, seven-headed monster, we but behold her subjected to the very same temptation to which our Lord was exposed, “All the kingdoms of the world and their glory.” The result of the temptation we have yet to see.

The Beast itself, as has been frequently observed, is merely com[274]posed out of the four bestial symbols under which were represented to Daniel the four great world-monarchies which were to last from his own time, until the setting up of Christ’s kingdom of glory. It represents the World-Power as a *whole*. But at the time when S. John wrote, this Power had reached its sixth stage of development. “Five of its heads,”² says the angel, “have fallen; one is; one is yet to come,” which is to be an ‘*eighth*.’ We have discussed this most difficult passage on a previous occasion in these pages.³ But it is well worthy of a little additional consideration. And we are fortunate in having to prosecute our examination in company with so thoughtful and sober-minded an inquirer as Dr Auberlen.

The ‘Woman’ and the ‘Beast,’ as we have already seen, represent respectively the kingdoms of God and of the world, “not in this or that period of their development, but in their general universality.” Hence the different heads of this Beast are but the successive evolutions of the one God-opposed Power whereby the Woman has been at successive periods of her history confronted and ensnared.⁴

¹ We have already observed that the fundamental contrast between the human and the bestial symbols, in this Book, is derived from Daniel. In Daniel we have the “*four Beasts*” and the “*Son of Man*;” in S. John we have “*the Beast* (a compound of the same four Danielic Beasts) and the *Woman*.”

In both cases,” writes Dr. Auberlen, “human is opposed to bestial; only with Daniel in male, with S. John in female shape. We know that herein the contrast between the kingdom of God and that of the world is symbolized. Daniel beholds the *Man*, the Bridegroom, the Messiah; because he looks into the time when CHRIST shall reappear visibly, and establish His kingdom upon earth. S. John, on the other hand, within whose horizon lies (to speak, at present, only in a general way) the *time before the second Advent*, beholds the *Woman*, the *Bride*, the congregation of GOD *in the World*.”—p. 240.

² See c. xvii. 9—11.

³ Vol. XV. pp. 510, &c. φ ‘Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse’ see pp. 56ff. *supra*.

⁴ The ‘heads’ of the Beast, it will be observed, are explained (xvii. 9, 10) as being at once ‘seven *mountains*’ and ‘seven *kings*’ (or kingdoms). But this twofold interpretation of the symbol is merely in order to keep up the propriety of the imagery. The parallel case of the *Bride* explains it. She is spoken of as a *City* and as a *Woman*. As a *City* she is seated on an exceeding high *mountain*: as a *Woman*, she pays loving homage and service to her Divine LORD and King. So the *Harlot* in like manner, as a city, is seated

{cont.}

‘Five’ of these heads ‘are fallen,’ in S. John’s time; ‘one is.’ The then reigning head was plainly the power of Rome. The five fallen heads, or world-monarchies, will thus naturally be (as our author, with Hengstenberg and others, assumes) Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece. As regards the sequence of the last four of the six heads, i.e. Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, we can have no doubt; as Daniel fixes them for us. The only question is, which are the two great phases of the world-power, *anterior* to the time of Daniel, which have a significance in respect to the history of God’s Church, from having either persecuted or seduced her. That these are Egypt and Assyria, Holy Scripture seems clearly to indicate. “The collocation of these two, as the pre-Chaldean worldly powers that *oppressed* the kingdom of God (says Hengstenberg) is of frequent occurrence in the Old Test.—Comp. Isa. lii. 4, 5, ‘For, thus saith the Lord, My people went down aforetime into *Egypt* to sojourn there [and suffered violence]; and the *Assyrian* [afterwards] oppressed them without cause. And now what shall I do *here* [i.e. in respect to the Chaldean invasion]; for My people is taken away for nought, and My Name every day [275] blasphemed.”¹ And with regard to the *seduction* of the Church by the World-Power, the same collocation occurs. Here is God’s indignant remonstrance with His ancient Church. “Thou hast committed fornication with the *Egyptians*. . . . Thou hast played the whore also with the *Assyrians*. . . . Thou hast moreover multiplied thy fornication into *Chaldea*.” (Ez. xvi. 26—29.) And thus we are brought, as in the preceding passage, up to the times of Daniel, from whom we learn the remainder of the sequence. In like manner (in Ezek. xxiii.) we have another enumeration of the abominable whoredoms of Israel and Judah; and again the same order adopted. We read of the Church’s whoredoms with *Egypt* (v. 3) with the ‘chosen men of *Assyria*,’ (v. 9); and lastly, with ‘the Babylonians of Chaldea,’ (v. 15.)

So much then for the first six heads.² “One is yet to come.” Which is that?

“He describes,” says Bede, “the plenitude of the Power of the World in the number seven; the last phase of which, to wit the *kingdom of Antichrist*, has not yet appeared. Hence he says that five heads are fallen, one is, and *one* is yet to come.”—(*Comm. in Apoc.* in loc.)

We cannot agree with Dr Auberlen in his interpretation of this portion of the vision. He appears to us, in fact, to contradict himself. One while he tells us that the Roman Empire (i.e. the sixth phase of the Beast) is *still* “essentially *existing* in history” (p. 220.) Another while he tells us that the seventh head has already arrived, viz. the ‘*Germanic*,’ p. 271, and that the ‘*eighth*’ head is to be the kingdom of Antichrist.

on ‘seven *mountains*’ or strongholds of power: as a *woman*, she holds unholy intercourse with ‘seven *kings*,’ the successive phases of the power of the world, the representatives of its successive seats of dominion.

¹ See his ‘*Revelation of S. John*,’ vol. ii. p. 11 (Clark’s Ed.) “So also are Egypt and Assyria coupled together in Isa. x. 24—26; xi. 11—16; xix. 23; xxvii. 13; Hos. ix. 3; xi. 11; Jer. ii. 18, 36; Zech. x. 10, 11; where Egypt and Assyria, as the most dangerous enemies in earlier times, appear as the types of the present and future oppressors of GOD’S people.”

² It ought not perhaps to be left quite without notice, in reference to the five fallen heads, that (independently of the literal historical allusion to the preceding phases of the World-Power)—as the number *five* is the recognized numerical signature of the imperfect times of the Old Dispensation (as we showed at length in a recent paper) [φ ‘The Symmetrical Structure of Holy Scripture’, Vol. 18 (pp. 167ff *supra*)]—it is but conformable with the propriety of numerical symbolism to find the Bestial Antagonist of the Woman during that period, impressed with that particular number—to find it represented as having passed through *five* stages of development.

We have only to remark (as we have pointed out before) that the Beast has *not* eight heads. We are definitely told that he has only *seven*. The seventh head however has certain terrible characteristics which differentiate it from all predecessors.

And first: we have this enigmatical, but significant, statement made with respect to it, that it is “an *eighth*” ([Greek]).

The number *eight*, as we all know, is symbolical of regeneration, resurrection. As such, it belongs to Christ, the ‘first begotten from the dead,’ and therefore to His Diabolic counterpart Anti-[276]christ, who in like manner, in virtue of his seeming death and resurrection, is styled “an eighth.”

But this is not all. We see in this expression an indication the sevenfold intensity, power, malignity of the culminating phase of the World-Monarchy. Noah was ‘*an eighth*’ ([Greek] 2 S. Pet. ii. 5); because he was ‘one of eight;’ he had *seven with him*. Even as the Evil Spirit which animates the World-Power, which has appeared to have been cast out and to have departed, after long seeking for rest, shall ‘return unto his house whence he has been cast out,’ *with seven other Spirits more wicked than himself* (S. Matt. xii. 45.) Note the expression, “He *goeth* and taketh to him seven other spirits:” ‘goeth’ whither? Doubtless to the abode of Evil Spirits, the ‘Abyss’ or Bottomless pit. Even as we are significantly warned with regard to the Beast, in its awful final manifestation, that it is to ‘ascend out of the bottomless pit,’ (Rev. xvii. 8.) He is to reappear reinforced with all the powers of hell, with sevenfold spiritual wickedness, so that in the last head shall be recapitulated all the combined GOD-opposing malignity of all previous phases of the Beast. The essential enmity to GOD and His people which really animates and characterizes the World, shall then be fully and intensely manifested. Times of untold distress and persecution shall ensue: and the furnace of affliction be heated for the faithful few, “*one seven times more than it was wont to be heated.*”

But, as in the case of the rest of the symbolical language of this Prophecy, there is here also a definite historical allusion underlying and supporting the obscure expression ‘he is an *eighth*,’ as applying to the seventh head.

The sixth or Roman head, we must remember, though broken up, revolutionised and disintegrated, is still essentially existing. The terrible short-lived seventh head has not yet come to supply its place. Now from this sixth head, as we learn both from Daniel and S. John, ten horns were to sprout forth: which horns as we learn from Daniel, are “ten kingdoms which shall rise up out of it.” From among these ten fragments of the old Roman empire, we further learn, an *eleventh* (the “little horn” of Daniel) shall suddenly and mysteriously emerge, who shall subdue and utterly uproot *three* of these kingdoms, and receive the submissive allegiance of the other seven; so that he shall reign along with his seven confederates, “an eighth.” “It is clear,” says Irenæus, in reference to these ten kingdoms, “that the Coming One will destroy three of them, subdue the rest, and thus become the *eighth* among them.”

It will be at once seen that the mistake of giving the Beast an eighth head, into which so many of our modern commentators have fallen, simply arises from the fact of their failing to notice the absence of the article before [Greek], in marked contrast with the [Greek] (v. 10, 11.)

[277]

Moreover, from this last expression we learn, plainly and categorically, that this still future, multiform head is, not some additional eighth head, but, “*of the seven*” ([Greek]: cf. Acts xxi. 8.) “We entered into the house of Philip, who was [Greek], *one of the seven.*”)

But a further difficulty, in connection with this most compressed and enigmatical synopsis of the history of the World-Power as given by the Interpreting Angel, is presented by the following fact, that the expression ‘the Beast’ is attached indiscriminately to the whole continuous Monster and to his short-lived seventh head. We must bear in mind, generally, that the Beast has no separate existence independent of his heads; that he lives and manifests himself through his heads; that they represent but the successive historical evolutions through which he passes; that he has only one at a time; and that each successive head is the Beast for the time being.

Thus in Egyptian times, the Beast was the power of the Pharaohs; in Roman times the power of Rome. But in the seventh or Anti-Christian head shall be revealed, in some peculiar and terrible manner, a summary and recapitulation of the *whole* intimate nature and history of the Beast. Nor will it be, in fact, till the seventh head has arisen that this Apocalyptic Vision will be perfectly plain, and the Beast fully manifested. S. John sees the Beast and Harlot alike *when they are ripe for judgment and have reached the summit of their impiety*. Hence the Beast which S. John sees, is emphatically the Kingdom of Antichrist. It is the World-Power *when it has reached* its highest point of Antichristian development; i.e., in its seventh head. This is the Beast proper of the Revelation. And it is only when exhibiting the historical relationship of this final mundane manifestation with the long previous career of the World-Power, that the former preparatory history of the Beast is touched upon, and the exact stage to which in S. John’s time it had already arrived, is alluded to.

One very obscure remark of the Interpreting Angel we have not yet noticed.

Three times, when explaining the secret history of the Beast, he throws in the words “*He is not*” ([Greek] c. xvii. 8, 11); and he asserts this, even when affirming that he is yet about to appear ([Greek]) and to ascend out of the abyss. He asserts this also notwithstanding the seeming vigour of the then reigning sixth head; notwithstanding the predicted sprouting forth of the ten horns, and the yet future rise of the seventh head or Beast *special*.

It is evident that this statement can refer, in its full bearing, to nothing short of the Victory *already achieved* by our LORD over the Beast: *I have overcome World.*” It can only refer to the Death-stroke which the World-Power received in the very moment [278] of its seeming triumph, when it “crucified the Lord of glory.” Hitherto the fall of one of the Beast’s heads had been immediately succeeded by the rise of another. But in its sixth head, the whole Beast received its death wound. As Adam and Eve died in the secret counsels of God the very day they partook of the forbidden fruit, so did the World and its Prince die when the dying Saviour “by his Death destroyed Death, even the Devil.” The power of the World, notwithstanding its seeming might and seductive fascination, is only visionary; it is not real. True, its death is not *manifested* as yet. It is not apparent to sight, only to faith. Faith triumphantly realizes it, and men now joyously sing, “Thanks be to God which *giveth* us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Thus then, although it is a profound and absolute spiritual truth that even now the Beast ‘is *not*,’ still, relatively to the corporate history of the visible Church, its prolonged existence is a most important practical fact. As Christ suffered ‘once for all’ for sins; and yet His Church has to ‘*fill up*’ her complement of His sufferings. As He obeyed perfectly, and yet she has to render up, in her every individual member, a strict tale of holy requirements,—‘the righteousness of the Law’ being ‘fulfilled’ in her. In like manner, although our Lord *has* already, for us, overcome the world, vanquished and killed the Beast, still the victory has not the less to be wrought out, the battle to be personally fought and won by His Church. The ‘half week’ of our Lord’s Ministerial life witnessed His Personal encounter

and conquest. The remaining half-week, the period of His Church's militant career, witnesses her long protracted struggle; closing, like her Lord's, with her Gethsemane and Calvary; but succeeded by the triumphant shout, 'The kingdoms of this world are become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ.'¹

One weapon has the Church bequeathed to her whereby she is to effect the conquest, and one only, "This is the Victory that overcometh the world, even our *Faith*." The 'Faith once for all delivered'—the Divine Deposit enshrined in the Holy Scriptures, and witnessed to by the *whole* Church from the beginning—this, in its simple, unadulterated, unmutated integrity, is the one, the only impregnable defence against the assaults of the World: protected by this supernatural shield, and wielding with steady arm her great offensive weapon the bright 'sword of the Spirit,' the infant Church "strong in the Lord and the power of His might," bravely [279] withstood all the hosts of the enemy. Persecuted, but not forsaken; cast down, but not destroyed; ever dying, and yet ever more truly and vigorously living; she rose after each encounter like a 'giant refreshed with wine.' From her Martyr-seed sprang forth an ever increasing and still goodlier progeny. The Beast's power tottered to its foundations. He was ever worsted: He was losing heart and strength. At last he was laid low; and appeared, says S. John, [Greek]. His time had come. The very World Power itself became Christian. The Beast *qua* Beast died. The Church's final conquests now seemed sure: the Kingdom of the world was already becoming the Kingdom of the LORD CHRIST. Aided now by the friendly World-Power, the Church will assuredly carry all before her, subdue to the obedience of CHRIST the remotest tribes of earth, and bring about the times of universal peace.

But stay, let us ascertain what is the precise nature of the change that has come over the Beast. Is he transformed, is he regenerated? It is true that as regards his GOD-opposed, savage, bestial nature he is no more. But has he really become man? Has a man's heart been given to him? Though mortally wounded, powerless, prostrate, has he ceased to be a *Beast*? No, with emphatic and terrible significance S. John always reminds us that the deadly wound has yet to be healed: that the Beast has yet to reappear in his proper nature, reinforced from the abyss, and with a sevenfold intensity of rabid ferocity: that its ten horns have to rise to power² and to engage in open and infatuated warfare with the LAMB.

¹ The difficulty as to the simultaneous existence and non-existence of the Beast is perhaps best illustrated and explained by the analogous case of the destruction of the Old Adam in Holy Baptism. The old man then dies and is buried: we are regenerated. We have a *potential* victory given us over Satan, the world, and the flesh. If however, we do not improve our advantage, and make the victory *real* and lasting, through the indwelling Power of Him Who hath obtained and *given* us the victory, the old man will revive; the Evil Spirit will thither return whence he has been cast out; and our last state shall be sevenfold worse than our first.

² But are not these ten Kingdoms in power already? For surely, if they represent the several kingdoms of modern Europe, the sprouts from the old Roman head, they are at this time exercising their several independent sovereignties. True: but this is not the particular kind of dominion here signified. The power here specifically referred to, is *bestial*, open Anti-Christian power. This they have not received as yet. The horns already exist; but they are not *crowned*: for the Dragon has to crown them.

It must be observed, that when S. John first sees the Beast, he beholds it in its full-blown vigour, and developed proportions, with its horns crowned. But he is subsequently told that this state of things has not *hitherto* been realized: it only '*is to be* hereafter.' These several horns, or kingdoms, then, which have already emerged, as predicted, from out of the old broken Roman head, are yet waiting for their bestial life, their Anti-Christian power and kingdom. For that they have not this at present, is manifest from the fact of their being hitherto, outwardly friendly to Christ. But their power has to come from the Abyss: and bestial nature of the World-Power is beginning to revive, and the Seventh Head is springing into being, then shall these kingdoms (at that time *ten* in number) be animated and possessed with the same diabolic

{*cont.*}

[280]

But meanwhile, the Beast is in a state of torpor. He is lying headless and prostrate. He has become Christianized: and instead of devouring, gently supports the Woman. He is her harmless and friendly Beast of burden.

This good understanding between the Church and the world is expressed by S. John under another figure in the original picture of the woman in the wilderness, in the twelfth chapter. Let us revert to this chapter for a few moments.

We saw, a little while ago, that the Church had found her a home in the barren wilderness of heathendom; had obtained a secure seat in the very centre of the kingdom of the world. Meanwhile the dragon, furious at her success, “casts out of his mouth water as a flood after her that he might cause her to be carried away of the flood.” (xii. 15.) What signifies this “flood of water?” It “refers undoubtedly,” says our author, “to the streams of the migration of nations.” (p. 261.) The Roman empire, once his great stronghold, having deserted his cause and embraced Christianity, he will let loose upon it his unregenerate masses, who shall destroy it, and thus, as he fondly hopes, the Christian religion itself. But once again he is foiled, “the *earth* helps the woman and swallows up the flood.”

“We know that the *earth* in contradistinction to *water*, signifies the world as already consolidated and civilized. The cultured Roman world received the wild Germanic masses, subdued and mollified their hostility, and reconciled them to Christianity, which is regarded here, as we see, not so much in its heavenly aspect, as in its earthly, as a power of civilization.”

But at this point of the symbolic history a very important distinction arrests us which runs secretly throughout the whole of the Apocalypse; we mean the distinction between the *Woman* and her *Seed*; or, as it is here expressed, “*the remnant of her seed which keep the commandments of GOD.*” What is the import of this distinction? With two characteristic notices S. John for a time leaves them. With regard to the woman he says, “The *earth* helped her;” with regard to the faithful remnant of her seed, he says, “the dragon persecuted them.” So that henceforward we are to have two distinct phases of Church history running on side by side, an exoteric and an esoteric. We have the Church, henceforward, regarded in two separate lights (1.) as militant and visible, consisting, like the net, the barn, the field, of good and bad, wheat and chaff; good seed and tares; and (2.) as consisting of the true faithful members of CHRIST alone. In her visible, mundane aspect, [281] woman, she soon becomes Babylon, confusion; in regard to the Holy Seed she is still Jerusalem the city of GOD.

The Man-Child to whom the woman, or mystical Sion, gave birth (xii. 5,) was CHRIST Himself; hence therefore, the “remnant, or *remainder* ([Greek]) of her seed” are the

life; the same rabid and open hostility against God and His people. “This shall be their hour and the power of darkness.”

It is at this particular crisis—while the change is coming over them, and they are being demoniacally energized from beneath, and have begun in savage frenzy “to make war upon the Lamb,”—it is at this crisis that God shall use them as His terrible instruments of retributive vengeance against the Harlot. She has “trusted in the strength of Pharaoh: the strength of Pharaoh shall be her ruin.” “The ten horns shall hate the Whore, and make her desolate, and burn her with fire.” It is not till after the destruction of the Harlot that the Anti-Christian Kingdom is *fully* consolidated; that, subduing three of his confederate kings, he becomes “an eighth;” and that he sets himself up openly and deliberately, as the god of the world; claiming, and exacting on pain of death, universal and exclusive worship, as though he were Incarnate Deity, the Image of GOD, instead of the ‘vile’ impersonation of the Beast-nature—the “image of the Beast.”

complement of CHRIST, His true members; the invisible Church which is now hid and included within the visible. The *Woman* is the Church *as manifested during the present dispensation*; her *Seed* are those alone of her present members which shall be accounted worthy to attain to the glories of the first resurrection; they are the secret election from out of the visible election.

It is they who are *hereafter* to reign; *not* the *Woman* who is to reign *now*. The distinction is of infinite importance. The attitude of the *Woman* is to be a suffering, meek, militant one, not a haughty regnant one. When the kingdom comes, it will be set up and established by means wholly supernatural, not by earthly processes. The weapons of the Church's warfare are not carnal. The whole dream of a visible, universal mundane theocracy during the present [Greek] is an essential and fundamental mistake. The words, "I sit as a *queen*," are essentially those of the harlot. The duty of the woman is now to 'bring forth children unto CHRIST;' in the *next* dispensation her *Seed* shall "rule all nations with a rod of iron."

Now of the Church under these her two distinct aspects, as visible and invisible, S. John proceeds to tell us many things.

Of the *Seed* we read that the devil "went his way to persecute them." For of every true member of the Body Mystical, it ever has been, and ever must be true, that 'in the world they shall have tribulation;' 'that their reigning with CHRIST' shall be antedated by their 'suffering with Him.' These are the blessed mourners to whom are assured the strong consolations of the everlasting Comforter; "sorrowful, but always rejoicing; poor, but making many rich; having nothing, and yet possessing all things." These appear in the Apocalypse as the "Two Witnesses," as keeping the two Testaments, and nurtured by the two great Sacraments. As the *Woman* comprehends the whole Temple of GOD, so do these constitute but the inner Sanctuary. They are the 'called,' the 'sealed ones;' they re-appear as the Bride. As yet they belong to the *Woman*. But as of old when Jerusalem became Sodom and Egypt, GOD summoned His Church out of it ("I called My SON out of Egypt"); so when the 'faithful city' has again 'become a harlot,' and the woman's 'sins have reached to heaven,' the mysterious voice will again be heard: 'Come out of her, My people, that ye partake not of her plagues.' For their sakes GOD as Yet spares the city. But when their secret number has been made up, the last one brought in the Bride fully prepared, they will, like righteous Lot, be summoned to 'come out [282] and separate themselves,' that judgment may take its relentless and inexorable course.

Thus much with regard to the 'Seed.'

On the career of the 'Woman,' the Apostle dwells more at length. Nay, her sad history and miserable doom form the leading feature of the remaining portion of the Apocalypse.

The earth helps her. The Beast receives a deadly wound; becomes gentle and friendly. The kingdom of the world ceases to oppress her from without. But a far more dreadful thing befalls her; the essence and spirit of the world penetrates into her own sphere. In influencing the world she suffers herself to be influenced by the world.¹ The world lays aside its enmity; and she her stern virgin purity.

¹ The deeper the Church penetrated into heathenism, the more she herself became heathenish; she then no longer overcame the world; but suffered the world to overcome her; instead of elevating the world to her divine height, she sunk down to the level of the worldly life. As the heathen masses came into the Church unconverted, so in like manner the heathenish worldly spirit passed over into the Church without passing through the death of the Cross."—*Auberlen*, pp. 291, 292.

“As the Beast gives up its God-opposed character, the Woman gives up her divine one. Both parties meet half way. World and Church make mutual concessions: the Beast carries the harlot. *Christianity* has become *worldly*; the *world* has become *Christianized*. This is the fundamental type of the Christian era. The gainer in this process is, after all, the World; for the Church whose life comes from the Father and the Son, can only be a loser by thus mixing with the world. Hence, though the state of the Christian world may appear satisfactory in the eyes of man; yet in the sight of God, the present Christianity of the world is by no means genuine.”—P. 299.

II. We have left ourselves very small space to allude to the second Foe of the Woman.

The “Beast from the sea” is not her only antagonist. She has an enemy more plausible, specious, wily, and dangerous: the “Beast from the earth,” or false prophet: the official mouth-piece of him who was “more subtle than any beast of the field.”

What is this second Beast?

The first thing that strikes us is this, that he comes in the name, and parades the authority of Christ. Its two horns are those of the lamb: yet his words are those of the dragon. Notwithstanding the accident of his imposing and Christian exterior he is still a Beast.¹

Now as the ‘Dragon,’ the dread ruler of the kingdom of darkness, is plainly the diabolic counterpart of the everlasting Father:

As the ‘Beast’ or ‘Corpus anti-Christi,’ the visible representa[283]tive of the Dragon, to whom he commits his seat and authority, is of GOD the SON:

So is the ‘Beast from the earth,’ or false prophet—the impersonated utterance, and wisdom, and power, of the Dragon and the Beast—of GOD the HOLY GHOST.

He is the representation or embodiment of earthly, sensual, demoniacal wisdom.

“The first Beast,” writes our author, “is physical, political; the second Beast is a spiritual power, the power of doctrine and knowledge, of intellectual cultivation Both are from below: both are *beasts*. The worldly anti-Christian *wisdom* stands in the service of worldly anti-Christian power.”—P. 306.

And this has ever been the case. The world’s wisdom has ever energetically supported its GOD-opposed power. Thus, when Pharaoh represented the ‘Beast from the sea,’ his ‘wise men’ stood to him in the relation of the ‘Beast from the earth.’ When the king of Babylon succeeded to the dominion of the world, his “magicians, astrologers, and soothsayers,” would occupy a corresponding position. But no mention is made by the interpreting Angel of the early career of the False Prophet or ‘Beast from the earth,’ as is made of the former history of the first Beast. Hence we need not dwell on it. The second Beast does not come into notice at all till after the ascension of CHRIST. His great manifestation is still in the dark womb of the future.

We merely learn that he has ever attended upon, and invisibly and energetically worked for the first Beast. Hence as the latter passes, between the first and second Comings of CHRIST, through three great phases, *Heathen*, *Christian*, and *Antichristian*,² so will the False

¹ We feel convinced that, in our examination of this vision on a former occasion, we missed the particular point and bearing of this symbolic figure, by neglecting to observe the fundamental distinction which holds in this book between the human and the bestial emblems. The harlot, notwithstanding her miserable degradation is essentially ‘from above.’ Both the beasts are essentially ‘from beneath.’

² The essential difference between *ancient* and *Antichristian* heathenism must not be lost sight of. The ancient, as represented by the first heads of the Beast, “was only an apostasy from the general revelation {cont.}

Prophet undergo three corresponding transformations. During Roman times, he would manifest himself through the various forms of heathen philosophy. During the transition period, now passing, of the Christianization of the Beast, he will naturally conform to Christianity: but of this anon. During the final or Antichristian period, after the healing of the deadly wound, with the new Demoniactal power infused into the 'Beast,' will his potent influences receive a fresh and hellish vitality. Then shall all his "power and signs, and lying wonders and deceivableness of unrighteousness," foretold by our LORD and His Apostles, reach their full height. Then shall the 'False Prophet' of the 'False CHRIST' be fully manifested. Then shall there be a new Revela[284]tion; but from Hell. "Great shall be the company of the preachers:" "They shall stretch forth their mouth unto the Heavens, and their tongue go through the world." Then shall there be real Inspiration, real miracles; but Diabolic. A terrible inversion and counterfeit of Christianity. The impious centre if it, the Beast that "died and rose again:" who although for a time *apparently* worsted (so shall his prophets say) by Christianity, has yet shown himself victorious, and demonstrated, by his successes, that the religion of CHRIST is a failure, a fable, an imposture. And all the world shall believe in him. And they shall eat and drink and blaspheme.

But this frightful glimpse of the coming reign of terror is not our immediate concern.

Our business lies with Christian times. We have to do with the *Christian* manifestations of these two Beasts, and their influence on the *Woman*: for it is through their specious and pseudo-Christian seductions that the Woman is little by little enervated and demoralised, that she loses her real purity and strength, is enticed like Samson into parting with her supernatural powers, and thus, when the 'Philistines fall upon her,' impotently succumbs.

A very few words must suffice; as we have already exceeded our limits.

Here then are her two foes: the seductions of worldly *power*; the specious advances of worldly *wisdom*.

No wonder if, allured by the *first*, we find her beginning to sigh for a place in the world; for dominion; for universal allegiance.¹ No wonder if, inspired by the *second*, we find her presuming to tamper with the stern uncompromising simplicity of her Creeds; to improve upon the Deposit which she was commissioned, by sanctions the most solemn, to keep and hand down pure and intact—that faith which not even an angel from heaven might dare to add anything to, or diminish aught therefrom. No wonder if the specious subtleties of worldly philosophy and the showy refinements of "science falsely so called" have penetrated the Sacred Enclosures of the Church's Faith, affected its terminology, enervated and adulterated it; if an ambitious and dogmatic scholasticism, or a sensuous sentimentalism, or a cold rationalism should have shed their blighting influences on different tracts of the heritage of the LORD.

S. John declares that even in his day the 'Spirit of Anti-Christ' was secretly at work. What wonder if, even in the Church of [285] CHRIST, it has already shown itself above the surface under different guises manifesting itself in the Pharisaism of Rome, the

of GOD in nature and conscience of Divine love in the SON (Cf. Matt. xii. 41, 42); it is refined, intensified heathenism," "a heathenism more demonic, more of the nature of the bottomless pit."—(vid. Auberlen, p. 300.)

¹ It is noticeable that the Woman becomes somehow mysteriously identified with the seat of the then reigning World-Power. And "it is this very spirit of the *Roman World-Kingdom* (writes our author) which penetrated into the Church, and changed her in the West into a *Church State*, striving after an eternal, unreal, world-power, having its centre in Rome; and in the East, into a *State Church*, fettered by the world-power, having its centre in Byzantium: in both places into a World-Church." (p. 294.)

Sadduceism of Germany, the Herodianism of England? S. Paul speaks in the same strain: he informs us that even in his own time the subtle Antichristian principle was silently operating. What wonder, we repeat, if we are able to discern, in the various Branches of the Church, various indubitable developments of this one energetic but multiform principle of evil?

We have been assured, for instance, with regard to the greatest Branch of the Church, that “*some hypothesis*” is *necessary* to account for the “difficulty” which is presented by the variations between primitive and mediæval Christianity. And a most ingeniously elaborated and plausible hypothesis is accordingly advanced. That these new growths and expansions of the Old Faith—these corrections of the errors of the early Church and progressive enlargements of her imperfect and rudimentary knowledge—should be characterised as the simple developments of mere natural religion, and the manifestations of the inworking of the “wisdom of the world,” will be deemed the height of ignorance or impiety by those who reverently regard them as the outward indications of the Church’s ‘growth in grace,’ of her ‘increase in wisdom and stature;’ as the continuous and authoritative utterances of the indwelling Spirit of GOD. At all events, here are two theories. All we can say is, “*Respice finem.*” What is to be the issue of these ever-germinating developments of the Faith? S. John is thrown into an ecstasy of sorrowful amazement at seeing the Woman transformed into the *Harlot*. S. Paul mournfully tells us that this Dispensation will terminate in ‘*the Apostasy.*’ Our LORD bodingly adds, “When the Son of Man cometh shall He find *the faith* on the earth?” Here is the issue of the Developed Creed.

But no. Victory over the world is guaranteed to, and secured by one weapon alone—the Faith, the whole Faith, and *nothing but the Faith*. Its power was tried in early times, and never failed. It *must* have undergone some fearful transformation in later days, by addition or subtraction, or both—have lost its invincible consistency and solidity, and so become *the Faith* no longer: for we find it is found wanting. This adulterated Faith *is overcome by the World*.

Be this our watchword, our sole aim and object, in our present Church Revival: “*The Faith once for all delivered.*” Nothing more: nothing less.

We trust to add a few concluding remarks in a future number.¹

¹ φ In fact, the review is continued in ‘Warnings of the Apocalypse to the Churches’ which follows immediately.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 19. (Joseph Masters: London, 1857)

[304]THE WARNINGS OF THE APOCALYPSE TO THE CHURCHES

IN commencing the series of papers on Professor Auberlen's work on the Apocalypse—which we purpose bringing to a close in our present Number—we expressed the opinion, that of all the Church's endowments, none seemed more urgently needed by her, in the days of change and excitement, than the “spirit of *understanding*,” to enable her, if so it might be to apprehend intelligently her true position with regard to GOD and the world, the measure of her [305] present conformity, in her various branches, with her original ‘Pattern,’ and the real nature and tendency of the several activities now stirring within her.

We propose to offer, in all humility—and merely as ignorant inquirers—a few thoughts on this head, suggested by that mysterious Book which has lately been engaging our attention. And here we must at once express our persuasion, that if we would derive any light from the Apocalypse on the momentous questions which continue to agitate Christendom, there is one central, cardinal point which before all others we must have definitely fixed, and it is this, What is the Harlot Babylon?

In our last paper we discussed at some length the distinctive features of the Beast and False Prophet, the embodiments respectively of the Power of the World, and the Wisdom of the World. And with regard to the Harlot, without entering into any detailed proof of our position, we yet assumed that she was, in some measure, identical with the Sun-clothed Woman in the twelfth chapter—that she was *one aspect* of that concrete, whereof the Sun-clothed Woman forms *another*—or, perhaps, (we might rather say) a representation of the Woman of the twelfth chapter fallen from her primitive purity and chaste spiritual-mindedness; allured by the Beast into conformity to the world, and by the False Prophet into tampering with her holy Faith.

But as this a question of no ordinary importance, we are quite willing, ere we proceed, to examine it a little more closely.

Many of the Clergy of the East Riding will remember the two interesting Papers read before them, on the subject of the Apocalypse, (subsequently embodied, to a considerable extent, in an article in the *Christian Remembrancer*,¹) by one lately gone to his rest, ever to be remembered by them with affectionate veneration and painful regret.

In these papers Archdeacon Wilberforce argued that the Harlot must necessarily be Heathen Rome. We will quote his words as given in the *Remembrancer*:

“That *Rome* is intended by the Woman who sits upon the seven-headed Beast is *of course* allowed on all hands, *because the Angel says so*. This is one point *of which we have an authorized interpretation*. The question is, whether the reference is to a civil or a spiritual power And we maintain, that the emblem connects itself so plainly with a *worldly* power, and not with a *Church*, that to doubt it is to lose sight of the entire analogy of Holy Writ.” And, after referring to the ‘De Civitate Dei,’ and the contrast there maintained between Babylon and Jerusalem, he proceeds “To allege that S. John, when he saw a woman having the name of Babylon, would think not of a worldly power but of a Church, is as great a practical absurdity as [306] to suppose that the readers of a political apologue would understand Nick Frog to mean the English, and John Bull the French.” XXVI. p. 398.

Now in the first place, it is to be regretted *in limine* that the Archdeacon had not a more rational theory to combat than that against which he argues. The object he proposes to himself is to examine the respective claims of two rival systems of interpretation, both of

¹ Vol. xxvi. 383.

which appear to us equally, and on precisely the same grounds, untenable; to wit, the “Anti-pagan and the Anti-papal;” the former of which refers all the emblems alike, Beast, False Prophet, Harlot, to Heathen, the latter to Christian Rome. Archdeacon Wilberforce assumes that, as one of these systems must be true, if the ‘Anti-papal’ is manifestly absurd, (as he has no difficulty in showing against Mr. Elliott, Dr Wordsworth, and others,) the ‘Anti-pagan’ must be established.

But here arises the necessity of discriminating between the human and the bestial. It is every whit as wrong to identify the Woman with the World, as it is the Beast with the Church. Here lies the contrast. Not but that the two *may*, and do in fact, become in a certain sense practically identical. When the Beast becomes wounded to death, and the Woman demoralised; when the Beast ceases to oppose the Woman, and the Woman the Beast; when they effect a mutual compromise, the World becoming Christianized, the Church worldly, it then, in fact, appears impossible to discriminate them. The worldly Church and the Christian World compose externally the same concrete. Still, if we would understand the Apocalyptic symbolism, we must not lose sight of the real, intimate distinction. The Christianization of the World is but an accident. The being wounded is as abnormal a state for the Beast as the being defiled is for the Woman: the former has to part with his distinctive bestial attributes, the latter with her feminine graces. The World “falleth down and humbleth himself self that the congregation of the Poor (i.e. the Church,) may fall into the hands of his captains.” The truth of the following verse has yet to be fearfully experienced: “He *doth ravish* the Poor when he getteth him into his net.”

But, says the Archdeacon, to allege that the Harlot is ‘a Church,’ is ‘an absurdity.’ Moreover, we have an ‘authorized interpretation’ of the symbol. We are assured that she is the *City of Rome*: ‘*the Angel says so.*’

Where does the Angel say so? Nowhere. The Angel speaks of this mystic Woman as a City seated on seven mountains, and exercising a potent sway over the kings of the earth. But then the question arises, How is this word ‘City’ employed in the Apocalypse? Is there a single instance of its signifying a *city* in the concrete, literal, ordinary sense? Not one. And the same is true of the other word ‘*Mountain.*’

[307]

In fact, to select one particular verse out of the whole of the Apocalypse, as is usually done, and apply to it a method of interpretation which notoriously will not hold in any other passage in the whole Book, appears to us irrational in the extreme.

Are the seven kings seven individual persons? the seven vials literal vials? the seven thunders, seals, trumpets, stars, &c., literal thunders, trumpets, &c.? Is the ‘great Mountain,’ thrown into the sea, a literal mountain?

Moreover in the case of the Harlot, the Angel instructs us, from the very first, to *prepare* for difficulties, and quit the regions of sight and sense. Her very name shows that the carnal or careless observer will fail to read her character and history aright. Her brow is impressed with the solemn word MYSTERY! It is of the marriage union of CHRIST with His faithful Church that the Apostle exclaims, ‘This is a *great Mystery.*’ Surely it is no less an awful ‘Mystery’ to find the Church faithless to her LORD. It is that fearful ‘Mystery of iniquity,’ which S. Paul connects with the Church’s ‘Apostasy.’ (2 Thess. ii. 3, 7.) Thus the Angel begins by telling the Apostle that he is about to put him in possession of the ‘*Mystery of the Woman and the Beast which carries her.*’ He proceeds, (still further to prepare us to look beneath the surface of his words,) “Here is the mind that hath *Wisdom.*” Now we are constrained to ask, Why should the Woman and her history be alike solemnly represented to S. John as Mystery? Why should the faculty of a supernatural Wisdom be

appealed to? Why, too, should the sorrow-stricken Apostle, “wonder with great admiration,” if, after all, the Angel merely meant to signify that the symbol represented old Heathen Rome built upon the well-known seven hills?

No, as soon as the one Woman—the Bride, Jerusalem—whose ‘foundation is *upon the holy hills*’ who is seen on the ‘great, high mountain,’ (Rev. xxi. 10; Ezek. x. 2,) is ruled to be the literal Jerusalem, then, with equal truth, may it be maintained that the other Woman—the Harlot, Babylon—seated on the seven mountains, is the literal city of Rome. The expression ‘the Woman,’ has a definite meaning throughout the Apocalypse: she may be chaste, or she may be defiled: she may be regarded in either of the three aspects, Woman, Harlot, Bride; but that does not affect the fixed and determinate sense of the expression itself. It is the abstract designation of the Church of GOD. And as the Church in the Old Testament is at once the ‘Holy City,’ (as containing GOD’S chosen ones,) and yet the ‘Bloody City;’ in one of her aspects, Jerusalem, in another Sodom and Egypt: so is the visible Christian Church, in one aspect, (as the Mother of the true Seed,) the Sun-clothed Woman: in another, (from her conformity to the world,) the Harlot.

Note too the marked and obvious antithesis. In the twelfth [308] chapter we meet with a Beast, a Wilderness, and a Woman; but here she is [Greek]: her own form is scarce discerned by reason of the supernatural radiance which encircles her. It is CHRIST that shines. She is lost, absorbed as it were, in Him. In the seventeenth chapter we meet with precisely the same collocation, a Beast, a Wilderness, a Woman;¹ but now she is [Greek].

Nor are we unprepared for this sad defection of the Woman from her original purity. The sevenfold Epistle to the Church Catholic foreshadows it all. Ephesus has fallen from her first love. Pergamos has those who teach fornication to the people of GOD. The Angel of Thyatira is represented as mysteriously wedded² to the false-prophetess Jezebel, and as faithlessly *permitting* her to seduce GOD’S servants into fornication. Sardis is *dead*, and contains but a small remnant who have not *defiled their garments*. Haughty Laodicea is about to be spued out of CHRIST’S mouth.

But, argues the Archdeacon, from Bossuet, had the Woman been the Church she would have been called an adulteress rather than a harlot. She would have been represented as the Bride that had become unchaste.

It will be observed, however, that, according to the symbolism of the Apocalypse, the *Bride* never appears during the present Dispensation. She is only manifested, when the possibility of her defection is for ever passed. As yet we merely meet with the *Woman*. However it is not for us to inquire, what word *ought* to be used: we have merely to see what word *is* used. And we find that all throughout those very chapters in the Old Testament, whereon this vision of the Harlot is founded, (Ezek. xvi. xxiii.) where we behold her earlier impurities, her unholy converse with the World-power in its former

¹ Professor Auberlen bids us notice that when these three expressions are introduced the 17th chapter, they all alike occur without the article, “as referring to expressions known from their previous occurrence.” But the omission of the article, he maintains, has a further reason. For the World-Power, the Church and the heathen world have, between the two Visions, “undergone great changes, insomuch that S. John can scarcely recognize them, and sees *a* Beast, *a* Woman, *a* Wilderness.”—P. 277.

² [Greek]

stages, [Greek] and [Greek] are again and again employed. Hence they are continued in the present vision.¹

It may appear strange, at first sight, that the Woman should be designated by the name of a great World-city. A corrupt Church, it is argued by Bossuet, might have been indicated by Samaria, or [309] even Sodom, but never by Babylon. This, however, only shows how terribly the spirit of the world has penetrated her. Her very name is fearfully significant—"Confusion." She exhibits a miserable confusion of things sacred and profane. She is "My FATHER's House," and yet "a house of *Merchandise*;" the "House of prayer for all nations," and yet "a den of thieves." She barter in all manner of worldly traffic, and no less with "the souls of men." She has "the *form of godliness*," and yet she "*denies the power thereof*." The world hates her, and yet bewails her. It tears her rabidly to pieces, and burns her with fire, because (as to her ultimate origin) she is from the FATHER: it bemoans and laments her, because she was really "of the world," and "the world must love its own."²

And still more apparent does this monstrous 'confusion' become, in her doom. In her destruction we witness a combined fulfilment of the denunciations pronounced by GOD, as well on Nineveh, Tyre,³ and ancient Babylon, as on Jerusalem.

Our LORD had declared that it should be more tolerable for heathen Tyre in the Day of Judgment than for His apostate Church; and that the men of Nineveh should rise up and condemn it. For "the worldliness of the Church," as Professor Auberlen truly says, "is the *most profane and worldly of all worldliness*."

"Hence it is that in the description of Babylon, the Apocalypse unites not only the chief features of Israel's sins, but also the sins of the heathens, as we find them delineated in the prophets. And for the same reason the Seer dwells longer on the description of the abominations and judgments of the Harlot, than on those of the Beast . . . And for this reason it is that there is more special joy in Heaven at her downfall, than over the downfall of the two Beasts. (Cf. xviii. 20—xix. 5)—P. 287.

But notwithstanding all the accumulation of worldly images, which characterise the description of the Woman, and especially the detail of her unholy "merchandise," (S. Matt.

¹ Moreover, "the term translated adultery simply signifies defilement; but the other expression, selling herself for hire, ([Greek] from [Greek], *vendo*) which idea pervades the whole of this subject. The impure Church barter and prostitutes her faith to CHRIST for the advantages of the world. The gold and the silver, the glories and delicacies of the world are especially dwelt upon; and for these she sells herself to kings, great men, and merchants."—Vide *Williams on the Apocalypse*, pp. 314, 15.

² "The Harlot Church did not molest the kings and mighty ones of this earth: she did not reprove their sins, but made their way to heaven smooth and easy: she was of service to them as a bridle, to keep in subjection the nations: she offered herself as a means of restoring their authority, and re-establishing order and safety; and her help was accepted, and found useful. Hence, no wonder that the kings mourn over her fall, (xviii. 9, 10) Also the merchants, shipmasters, found the Church useful as preserving order and peace; and under her protection commerce prospered, and their gains increased, (11—13.) And not only this, but she did not lift up her voice to witness against worldly-mindedness and luxury—the sources of the merchant's gains—but rather conformed herself to the world, and partook of its joys and pleasures: instead of caring for the sheep, she cared for the wool . . . instead of opposing and lessening, she *promoted and increased the sinful life and decay of the world by her own earthliness*, allowing the salt to lose its savour," (xix. 2, [Greek])—*Auberlen*, p. 289.

³ With regard to the solitary and exceptional use of the word 'fornication,' in the case of the two cities, Nineveh and Tyre; see *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xv. pp. 500—503. φ In 'Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse', pp. 88ff *supra*,

xxii. 5; S. John ii 16; 2 S. Pet. ii. 3; Rev. xviii. 11—13;) we have still far too [310] many plain and indubitable ‘notes,’ to make it at all doubtful what she *really is*; to convince us that she is no mere worldly power, and that it was not always thus with her, but that she was once none other than the ‘City of GOD.’

We see she is not judged with the World. No judgment begins at the Household of GOD.” It is not, therefore, till vengeance has been fully poured out upon her, that the Beasts, or Powers of the *World*, receive their doom.

Again: what is the nature of her punishment? It is that of the Priest’s daughter of old. For “if the daughter of any Priest profane herself by playing the harlot she profaneth her Father: she shall be *burnt with fire*.”¹ Hence of the Harlot Babylon we read, “she shall be *utterly burnt with fire*; for strong is the LORD which judgeth her.” The words of GOD to his ancient Church are to meet with some awful and mysterious fulfilment in her. “Wherefore, O Harlot, hear the words of the LORD, I will gather together all thy lovers with whom thou hast taken pleasure . . . and I will give thee into their hand; and they shall break down thy high places, and leave thee naked and bare . . . and shall *burn thy houses with fire*.” (Ezek. xvi. 35—41.) For “the ten horns shall hate the Whore and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall *eat her flesh, and shall burn her with fire*.” “For her sins have reached to Heaven, and GOD hath remembered her iniquities.” (Rev. xvii. 16; xviii. 5.)

Again: the removal of the Divine Presence from her, is predicted in the very words used of old to Jerusalem: “The light of a *candle* shall shine no more at all in thee; and the voice of the *Bridegroom* and of the *Bride* shall be heard no more at all in thee . . . for by thy sorceries were all nations deceived.” (Rev. xviii, 23; cf. Jer. xxv. 10; vii. 34; xvi. 9.)

And more terrible still: to her (we find) belongs that extreme malediction denounced by our LORD Himself upon His apostate Church, that “upon it should come *all the righteous blood shed upon the earth*, from the blood of righteous Abel.” It is of the Harlot of the New Testament that this blood is required. For she has inherited the curses as well as the blessings of GOD’S ancient Church. “In her,” therefore, we read, “was found the *blood of prophets and saints, and of all that were slain on the earth*.” (Rev. xviii. 24) Yes, according to the exceeding multiplication of her blessings, so will be the miserable accumulation of her woes. Her guilt is infinitely intensified by reason of the immeasurable excess of her gifts and graces above those of her elder sister. The “Mystery hid from ages and generations”—hid from the Jewish Church—has been revealed to her; to wit, the indwelling of CHRIST; actual incorporation into Him—we in Him, He in us; and the continuous Gift, through Him, of the informing, inworking SPIRIT. She has, [311] therefore, been called to be Holy *as her LORD is Holy*; to exhibit a pattern of Heaven on earth—a pattern of *intimate*, intrinsic, unity—oneness in CHRIST, oneness in Faith—a unity developing itself from within outwardly, attracting, and assimilating to it all who should come within the sphere of its Holy Influence. And has she done all this? Where is her unity, her purity, her earnest, uncompromising holiness? Ah! “How hath the gold become dim, and the fine gold changed!” Ancient Jerusalem abused her gifts, and became the Harlot: the Jerusalem of the New Dispensation, by reason of her more transcendent endowments, and deeper fall, becomes the “Mother of Harlots.”

There is a boding solemnity in that most difficult saying of our LORD: “I must work the works of Him that sent Me, while it is *day*: the *night* cometh, when no man can work. As long as I am in the world, I am the *light* of the world,” (S. John ix. 4, 5.)

¹ Lev. xxi. 9,—See Williams, p. 352.

Our LORD here speaks of a *day* and a *night*; of a Day wherein He *works*, and which *is* day by reason of the Light of His Presence; and a Night wherein He works no longer and wherein no man can work, and which is night by reason of the withdrawal of His Presence.

But through what agency is CHRIST still in the world? What is the instrumentality whereby the *Light* of His Presence still shines on mankind, and through which He still *works*? It is His Church. “Ye,” says He, “are the *Light* of the world:” and, “greater *works* than these shall ye do, because I go to the FATHER.” His Church, then, still continues His *illuminating* Presence, His gracious *operations* on earth.

Our LORD’S words then, plainly bear (besides their personal allusion) a *Dispensational* reference; hinting at some dread time, a night of gloom, of clouds and thick darkness, yet impending ere the sixth Day, or Day of Grace, dies into the seventh, or Day of Judgment; when the Sun itself, not of the natural only, but of the spiritual world, shall be turned into darkness, and the Moon, therefore, or visible Church, cease to give light; when the ‘*stars*’ or ‘*Angels*’ of the Churches, the luminaries of the heavens, shall fall from their spheres;—a night wherein “if any man walk, he stumbleth, because he seeth not the Light of the world.”

S. Paul, predicting the manifestation of the Anti-Christ, warns us of the coming night. He tells us that side by side with the Spirit of CHRIST in the Church, there is also a spirit of Anti-Christ, a hidden Mystery of iniquity, a Principle of lawlessness secretly at work. But this latter Principle, he adds, shall not always work *secretly*. There is, as yet, a *Restraining* Power keeping us in check, which prevents its open manifestation. Let but this Restrainer be removed; and all this pent up wickedness, now inwardly seething and stirring, shall burst impetuously forth—the Mystery of iniquity be exposed to view—the Man of Sin be revealed.

[312]

And who can this Restrainer be—[Greek]—“He who letteth?” Who, but CHRIST and the Blessed Spirit?¹ What was it, of old, restrained the sulphurous torrents from sweeping away the cities of the plain? The presence of Lot, righteous Lot, type of the HOLY SPIRIT in the Church; “*I can do nothing* till thou be come out.” What is it restrains the floods of darkness from breaking in upon the *natural* world? The presence of the *sun* in the heavens. Even as it is the Presence of CHRIST alone which withholds the billows of night from engulfing in their black surge the spiritual universe.

But what? Is CHRIST’S Presence, is the Light of His Holy Spirit ever to be withdrawn from His Visible Church? Where is His Promise, ‘Lo, I am with you always?’ It cannot be too often repeated that this Promise is not *unconditional*. It is *entirely contingent* on the Church’s teaching and observing ‘*all things*’—neither more nor less—“all things whatsoever CHRIST has commanded,” (vid. S. Matt. xxviii. 20.) So that just in proportion as any Branch of the Church fulfils this condition, in that proportion may she look for the gracious Presence of CHRIST. In proportion as she corrupts the Deposit, listens to the plausible seductions of the False Prophet, mutilates or augments the Faith, prefers her own developments or ‘traditions’ to the simple ‘commandments of GOD,’ and teaches as

¹ This is one of the only two suggestions on this mysterious question, common in the early Church. “There are *many*,” says Ecumenius, “who consider the restraining power to be the Holy Ghost.” For as soon as He shall be removed out of the midst, in consequence of the sins of men, and shall take His departure, then will that Wicked One soon be revealed; there being no one any longer to prevent him.” See this point further discussed, Vol. xv. pp. 535—538.

‘doctrines’ i.e., as ‘*de fide*’—what are but human inventions—in that proportion *she cannot but* forfeit the Divine Presence.

And this it is that the mystical Woman does. She adulterates the Christian Faith. The great season of trial comes—the Temptation (Rev. iii. 10); and this emasculated faith is unable to bear up against it. The *Apostasy* ensues (2 Thess. ii. 3); and the *Apostasy drives away the Restrainer*. And then it is that the Woman becomes in the fullest sense of the term the Harlot—the Mother of Harlots and abominations. Then only does she fully and intensely realize the description given of her by the Apostle. Dazzled by the flatteries, captivated by the friendly advances of the future World-King, who professing the most abject recognition of her spiritual claims, employs her as the great stepping stone to his schemes of universal dominion—for him, and in his cause, she fills up the measure of her iniquities. Her Babylonish dreams of worldly ascendancy and prosperity are realized. Energetically backed by the zealous and obsequious World-Power, she succeeds in putting down all opposition. Heretics are summarily committed to the “secular arm.” She now reigns as a Queen. She has [313] “*gained the World*.” Flushed with her successes and glorious prospects; drunk with the blood of the martyrs of the LORD JESUS, the faithful Witnesses who have still dared before High Heaven to utter their deep Protest against her blasphemous impieties;—she sits as a ‘Lady’—the World at her feet—she directing the Beast, while he supports her. But her time has come. The spirit of Life has departed from her. She has become a loathsome, putrid carcass; and stinks in the nostrils of the Most High. The eagles of prey scent her, and flock around her. The kings with whom she has lived deliciously fall upon her, tear her to pieces, trample upon her, and eat her flesh in frenzy of infuriated hatred. Out of the frightful Revolution that attends her downfall, the Kingdom of Anti-Christ, the visible despotism of Satan is organized and consolidated.

From all that has been advanced we thus learn, that Holy Scripture intimates, in language neither to be evaded nor mistaken, that like Israel of old, the Visible Christian Church shall apostatize from the Faith—fall from her first love—teach and practise spiritual fornication—grow in arrogance and self-sufficiency—embrace and enforce novel Doctrines incompatible with the Faith bequeathed her by our LORD and His Apostles, (‘I am rich and *increased* with goods’) and be finally spued out of CHRIST’S mouth.

But this is not all.

For we also learn that GOD shall yet reserve to Himself, through all times, a secret election who shall not bow the knee to Baal—the two sackcloth-clothed Witnesses—the “Remnant of the Woman’s seed who keep the Commandments of GOD;” against whom, as their Protest grows louder, and her infidelity more flagrant, the Harlot shall institute ruthless persecution; and who shall experience a terrible meaning in oaths like the following, imposed upon all the Dominant ecclesiastical Party—“*Hæreticos omnes et rebelles pro posse persequar et expugnabo*.” “The time cometh that whoso killeth you will think he doeth GOD service.” History furnishes us with but too ample warnings and foretastes of this bitter Cain-like spirit towards those who humbly and faithfully obey GOD, on the part of those who prefer a more ostentatious, self-gratifying worship of their own—not to prepare us for still more ruthless exhibitions, in the Church, of the pregnant truth of our LORD’S words, “O Jerusalem, which killest the Prophets.”

But, where is the Harlot now to be discerned? Where the Witnesses? GOD knoweth. Still, not to use the spiritual senses GOD has given us, in a momentous question of this kind, would be either feeble affectation or infatuation. And here, while fully admitting, with Dr Auberlen, that it is “Christendom *as a whole* in all its manifold manifestations of Churches and sects,” that is the Harlot, even as, of old, it was Israel *as a whole* that became a

Harlot—still it appears to us deliberate blindness not to acknowledge [314] with our great devotional writer, the earnest, devout, thoughtful Isaac Williams, that “the whole Prophecy does, in some awful manner, hover as with boding raven-wing over *Rome*.”

The Œcumenical scope of the Epistles to the seven Churches in Asia does not militate against, but arise out of, their particular reference. And, in like manner it is quite impossible to miss the *intentional* allusion to the local city and Church of Rome, underlying the more general reference to Christendom.

Rome claims to be the centre of Christendom. Hence, as Jerusalem was employed to designate the whole ancient Church, so under the figure of Rome, have we represented to us the whole carnal Church of modern times. And again. As Jerusalem was at once the great seat and centre of spiritual gifts, and also the great centre of apostasy, insomuch that the vials of wrath poured upon the whole Jewish Polity, were there locally concentrated:—So may it be that the doom of her modern counterpart shall present a fearful parallel; and that the very Branch of the Church which has in so signal a manner been exalted (or exalted itself) to Heaven, shall, in some equally signal and mysterious way, be cast down to Hell. The intensity of the whoredom in any part of corrupt Christendom, must plainly be proportionate to the extent of its endowments. “To whom much is given of them will much be required.” Hence we may well conceive the accumulated impurities of Christendom, in GOD’S sight, to be gathered up as at a focus in this richly-endowed Church—that famous Branch whose “Faith *was* spoken of throughout the world,” and yet to whom the great Apostle gives this prophetic warning, “Be not highminded, but *fear*.” “Behold the goodness of GOD to thee *if thou continue* in His goodness: otherwise *thou shalt be cut off*.”

That Rome will again rise to power, that her deep unsatiable thirst after universal supremacy,¹ for the securing of which she will ‘compass sea and land,’ shall yet be terribly gratified, seems far from improbable. Although “the Harlot is the unfaithful Church generally and universally,” and “bears the name of the World-city Babylon, not from its central geographical position, as on account of its worldly character,” yet it seems far from impossible that this inward, unfaithful, Babylonish spirit may again “concentrate itself in Rome in the final period when all Apocalyptic powers assume concrete embodiments.” We quote the following from Dr Auberlin:—[315]

“As yet the mystery of Babylon is not fully developed; and we *do not know what revolutions of the false Church are in the future, till it reaches that culminating point when it is ripe for judgment*. But Bengel, who (notwithstanding all the mistakes in the details of his exposition) was endowed with a wonderful intuition, which was increased by his study of the Prophetic Word, was probably correct in his expectation, that *Rome will once more rise to power*. . . . The adulterous, worldly elements in all Churches and Sects, lean towards that false Catholicism, and pave the way for its progress. . . . But let us take heed to the signs of the times, to the confusion of truth and error, worldliness and Christianity in manifold shapes and forms, and let us not partake of it.”—Pp. 295, 6.

¹ “He that reigneth on high”—(so begins the famous Bull of Pius V., absolving the people of England from their allegiance to Elizabeth)—“to whom is given all power in heaven and earth, hath committed the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church to *one alone* upon earth; to Peter and Peter’s successor, the Bishop of Rome, to be *governed in plenitude of power*. *Him alone* hath He made *Prince over all people and all kingdoms*, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume,” &c. &c. [a.d. 1570.]

It is as well to bear in mind what are the real theoretical claims of the Papal supremacy, as asserted by itself.

The future of Christendom is shrouded in awful mystery. We see, however, enough in the recorded past, no less than the manifested present, to assure us that a fearful day of reckoning has yet to come between GOD and His faithless Church for her abuse of her transcendent privileges. Let us but contrast her professed character, as One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, as the Body, Spouse, Representative of CHRIST, and the Tabernacle of His SPIRIT, with her actual condition at almost any era of her history, and can we forbear to adore the long-suffering mercy of a gracious GOD, Who has not long ago “paid her that she has deserved?” Can we fail to marvel that vengeance has not burst forth long ago? We have given below¹ a few passing notices, selected almost at random, [316] picturing the

¹ Take (e.g.) Baronius’ well-known description of the beginning of the 10th century, (a.d. 900,) “an age which by reason of its barrenness of good has been wont to be called the *iron* age, and by the deformity of its exuberant evil the *leaden* age” an age which witnessed “the *abomination of desolation* in the Temple of God.” “To our shame be it spoken, how many *monsters horrible to behold* were intruded into that seat which is revered by Angels! With what filth was it her fate to be besprinkled who was without spot or wrinkle, with what stench to be infected, with what impurities to be defiled, and by these things to be blackened with perpetual infamy!” &c. Then again, (a.d. 912) “What was the face of the Holy Roman Church? How exceedingly foul! when most powerful and abandoned harlots ruled at Rome, at whose wills the Sees were changed, Bishops presented, and (what is horrid and frightful to hear) false Pontiffs, their paramours, intruded into the See of Peter Christ was then evidently in a deep sleep in the Ship, when these winds blowing so strongly, the Ship itself was covered with the waves.”

In the next century we find Gregory VIIth complaining, (see his letter to Hugo, Abbot of Clunium, *Bar. An.* a.d. 1075,) that “the *Eastern* Church wanders from the Faith by the instinct of the Devil.” “And when I regard either the *West, South, or North*, I find *scarcely any* Bishops who are lawful either in institution or mode of life, who govern the Christian people from love of Christ and not from secular ambition.”

In the following century, (notwithstanding the great reformation effected by Hildebrand,) we gather from the stirring sermons of S. Bernard, a frightful picture of the corrupt state of the Church, the more widely diffused the more incurable; the more internal the more deadly.” “All ministers of Christ; and all *servants of Antichrist*.” (*In Cantica. Serm.* 33.) John of Salisbury gives a precisely similar account at the close of the same century.

In the ensuing century, (a.d. 1241,) we find Matthew Paris writing: “At that time the insatiable covetousness of the Roman Church, confounding right and wrong, reached such a height, that laying aside modesty, she, *like a common and shameless harlot, ready to be hired*, and exposed to all, esteemed usury a trifling evil, simony none at all.”

No wonder that we now begin to find the Apocalyptic Harlot boldly identified with the then carnal Church. The parallel between the two is drawn with fearful power in the Postills of the Franciscan, Peter John of Olivi. “The Church,” he writes, “publicly and most impudently plays the harlot away from her Spouse CHRIST. She has made both herself and all her subject-people drunk with the foul and carnal joys, simoniacal gratifications, and the vain pomp and glory of the world.” Again: “She is called the Great Harlot, because departing from the faithful service and true love of CHRIST her Spouse, she clings to the riches and pleasures of the world, and herein to the Devil.”

The Sonnets of Petrarch, (vid. P. i., Son. 107,) and the Revelations of S. Bridget (e.g. Lib. i., c. 41; iv. 33,) alike give testimony, in the next century’, to the wide-spread and appalling corruption of the Church.

The 15th century opens with the Council of Pisa, at which the abominations festering in the Church are loudly denounced by faithful men. See the speech of Gerson, Chancellor of Paris, on Ascension Day, (A.D. 1409,) who bitterly deplores the universal impurity, debauchery, and secularity of the Clergy. But, as Mosheim informs us, it is impossible to find a writer of eminence in this 15th century who does not wail over the “*miserable state of the Christian Church*,” and anticipate its ruin unless GOD should interpose for its rescue. The close of this century brought in that monster of monsters, Alexander VI. What marvel that we find Luther then writing to Leo X. early in the ensuing century. “The Roman Church, once the holiest of all Churches, has been converted into a den of thieves the most licentious, a brothel of brothels the most abandoned: a kingdom of sin, and death, and hell; *so that even were Antichrist to come, nothing could be conceived possible to be added to her iniquities*.” See the large collection of authorities on this melancholy subject collected in *Brown’s Fasciculus*. See also ‘*Counter Theory*,’ pp. 123—151.

{cont.}

actual condition of the Western Church, (as this most concerns ourselves,) at two or three periods of her history; and, we repeat, can we forbear to wonder that judgment has lingered so long, that the great Harlot and Mother of Abominations has not long ago met with her terrible doom? But the LORD is merciful, "He hath long patience." The HOLY SPIRIT still strives in the Church. The number of the elect is still incomplete. "When the kernel is mature the shell is thrown off." Meanwhile, little by little—one here, another there—the LORD is gathering in His own, the meek, the lowly, the humble ones, who, when the mighty are put down from their seat, and she which has exalted *herself* is abased, shall be raised by CHRIST to share in His Kingdom, and Power, and Glory for ever. One by one, the faithful are being taken from out this troublous scene, and conveyed to their quiet resting-place in the Bosom of their LORD, waiting in thrilling bliss of expectation for their Perfection. One after another, the 'living stones,' dug out of this earthly quarry, and here hewn, squared, and polished by the sharp strokes of the wise Master-builder, are being carried to that shadowy and mysterious land, where in dim and awful silence the August Temple is rising.

Soon shall the Bride, the Holy City, be complete. Soon shall her mystic number have been made up, her last jewel added. She [317] shall be "prepared for her Husband." And then the two Witnesses shall have "*finished* their testimony;" and "the Beast shall overcome them." Their martyr life shall be exchanged for a martyr death. On earth it shall seem that there is "*not one* godly man left;" that "the faithful are extinct among the children of men." It is "night." A thick darkness veils the spiritual world; but meanwhile the "Saints are rejoicing in their beds." Christianity has been *put down*, says the world. Little thinks it, that its Morning of terrible, and exulting, and everlasting triumph is just at hand.

But as yet the Harlot rules. So long, however, as she contains any true members of the mystical Bride, for their sakes she is holy: judgment tarries; space for repentance is vouchsafed.

Who can doubt—to bring this subject to bear on our own position—that the troublous season of the Reformation was, in some signal sense, a loud call on Christendom to "repent and do its first works"—a convulsive struggle on the part of the SPIRIT of LIFE in the Church to free itself from the loathsome incubus of death and corruption, of adulterous Faith and Practice which weighed it down? Would that the call had been heeded—the golden opportunity seized! That the great Movement which took place in this country, despite its acknowledged imperfections, was yet a genuine effort on the part of the Branch of the Church in these realms to recover herself from her fornication, to regain, if it might be, her lost purity, to conform herself to her pristine model, to disentangle her Apostolic Faith from the modern speculations, which, "while men slept," had, little by little, intertwined themselves around and amongst it, to detach the "commandments of GOD," which she had received to hold, from the "traditions of men," which virtually voided and nullified them, it were infidel blindness to doubt. The warning voice which throughout the whole of this age is continually sounding, "Come out of her, My people;" "Be ye separate and touch not the unclean thing," was then heard aloft, ringing loud and clear. She heeded the voice, and set herself with energy to purge her from her harlotry, to "come out of the Harlot"—*qua* Harlot—to purify those very sources of the Faith, which, vitiated by earthly accretions, sent fourth streams of practice foul and unwholesome.

Painful as this subject of Church History is to contemplate, it is not the less useful occasionally to be reminded of it.

Arduous and difficult was the task.—Herself paralysed by long unfaithfulness—enemies on all sides assailing her. Through GOD’S mysterious Providence the work was achieved. But her position was necessarily rendered critical and difficult in the extreme. Cast off by her Western Sister because she determinately refused to obey man rather than GOD. Tottering, crippled, enfeebled, isolated; how is it she has not long ago fallen to pieces and come to nought? Had the Reformation really been a fatal error or a *schism* on her part, it *must have been so*. But what is the case?

[318]

The author of the Theory of Development shall speak.

“Heretical and schismatical bodies cannot keep life; they gradually become cold, stiff, and insensible. They may do some energetic work *at first* from excitement, or *remaining warmth* . . . but, whatever their promise at first, whatever their struggles, they gradually and surely tend not to be . . . Now if there ever were a Church on whom the experiment has been tried, whether it had *life* in it or not, the English is that one. For three centuries it has endured all vicissitudes of fortune. It has endured in trouble and prosperity, under seduction and under oppression. It has been practised upon by theorists, browbeaten by sophists, intimidated by princes, *betrayed by false sons*, laid waste by tyranny, corrupted by wealth, torn by schism, persecuted by fanaticism. Revolutions have come upon it sharply and suddenly, to and fro, hot and cold, as if to try what it was made of . . . Yet what has been its career *upon the whole*? which way has it been moving through three hundred years? . . . *Every act, every crisis* which marks its course has been UPWARD . . . Look too at the internal state of the Church: much that is melancholy is there, strife, division, error. But still there is *life*. And, we humbly trust, a Heavenly Principle after all which is struggling towards development, and *gives presage of truth and holiness to come*. Look to the *daughter Churches* of England. Shall one that is barren bear a child in her old age? Yet ‘the barren hath borne seven.’ Schismatic branches put out their leaves at once in an expiring effort. Our Church has waited three centuries; and then *blossoms, like Aaron’s rod, budding and blooming and bearing fruit*. Surely she has ‘Notes’ enough . . . the Note of *life*, a tough life and a vigorous. She has *ancient descent, unbroken continuance, agreement in doctrine with the ancient Church*,”¹ &c. &c.

We have been compelled from want of space greatly to mutilate this striking passage, which we have quoted as introductory to a question of intense interest to ourselves namely:—What may we humbly conceive to be the secret Mission; what, therefore, the particular duties and dangers of our own Church? That GOD is manifestly preparing us for *something*—whether for doing or for suffering—it is impossible to doubt. If only our unfaithfulness, restlessness, wilfulness, be not permitted to frustrate His merciful intentions towards us.

Dr Auberlen thoughtfully remarks, in reference to the Second Advent, that “The LORD cannot come to judge Christendom *till He has given again an opportunity of hearing His Gospel proclaimed faithfully and purely*.” (p. 378.)

Is this then the Mission of our Church? Is it for this, she has been undergoing this long probation, this weary and protracted discipline? “At evening time it shall be light.” It is immediately before the judgment on the Harlot that an Angel is seen flying through mid heaven bearing “the Everlasting Gospel” to all them [319] that dwell on the earth. (Rev.

¹ See “A Letter to the Bishop of Oxford.” 1841. Pp. 35—40.

xiv. 6—8.) “This Gospel of the Kingdom,” said our LORD, “shall *first* be preached in all the world *for a witness* to the nations; and *then* shall the end come.” Even as it is just before the dread judgment denounced on haughty self-satisfied Laodicea, that the cheering words are uttered to the Church of Philadelphia: “I have set before thee *an open door*: and no man can shut it: for thou hast *a little strength*, mid hast *kept My Word*, and hast not denied My Name.”¹ Yes: “a great door and effectual” is again to be “opened” to the heathen world ere CHRIST returns; and again, as before, there will be found “many adversaries.” The Gospel message has been lightly regarded in the “streets and lanes of the Great City;” one has preferred “his farm, another his *merchandize*;” the King’s ambassadors are now to be sent into the ‘by-ways and hedges,’ the remotest corners of the earth, that the number of the guests may be made up, and the House be filled. And the message must be no *new* message; but “*that which we have heard from the beginning*.”

“Apocalyptic Prophecy is approaching its fulfilment.” Perilous times are drawing near. But “GOD will give Apostolic knowledge for Apostolic times and struggles.” Oh ! is it for this, the Church of England is secretly preparing; to stand out, as well in Christendom as throughout Heathendom, as GOD’S faithful Witness in the latter days? Is she learning afresh the old well-tryed Apostolic Faith to fit her for times of more than Apostolic trouble? Has she been clearing off the rust and defilement from the ‘Armour of GOD’ which has been left her, to enable her to encounter with success the Hosts of Hell? Is it to be her lofty privilege to nurture the Martyrs of the ‘last time’—the martyrs on whom the Beast shall vent his fury, and with whose blood the imperious Harlot shall yet be drunk? GOD knoweth.

But, say some, the tendency of the present Movement in the Anglican Church, and the one great issue to be thence looked and prayed for, is re-union with her Western Sister, and through her with the rest of Christendom. “Depend upon it,” said a member of the Society of Jesus to the writer, the other day—“the only chance of your Church weathering the storm of infidelity which is lowering over her, is her dutiful *submission* once again to Rome.” And the same view, we regret to see, is being sedulously and inconsiderately propagated in many quarters, even amongst ourselves. But what?—we are bound to ask—Is unity more valuable than truth? Is a hollow, compromising, craven-hearted uniformity a greater prize to be sought after than a pure primitive Faith? Is the Church built upon the Faith, or the Faith dependent upon the changing phases of the Church? Was Arianism more true when all Christendom was infected by it? Was the faith less the faith [320] when it was witnessed to by well-nigh and Athanasius alone? As the Church did not make the Faith, so neither can she alter it. Not one iota can she add to or subtract from it, without ceasing in that proportion to be truly the Church, and forfeiting the blessings promised to the Church. Now the *distinctive* tenets of Rome are either Catholic and Apostolic, and therefore true; or they are neither the one nor the other, and therefore false. If they can be demonstrated to have formed a part of the original Deposit, and to have been held as such by the Primitive Church; in GOD’S Name let us embrace them at once: in which case union with Rome will necessarily ensue. But if we fail to establish their claims; then, even though East and West combine in embracing them and pressing them on our acceptance—if GOD be true, we shall be infinitely stronger and more invincible, isolated, protesting, anathematized, than were we to compromise the *smallest particle* of Truth for expediency, or purchase a visionary union by cutting ourselves off, in so far, from the Everlasting Source and Centre of Unity.

¹ See the very interesting chapter on the Church in Philadelphia in Mr. Chamberlain’s “*Seven Ages of the Church*.”

That GOD is gently and gradually leading us on, in His own all-wise and secret way—as we are able to bear it—towards a fuller apprehension of catholic truth, a deeper sense of our responsibilities and miserable shortcomings, an increased earnestness and self-denial,—that He is stirring up among us more reverent longings to know and conform ourselves to His revealed will, we humbly and trustfully believe. But are we being therefore brought any nearer to Rome as she now is? Are we a whit more likely to hold and submissively acknowledge, that “obedience to the Bishop of Rome, on the part of every human creature, is *omnino de necessitate salutis*?” Are we any nearer believing that when our Blessed LORD has left a solemn injunction to His Church, “*Drink ye all of this,*” reiterating the command through His Apostle, confirming it by the practice of His holy universal Church in her public eucharistic services for 1200 years, this command may be deliberately set at nought? that we may with impunity reject that Holy Gift which the Head of the Church declared to be the “True Drink” of His mystical Body, and *necessary* to its spiritual health, simply because Rome arrogates to herself to pronounce that it is *not* necessary?

Are we likely to look more favourably on Rome’s modern revelations respecting the position of S. Mary in the economy of grace? Are we any more disposed to embrace this ‘new Gospel’ (Gal. i. 8) ourselves, or to go and “tell it out among the heathen:”—that “no one can partake of CHRIST’S Blood save through the intercession of Mary;” that “*all* gifts, virtues, graces are dispensed through *her* hands, to *whom she wills, when she wills, and how she wills;*” that “it is impossible for those who neglect the devotion of the blessed Virgin to be saved;” that “she is the most true mediatrix between GOD and man,” the “great Peace-maker;” that [321] “we shall often be heard more quickly if we have recourse to Mary, and call on *her* holy name, than if we called on the Name of Jesus!”¹ Is our catholic revival, we repeat, bringing us any nearer to the admission of these and other kindred ‘developments’ of Primitive Christianity, and so to union with Rome? We earnestly believe that the very reverse is the case; and that, notwithstanding the generous hopes of certain of our youthful enthusiasts, restoration of visible communion between the two Churches is farther off than ever. Surely the more we advance in Apostolic Christianity, the more thoroughly we are penetrated by the stern realities, the awful and soul-subduing mysteries, of the Catholic Faith, the more deep and solemn *must* be our protest against the uncatholic innovations of Rome,—especially that seductively elaborated system of emasculate and sentimental devotion whereof the Blessed Virgin forms the centre; which with its appalling power of fascination is bidding fair, like some deadly canker, to eat out the very heart of Western Christianity, and leave it like the apples of Sodom, fair and beautiful to look at, dust and ashes within.

No; we cannot afford to waste our energies, or delude ourselves and others, by indulging in visionary dreams of reunion with Rome. We have other work to do. We have to strive after the restoration of discipline amongst ourselves.

Here is our great practical need. Here is a subject demanding most prayerful caution, most wise untiring vigilance. GOD has given us our position; our duty is to make the *best of it*. Here we are patiently to abide with HIM; leaving the *future* to His All-wise and merciful Providence; contentedly working on for the *present*. Not restlessly sighing after a visible unity which HE who in infinite wisdom has permitted it to be broken can alone restore; but bravely, trustfully, contentedly working on where He has placed us, endeavouring to make the fullest use of all the appliances of grace which have been left us: not querulously

¹ See “Glories of Mary,” *passim*.

yearning or wilfully grasping after what is not *legitimately* within our reach, nor impatiently trying to *hurry on* the orderly course of that loving Providence which is so tenderly watching over our revival; but reverently and cheerfully, “in quietness and confidence,” using that which we have. “We can bear no *sudden* restoration,”—(would that some of our impetuous revivalists would ponder these words of deep *practical* wisdom of Dr Pusey,)—“but in this and all things we need but patiently to wait for His Hand, who is so graciously and wonderfully restoring us . . . All will be well with our Church *if man outruns not by his impatience the deep orderly movements of the Spirit of God.*”¹

But we must draw to an end.

[322]

And as we have been presuming to touch on the subject of unfulfilled Prophecy, let us venture to conclude with a caution which seems suggested to us by the points which have come under review.

If we ask any number of English churchmen in what quarter lies the danger which most imminently threatens our Church, we shall receive three different answers. One party will assure us that our greatest danger is from the side of *Rome*: that she is deluding us, and flattering us; that we are wilfully shutting our eyes to all her false teaching and uncatholic tenets; and we are about to allow ourselves to be blindly ensnared within her net. Another party will tell us, that *Rationalism* is our greatest object of dread,—Rationalism, preparing the way for open infidelity: they will tell us that *broad church* views are spreading far and wide; that all definiteness of faith is disappearing; that Germanism is on the ascendant; and that hither ought all our energies of resistance to be directed. A third party will assure us that it is on the side of *State encroachment* that our real danger lies: that *Worldliness* is our great adversary, whether in the form of secularism or Erastianism; that Parliamentary influence and tyranny is the one monster bane of our Church.

Now we frankly confess, it appears to us that we are threatened by *real* dangers in *all* these quarters; on the side of Pharisaism, Sadduceism, and Herodianism; and that it is infatuation to ignore or disparage any one of the three.

But the point we wish to notice is, that (if we read the Apocalypse aright) these are precisely the three classes of enemies we are prepared to expect:—the Harlot, or false Church; the Beast, or power of the World; the False Prophet, or intellectualism; earthly, natural, demoniacal *wisdom*.²

But these three Antagonists are the Witnesses assailed. Their faithful testimony arouses the malignant attention of the great Enemy. It disconcerts him. He applies himself to frustrate it; and in each of these directions sets his emissaries at work. And for a time he is terribly successful. “Many of understanding fall to try others by them.” But his seductions at last begin to lose their effect on the well-trying faith of the Woman’s Seed. Many hold fast their integrity. And it is their uncompromising attitude; their bold and simple proclamation of the ‘Faith once delivered;’ their open denunciations of worldliness; their unflinching maintenance of the mysteries of their Holy Religion despite the infidel sneers of the ‘wise and prudent;’ which at last arouses the open and bitter hostility of all the powers of evil. The False Church [323] (whose self-asserting claims seem at last to have been well-nigh

¹ See Dr. Pusey’s admirable Sermon on “The entire absolution of the penitent,” pp. 49, 50.

² It is to be observed, that after the Woman has been herself corrupted by the pernicious influence of the two Beasts, and become a Harlot, she, in her turn, becomes a Tempter, distinct from the other two. Her seductions are the more dangerous as combining *spiritual* elements. She poisons GOD’S people not with worldliness *as such*, or the ‘wisdom of the world’ as such, but with adulterated Christianity.

universally recognized) cannot endure that her authority should be here stoutly repudiated. The World cannot and will not tolerate that Christian men should presume to have a conscience, and dare to place any Law higher than “the Statute Law of the land.” The ‘wise men after the flesh’ are cut to the quick to find their ‘wisdom’ calmly accounted ‘folly,’ and reason set at nought by Faith. Seduction gives place to persecution. “These men must be put down,” is the universal cry. “They are heretics;” “They forbid to give tribute to Cæsar;” “They are arrogant fanatics.” And now ensues the unholy league. Jerusalem again combines with heathen Rome in putting to death the SAVIOUR. Here is the culminating act of the monstrous ‘Confusion:’—The World and the Church linked together in crucifying CHRIST. HIS “open adversary,” and His “own familiar friend who ate of His table” united in a diabolical crusade against Himself, and glutted with the blood of His own members!

But we must not proceed.

Let it but be our care with steady eye and hand to meet our several foes, and not think of opposing one by rushing into the arms of another. The dangers of our position are manifold and complicated. Our every step is fraught with peril; false friends and open foes surrounding us on all sides. Still, ‘greater are they that are with us than they that are against us.’ If we would indeed stand forth as CHRIST’S faithful Witnesses, it must be ours to maintain constant communion with HIM, ever looking into His Blessed Countenance, pondering over His written Word, learning of HIM, taking up our cross and following HIM. So, in His Light shall we see Light, and be endued with a “Wisdom and a Power which none of our adversaries shall be able to gainsay or resist.”

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 20. (Joseph Masters: London, 1858)

[433] **THE VOICE OF THE LAST PROPHET**

The voice of the last Prophet. A Practical Interpretation of the Apocalypse.

By the Rev. EDWARD HUNTINGFORD, D.C.L., late Fellow of New College, Oxford.

London: William Skeffington. 1858

We have here another work on the Apocalypse.

Though unable to endorse the Author's own estimate of his labours as expressed in a somewhat pretentious and unpromising preface, we yet gladly accord the book the merit of originality and ability. It is written in a clear, vigorous, and interesting style; and, though but small in compass, has evidently been the result of much patient thought and conscientious labour. As the Author distinctly disclaims writing for "the student," and only professes to address himself to the "sensible and practical Christian reader," we ought not, perhaps, to complain of rather a loose way of dealing with the Inspired text. His object, however, is not to explain and examine the language of S. John, but rather to furnish a general view of the interpretation of the whole book. He assures us, with honest self-complacence, that his is the only consistent scheme of interpretation of the entire Book of the Revelation that has ever yet been offered; that it has been patiently and independently worked out, and that he doubts not it will commend itself to all candid readers as, in the main, correct.

But we will proceed to take a hasty glance at a few of the points in Dr. Huntingford's scheme of interpretation.

His explanation of the seven Epistles calls for no remark. He treats them but slightly, regarding them merely in their practical bearing as containing warnings and consolations for the Church in all times; and singularly enough, postpones their consideration till nearly the close of his work, (pp. 345—353,) with a view, we suppose, of being enabled thereby to point out more clearly the allusions contained in them to other portions of the Apocalypse.

The chapters, from the 4th to the 19th inclusive, he treats as a whole; regarding them as one continuous dramatic Allegory, consisting of many separate acts and scenes, which he designates, "The Allegory of the Rider on the White Horse."

He supposes it to commence with the opening of the first seal—immediately after S. John's rapture into Heaven. Here we have introduced to us the Divine Hero of the Drama—the Solitary Rider—mounted on a White Horse, a bow in His hand, a victor's wreath on his brow, issuing forth on His eventful career, "conquering and to conquer." The final scene of the Allegory he conceives to be represented in Rev. xix. 11, &c.: "I saw Heaven [434] opened, and behold a White Horse: and He that sat upon him was called Faithful and True. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on His head were many crowns... and His Name was called the Word of God. And the armies which were in Heaven followed Him upon White Horses... and He hath on His vesture and on His thigh a Name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords."

This Allegory contains a series of connected visions, embracing the 7 seals, 7 trumpets, 7 vials, together with other parenthetical visions of an explanatory or supplementary character. Its leading subject is "the warfare and final victory of the Rider on the White Horse; or, in plainer language, the warfare of Christ with Satan, the struggles of Christianity with the world."—p. 35.

The two sequences of Seals and Trumpets are treated by Dr Huntingford in a very interesting and able manner. The former, (pp. 30—73,) he regards, generally, as unfolding the prophetic future of the Church; the idea being that of a book, or sealed scroll, “the seven seals of which are opened successively, and the contents of the volumes thereby disclosed in order to the Apostle.” The Church’s career is here revealed to us; her bright commencement, and sad progressive deterioration; the persecution of the holy souls within her who from time to time witness against her departures from primitive faith and practice; and the terrible events of the “great Day of Wrath.” The Trumpets, (pp. 76—143,) he regards as the successive warning-notes of judgment wherewith God has from time to time startled the Church and the world. They are “judgments which fall upon some for not accepting, and on others for corrupting the pure doctrines of Christ’s Holy Religion.”

His Exposition of the 12th chapter, containing the Vision of the Sun-clothed Woman and her old enemy the Dragon, is carefully and ably worked out. We are quite unwilling, however; to accept his assertion, that “Michael and his Angels” signify “Christ and His Saints.”

In his interpretation of the symbol of the “Beast from the sea,” (c. xiii.) he adopts, what we conceive to be, the only admissible explanation, which regards it as the Personification of the God-opposing Power of the World; its successive heads beings the several evolutions of that Power, or great World-Kingdoms, as they have appeared one after another on the stage of history.

With regard to the Harlot Babylon, our Author seems clearly to recognize the adverse and antithetical relation subsisting between her and the Mystic Jerusalem: on one side the pure woman, on the other the defiled—the Bride and the Harlot, the Holy City and the faithless City, Jerusalem and Babylon. Still, after distinctly pointing out this, it is by no means clear on what grounds he so constantly speaks of Babylon as the actual “*City* [435] of Rome,” “Rome Papal.” He himself has shown, and that very clearly, that Babylon and Jerusalem are equally œcumenical in their signification, and therefore, that the idea of a *literal* city in either case is equally untenable. Hence we are quite at a loss to account for the apparent confusion of thought, that permits him, again and again, notwithstanding all himself has written, to speak of Babylon as the “*City* of Rome.” He may, however, be right thus far: that, Rome claiming to be the centre and Metropolis of Christendom, there may unquestionably be some particular allusion to her, independently of the more general reference to the whole of the secularised Church. We think, however, that this confused explanation of the Woman Babylon seriously injures other parts of our Author’s scheme of interpretation. Thus (e.g.) he invariably speaks of the Euphrates—the river of Babylon—as symbolizing the “popular support” now given to *Rome*, (p. 305.) Why only to Rome?

With regard to the symbol of the Beast from the earth, or False Prophet, Dr Huntingford appears to us to narrow unwarrantably its scope and significance, by confining its reference to the Pope.

To a limited extent, and in a certain secondary sense, we might perhaps admit the correctness of the interpretation. The False prophet is the spiritual ally of the Beast; his devoted attendant, and the secret source of his stability and power. Hence, during the present stage of the world’s history, while the Beast itself is externally Christian, the Pope may be considered as the visible, personal representative of the spiritual Power. In a later stage of the Church’s downward progress, we find her realizing the terrible image of Babylon, “the Mother of Harlots and abominations,” and showing herself the active and overt ally of the now well-nigh un-Christianized and anti-Christian World Power. Like the “salt,” she has “lost her savour;” she has failed in keeping the world from rapid

deterioration and decay; and now, in judicial retribution, she is about to be destroyed by the world, being in her LORD'S stern language, "henceforth good for nothing but to be trodden under foot of men." It is only when this destruction of Babylon has taken place, and the kingdom of Antichrist is rising out of its ruins, that the False Prophet officially succeeds to the place once occupied by the Harlot, and enters actively upon the career of wickedness predicted for him in the Apocalypse.

His history seems to be as follows.

It is well known that amongst the three great classes of Apocalyptic Expositors, Præterists, Presentists, (if such a term is admissible,) and Futurists, three distinct explanations of this symbol are offered.

The first class, among whom we may mention such names as Bossuet, the late Archdeacon Wilberforce, Hengstenberg, with [436]many others, regard him as a personification of ancient Pagan Philosophy, an embodiment of the *Religion* of old Rome.

The second class—among whom we may rank our Author, although he is far in advance of the ordinary type of the class—consider him to represent the corrupt Church, (special reference being had to the Roman Communion,) of the present day.

The third class, the school of Dr Todd, Dr Maitland, &c., regard him as the High Priest, or Priesthood, of the still future Antichrist.

Now it appears plain to ourselves that there is reason in all these interpretations. The fact being, (as we have suggested in these pages before,¹) that as the World Power itself passes through its three predicted stages of Heathen, Christian, and Antichristian, (represented as the Beast from the "Sea;" the Beast "*wounded to death*;" the Beast from the "*Abyss*;" its spiritual ally will necessarily undergo a similar transformation. We have now Satan at work *in* the Church, and *through* the Church, clad as an Angel of Light, seeking to corrupt the Church's Faith, mutilating or developing (as the case may be,) her Sacred Deposit; acting the part of the old false Prophet at Bethel, and teaching that the explicit commands of GOD must give way to the fancied authority of some subsequent revelation. ("I am a Prophet as thou art; and an *Angel* said unto *me*," &c.)

It is evident, however, that the fearful description of this Enemy, the "Beast from the earth," as recorded in the 13th chapter, cannot be fully realized till he appears in his final and Antichristian stage of development.

It is when the deadly wound of the first Beast is being healed; when the Monster, once seemingly dispossessed and humanized, is regaining his proper *bestial* nature: when the Beast, designated now by the enigmatical title, "*an eighth*," to symbolize its terrible Resurrection and Re-possession, is rising from the Abyss, reinforced with new powers from Hell, and tenanted by seven other spirits more wicked than that which of old held it in thrall; it is then that the False Prophet, in his true character, appears upon the arena. What will be his particular form, or mode of manifestation, its seems presumptuous to imagine. We may merely assume thus far: that in him we see an embodiment of the various supernatural agencies; an ideal, (possibly a *real*,) head of that vast array of "false Prophets showing great signs and wonders," coming in with "all deceivableness of unrighteousness," by means of which the future World-King will be enabled to maintain, during the foreordained period, his absolute and undisputed sway over the bodies and souls

¹ See *Ecclesiastic*. June, 1857. P. 283. φ 'Auberlen on Daniel and the Apocalypse', at p. 259 *supra*.

of men, as the one manifested object of civil and religious adoration on the part of “all the world whose names are not written in the Book of Life.”

[437]

In connection with this symbol, we must express our inability to accept Dr Huntingford’s solution of another, closely related to it—the very mysterious symbol of the “Image of the Beas.” He identifies it with “the Revived Western Roman Empire; the Holy Roman Empire which commenced in the person of Charlemagne.”

As our Author is by no means singular in his interpretation, and maintains his point (as is generally the case with him throughout the Book,) with considerable ability, it is worth while adding a few words on the subject.

And here, it seems at once plain that if, as himself appears to acknowledge, the “Beast” of the Revelation represents the World Power in its abstract universality, we cannot confine the corresponding symbol, “the *Image* of the Beast,” merely to a *partial* revivification of *one* of the Monster’s heads.

That Rome was the 6th head of the Beast we agree with our Author. That it was, therefore, the reigning head in S. John’s time, and the visible representative to him of the World Power, and, as such, is alluded to in some special manner, we likewise fully admit. Nor can we doubt the abstract propriety of the application of such an expression as the “*Image* of Old Rome,” or “Image of the Beast,” to the revived Empire of the Middle Ages.

Still further, we cannot question that other seeming requirements of the Prophecy are in a measure met by this interpretation. The Image of the Beast is represented as owing its being, vitality, and continuance to the Spiritual Power which supports it; even as (Dr Huntingford reminds us,) it was the Pope to whom this New Roman Empire owed its life and consolidation. He recalls to us the august ceremonial of the Coronation of the first representative of this new dynasty of Cæsars; the symbol of royalty placed on his head by Leo himself; the air meanwhile resounding with the joyous acclamations, “Long life and victory to Charles, the most pious *Augustus, crowned of God, the great pacific Emperor of the Romans.*” And here, he insists, we see a visible fulfilment of the predictions that the “False Prophet” should “give life to the Image of the Beast.”

Now that all this *may* come within the comprehensive scope of the Prophecy, as one of its partial precursive fulfilments, as a faint shadow of a more terrible fulfilment in future times, we are far from disputing. But that it exhausts the meaning of the prediction, or constitutes in any sense its *primary* reference, we must emphatically deny; and for this additional reason, above all others: the Beast in the Apocalypse is the *God-opposing* Power of the World, the *avowed* Antagonist to CHRIST: hence it is obviously necessary that the Beast’s Image, or personal representative, should possess a like character. Now in Heathen Rome the [438] Beast exhibited itself in its true character as GOD’S open enemy. But when the Empire became Christian, and the World began to side with the Church, and persecution ceased, the Beast lost for a time its proper nature, or, in S. John’s language, became “wounded to death;” so that for a long term of years the Beast, *as Beast*, is scarcely discernible. Hence we can never admit that any evolution of the World Power, during this its prostrate and unnatural condition, can really fulfil the awful requirements of the symbol in question.

No, it seems evident that, as yet, this Image has not appeared. The Beast has had many *heads*: he has undergone, that is, many successive modifications and developments; and his last, ten-crowned, Antichristian Head is yet to appear. But his one perfect *Image* has never yet been manifested; by which we understand, some individual embodiment and personification of all his concentrated energy and impiety. Such an one is yet to rise. A

Personal Image of the invisible Prince of the world is to be revealed, as the antagonist of the “Image of the invisible GOD.” But an individual Prince of the world has never yet been seen. The world has never yet beheld any *absolute* universal monarchy. For there has been no one principle of coherence as yet developed and universally diffused, sufficiently active and constraining to draw and absorb into itself all the conflicting interests of mankind, and weld together in one consolidated mass all the separate fragments of the vast mundane empire. No phase of heathenism has been sufficiently energetic or self-consistent to effect such a concentration. The only Power that *is* capable of knitting together in one unbroken and *permanent* communion, under one Head, the universal family of man—yea, “all things in Heaven and earth,” has never yet been brought fully to bear upon mankind. The Organ through which it was to be diffused throughout the world has itself failed in performing its sacred functions. An Election, it is true, is being continually called *out* of the world, and being incorporated into that Kingdom which is yet to “fill the whole earth,” (Dan. ii. 35;) but the world, *as such*, has never been penetrated by Christianity; and hence, the kingdoms of this world have not yet become the everlasting Kingdom of our LORD CHRIST. The diluted, nominal, partially diffused Christianity of the middle ages was utterly powerless to gather into one, through its attractive and assimilative influence, all the kingdoms of the earth. Worldly Christianity, like “the double-minded man,” is “unstable in all its ways;” it is inconsistent, and therefore weak. For a short time, however, *one* Principle shall be let loose which shall be found possessed of the requisite energy and consistency to effect for a *brief* period the union now contemplated—active, diabolic, all-pervading *Antichristianity*. Silently and stealthily this Principle is even now diffusing itself, despite the feeble counteracting influences [439] brought to bear against it by the Church. The “Mystery of Iniquity” is actively at work; at present mainly under the very cloke of Christianity itself. By little and little it will gain strength; increasing in potency as the world’s twilight grows on apace, and the spirits of darkness begin to issue from their lurking-places, the “predicadores Antichristi,” the “ministers and stewards of his mysteries,” sent “to prepare the way before” the Man of Sin.

And they will “go on and prosper.” Like the devastating swarms of scorpion-locusts issuing out of the Bottomless Pit,¹ by reason of whom “the sun and the air are darkened,” they will spread their pestilential tenets far and wide, inflicting their deadly sting on all “who have not the seal of the living GOD” firmly impressed “upon their foreheads.” False Babylon, who has ever tried to rule the world by conforming to the world, will be compelled to advance with the movement; prostituting herself to the restless World Power ever more and more unblushingly.

Times of fearful revolution will ensue; the very earth heaving to and fro through the power of this mighty Influence, whereby it is being gradually impregnated; the ten Antichristian Kings² striving with each other for mastery; “nation rising against nation, and kingdom

¹ See the Fifth Trumpet, (c. ix. 1—12,) which seems to point to these “seducing spirits,” and to the “evil men and seducers,” who shall be their instruments. φ Dykes’s grandfather used the ‘bottomless pit’ as a metaphor for the Oxford Movement, ‘which threatens to shed darkness over the whole land’. (King, J. *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dykes LL.B* (Seeleys; London, 1849) pp. 207—208) We may confidently assume that the grandson would have deprecated the use of any metaphor which equated Keble, Newman, Pusey *et al* with the ‘*predicadores Antichristi*’.

² In other words, the ten crowned Horns of the *seventh* Head of the Beast; which Head just springs to maturity, shoots forth its horns, enjoys a short-lived divided existence, and is absorbed, together with its Six pre-decessors, into the One universal Empire of Antichrist. Dr. Huntingford uniformly identifies these Ten Kings with the Christian Kingdoms of Modern Europe—the dismembered fragments of the Roman Empire. To a certain extent this is correct. Still, we must not forget what the Angel says, “they have received *no* kingdom *as yet*; but shall receive it at the same time as the Beast.” In other words: so

against kingdom;” till, at last, one all-controlling interest succeeds in uniting the Rulers of earth in impious combination—namely, bitter, *active* hostility against GOD and Christianity.

The Sixth Trumpet blast is blown. All providential restraints, are judicially removed. The “four Angels bound at Euphrates” are loosed. Babylon is seized upon by the infuriated Kings. The Harlot’s flesh is torn to pieces, and her mutilated remains burnt with fire. False Christendom becomes “the habitation of demons, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.” The Restrainer is removed; the Evil Spirit thoroughly disenthralled; and now, out of the surging, heaving mass, the Despotism of Antichrist emerges. The Name of GOD [440] and CHRIST is repudiated; and on this awful basis, of *negation of GOD*, (cf. Ps. liii.,) is the World Kingdom established. The world will make its own GOD, “Quem creant adorant.” The Idol of the people—the Coming Man, whom the world is even now instinctively sighing after—is set up as GOD and King; “sitting in the Temple of GOD, showing himself that he is GOD.”

The express Image and Representative of Worldliness in its innermost essence, this is enthroned in the person of Antichrist. And to it “all peoples and nations and languages” fall down and offer worship. And thus it is that the False Prophet “gives life to the Image of the Beast.” By his teaching, he has “prepared the way before him.” The universal diffusion of Antichristian Principles has trained men to accept a Personal Antichrist. The world sets him up as its own Image; and worships the work of its own hands. It worships *itself* in him. Or rather, (for we must go a step deeper,) it worships *Satan* the invisible Prince of the World; who himself reminds us that the grant of “all the Kingdoms of the World and their glory,” is annexed to one condition—worship of *him*.¹ This, then, is the secret principle which is to bind men together! Here we see what worldliness is in its essence!

It will be borne in mind that, till CHRIST had appeared, Anti-christianity could not exist. It involves a deeper fall, and more terrible sin, than could have been committed, had not the Redeemer died, and the HOLY SPIRIT been given. It is essentially, “blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST.” Hence the Antichrist himself, of whatever nation sprung, (whether Jew, as maintained by many, or European,) *must* have been once a believer in CHRIST, and *baptized in the Name of the HOLY TRINITY*.

We have parted with our Author, and must return to him for a moment to remark that, although throughout his book he explains the Image of the Beast as the Empire of the Middle Ages, still, in two passages, he rises above that narrow interpretation. Thus he writes:

“This Image, to which the Pope gave life, came to an end after having lasted a thousand years. But the same claim to universal dominion was set up by Napoleon. And it is in this claim to universal dominion that the likeness to old Rome consists. Any Prince in Christendom who strives to gain *universal dominion*, identifies himself thereby with . . . the Image of the beast.”—P. 266.

long as they remain *Christian*, their proper *bestial* kingdom does not come. It is only when the World Power as a whole is arousing from its state of torpor and death, and is becoming Antichristian, that the *proper reign* of these Kings (who, *together*, seem to constitute the *seventh* Head of the Beast,) commences. Thus they are contemporary with Antichrist, and jointly constitute the Antichristian Kingdom in its first, or divided stage. They subsequently, (after the destruction of Babylon,) lose their independent sovereignty, and are merged into the despotism of the Personal Antichrist.

¹ “All power will I give Thee, and the glory of them: for that is delivered unto me; and *to whomsoever I will give it. If Thou therefore will worship me, all shall be Thine.*” S. Luke iv. 6,7.

And again, in a sentence which we accept more cordially:

“S. Paul’s Man of Sin cannot be the Pope. He is rather the Beast to whom is given a mouth speaking great things; the great Head of [441] the world Power; the last great *Image* of ancient Rome who shall fight against the LAMB.”—p. 293.¹

We consider Dr Huntingford’s explanation of the Seven Vials, the least satisfactory portion of his work. He regards them all, except the two last, as having been already poured out upon Christendom.

Is it not rather plain that they are all still future; that they represent the successive judgments, poured out in answer to the prayers of the “two Witnesses,” upon the Kingdom of Antichrist?

We think that a comparison of c. xvi. (containing the description of the Vials,) with c. xi. 3—10, and also with Ps. 79, will go far to prove this; although the real clue to the progressive order of events in this as in other parts of the Apocalypse is, beyond measure, difficult to discover. It is only by constantly recurring to the same points, comparing the parallel parts of the successive visions again and again, taking advantage of all discovered failures and mistakes on the part of ourselves or others, not being ashamed to part with some favourite interpretation, and being content to [442] [412] remain in humble, teachable ignorance of a great deal, that we can make any progress in this most difficult and mysterious Book.

Dr Huntingford follows Professor Hengstenberg in his interpretation of chap. xx.; regarding the thousand years of Satan’s incarceration as the thousand years of the Church’s

¹ It should not be forgotten that, as it would be impossible for any Prince of Christendom to obtain universal Supremacy without the aid of the Church, it *must* be through her outward instrumentality (as Holy Scripture seems to intimate,) that the future World King will succeed, in the first instance, in winning his way to Power and Dominion. Hence he will doubtless appear, for a time, the great Champion of the Church, the most devoted of her sons; craftily enlisting, in turn, in his own behalf, her energetic sympathy and zealous support; blinding her, the while, by his obsequious flatteries, and seducing her to her ruin.

Let the Church beware of any second Charlemagne—of the “*Monarcha fortis*,” from whose chivalrous patronage the *Union* anticipates such glorious results.

The Church’s day of triumph has yet to come: but it will not be brought about (as Satan will tempt her to believe,) by human means, or through the might of any *earthly* Potentate. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that, before her Morning dawns, “the *Night* cometh.” She has to pass through her Gethsemane and Calvary before she can celebrate her Easter. Further: so long as the “Mystery of Iniquity” is secretly at work *within* her, as well as in the world without, so long must her predicted season of glory be delayed. It is not till this hidden wickedness has come to a head, and the Harlot and Beast, (the embodiments of this lawless Principle in the Church and the world respectively,) have reached their maturity, and been terribly judged; not till the faithful Church has been baptized in a baptism of blood, and the piteous and agonizing cry has pierced the Eternal Throne, “There is not one godly man left:” “My GOD, my GOD, why hast Thou forsaken me!” that the “Almighty WORD leaps down from Heaven,” the Millennial binding of Satan takes place, and the Church’s day of exulting triumph commences.

Once more. Before the final catastrophe, a great religious revival is, doubtless, plainly predicted; which even now, appears in process of being realized. But a specious counterfeit revival seems also predicted, as existing side by side with the former, producing infinite perplexity and mischief; Satan, in the sacred garb of an “Angel of Light,” secretly directing the latter. The course of the one is indicated in the words, “Thou hast a little strength, and has *kept My Word*,” of the other, in “Thou sayest, I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing.” The Enemy will assuredly be sleeplessly at work to misdirect the awakened energies of the Church, or to mar her work of steady revival by stimulating it into unhealthy and feverish vitality. May our own Branch of the Church be awake to his manifold and multiform devices!

quiet establishment during the Middle Ages, extending from the times of Charlemagne till the French Revolution. Now, while fully admitting that this period of general tranquillity for the Church may be considered as *one*, very partial, fulfilment of the Prophecy, and as a dim shadow of the glorious fulfilment yet in future; still to regard this, as our Author does, as the full and adequate realization of the prediction, we confess ourselves wholly unable.

What can be clearer than that the thousand years of triumph *succeed* the 3½ years of distress; and that, of the glorious band of Martyrs and Confessors that share in the Kingdom, *they* have the highest place who have withstood Antichrist himself, and have passed through all the horrors of "*the* great tribulation." According to Dr Huntingford's theory the 1000 years either precede, or form a *part* of the 3½ years. This surely cannot be.

Our Author's great objection to placing the 1000 years, (where S. John places them,) *after* the coming of CHRIST to destroy Antichrist, is, that he cannot understand there being any "Resurrection of the just," or [Greek], prior to the general "resurrection of the dead." He seems to think that all the dread events attendant upon the Resurrection and Last Judgment must be crowded up into one literal *day*. But no, Holy Scripture seems rather to indicate that this great series of transactions will be no more simultaneous than were the first and second Advents, which, seen through the Prophetic perspective, undoubtedly seemed to comprehend but one event.

S. Paul distinctly warns us: "Every man in his own order" CHRIST the First-fruits: *afterwards* ([Greek]) they that are CHRIST'S at his [Greek]: *afterwards* ([Greek]) cometh the *end*, when He shall deliver up the kingdom," &c. We cannot throw away our cheering belief that the petition we are taught to offer day by day shall yet be fully and gloriously realized, and that "GOD'S will shall yet be done on *earth* as it is done in Heaven." "Thou hast made us kings and priests, and we shall reign on the *earth*."

We have ventured to differ in several respects from our Author. We do not the less entertain a high estimate of the general ability and value of his work.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 20. (Joseph Masters: London, 1858)

[385]THE MIRACLES OF ANTICHRIST

THE writer of the following article is desirous of not looking upon the subject simply in the light of a speculative inquiry. If the times of the last great Antichrist are to be distinguished by the performance of Satanic miracles, both unprecedented as well as stupendous in themselves, it is in the very highest degree important that the Church should accustom herself to the anticipation. She will then be able through GOD'S mercy, when the awful time does come, so to maintain her ground as not to be shaken from her confidence by any display of signs, or wonders, or prodigies, which may be used to tempt her to forsake her allegiance as the Bride of CHRIST.

Two propositions, with respect to miracles and miraculous signs, may be safely laid down. The first is, that there never has been an age since time began when they have altogether ceased. The second, that speaking both of a *Divine* interference with the ordinary laws of what is called Nature, as well as of extraordinary permitted manifestations of diabolical power, distinct from that liberty to tempt which is of ordinary course, it is quite evident that each of those, that is to say, both Divine and Satanic agencies have been far more active at some periods of the world's history than at others.

It will be unnecessary here to point out the Scripture evidence which there is, for a very great variation as to the manifestation of Divine miracles and prophecies during the Old Testament dispensation. But we shall proceed to take notice of two or three periods, in which there seems to have been an extraordinary development of Satanic activity; and which, in so far as they were characterised by a display of miraculous powers, are typical of the rising of Antichrist, and of the end of the world.

But before entering into this branch of our subject, it may be well to quote a passage from S. Gregory of Rome, which brings vividly before us what we may well call the peculiar horror and fearfulness of the latter days, that at the very time when Satanic miracles shall abound beyond all former precedent, true miraculous power shall be all but entirely withdrawn from the Church.

S. Gregory takes occasion from the words, "Want goeth before his face,"¹ (which is the Vulg. translation of Job xli. 20, in the description of leviathan), to speak as follows:—

"With regard to our knowing that want goes before his face, there is another point for us to expound in a more melancholy manner. For by the [386] awful curse of the secret dispensation, before this Leviathan (Satan himself) appears in that accursed man whom he assumes, signs of power are withdrawn from Holy Church. For prophecy is hidden, the grace of healings is taken away, the power of longer abstinence is weakened, the words of doctrine are silent, the prodigies of miracles are removed. And though the heavenly Dispensation does not entirely withdraw them, yet it does not manifest them openly, and in manifold ways as in former times. And this is so caused by a wonderful Dispensation, in order that the Divine mercy and justice may be fulfilled together, by one and the same means. When, therefore, the humility of the faithful is deprived of the manifold manifestation of wonders, by the terrible judgment of the secret Dispensation, there is heaped up more abundant mercy for the good, and just anger for the evil by the same means. Because these signs of power cease in great measure, in Holy Church, before this Leviathan manifestly and visibly comes, it is now rightly said, 'Want shall go before his face.' For the riches of miracles are first withdrawn from the faithful, and

¹ Faciem ejus præcedit egestas. Vulg. [Greek]. LXX. "Sorrow is turned into joy before him." E.V.

then that ancient enemy displays himself against them with visible prodigies, in order that as he boasts himself on his wonders, he may be overthrown more mightily and more honourably by the faithful without wonders. For though signs will not be wanting to the faithful in their contest with him, yet his will be so great, that those of our people will seem to be rather few or none at all. But their virtue doubtless becomes mightier than all signs, when it crushes with the heel of inward resolution all his terrible deeds which it beholds. But the malignant enemy displays himself against them with so much the fiercer cruelty, the more he grieves that he is despised, even with the brightness of his miracles. He, therefore, gathers himself together for their destruction, and unites all the reprobate with unanimous cruelty for the death of the faithful; in order that he may put forth his cruelty with so much greater power, in proportion as all the members of his body agree with him in the things he seeks perversely to effect.”—S. Greg. Magn. Moral. III, 623, 624. Oxf. Trans.

Few, probably, but persons of ultra-montane opinions, or such as write for a party purpose, would be inclined to deny that extreme paucity of authentic miracles and prophecies in the Catholic Church, at the present day, agrees exceedingly well with what S. Gregory says in that respect with regard to the character of the times which shall immediately precede the coming of Antichrist. And recollecting what S. Gregory says in other places of the miracles of Antichrist, combined with his dreadful persecution of all the faithful, we may well take up our parable with Balaam, and say, “Alas, who shall live when GOD doeth this?”

Thus we read, “Antichrist at that time rouses himself with such power as to confound, if possible, even the elect members of [387] the LORD. He makes use of such signs and prodigies, as to seem to glitter with the power of miracles, as if with a kind of light of fire. For in rousing himself to persecute the just, he shows forth before the eyes of the reprobate with mighty signs.” And again, “The prudent of this world, who adhere to the perverse counsels of the malice of Antichrist, are, as it were, the eyelids of the morning, because they declare that the faith of CHRIST which they meet with is, as it were, the night of error, and profess that veneration for Antichrist is the true morning. For they promise to banish the darkness, and to announce the light of truth by brilliant miracles; because they cannot persuade what they wish, unless they profess to offer better things.”¹

To proceed with the investigation of the history of Satanic miracles, in order to deduce what conclusions we may respecting such as are yet future, it is indeed peculiarly marvellous, yet none the less strictly true, that there has been a constant effort on the part of the great enemy of GOD and man to imitate the miracles of Divine Grace. And when signs have been spoken of aforesaid by the Prophets, as about to take place when the SON of GOD should become Incarnate, Satan has endeavoured to anticipate them. Thus he has striven to retain the nations of the world still under his sway and dominion. So S. Justin Martyr writes, that the demons knowing the old Hebrew prophecies, imitated them in many of the actions of the heathen gods, as far as they could understand them, but that they were at the same time often mistaken in their import. This they did, he says, in order that the actions of the Blessed JESUS, when, when He did truly fulfil prophecy, might be discredited and disbelieved. Among other instances S. Justin mentions the prophecy in Gen. xlix. 11, “Binding His foal unto the vine, and His ass’s colt unto the choice vine; He washed His garment in wine and His clothes in the blood of grapes.” “The demons,” he says, “knowing of this prophecy, asserted that Bacchus was born the Son of Jove. They

¹ Moral. III. 609, &c. &c.

ascribed to him the invention of the vine; and in the celebration of his mysteries led an ass in procession, and taught that Bacchus was torn in pieces, and taken up into Heaven.”¹ Again, from Ps. xix. 5, “Who rejoiceth as a Giant to run His course,” the “demons invented the fables of mythology about Hercules, as they did those about Æsculapius, from the prophecies in Isaiah concerning CHRIST HEALING THE SICK.”

It is the opinion of many, who are eminently well qualified to form an opinion upon the subject, that the entire history of Buddhism has been signalized by a constant succession of diabolical miracles and prodigies; frequently exerted even now, but especially active at the period of its rise as a form of religion, and at [388] its introduction into countries foreign to its birth, as China and Japan.² Again, persons who are conversant with missionary reports, both Catholic and Protestant, are well aware that the evidence of facts, and of their own senses, frequently forces from educated Europeans the conviction and acknowledgment, that diabolical agencies are in operation in a marvellous way in heathen lands; and that the power of Satan appears to be unchained to do visible and tangible acts so to say, operating not inwardly only upon the soul, but outwardly upon the body. To mention one instance: the contortions of what are called the devil-dancers in Ceylon, and on the Coromandel coast, are such as are considered incapable of being performed by human beings, except upon the supposition of some bodily Satanic possession. At the same time we have evidence from quarters the least liable to suspicion, that all direct and immediate power of the devil on the heathen ceases at once upon their becoming Christians. Ellis, a missionary of the London Missionary Society, and therefore either a Presbyterian or a Congregationalist, has a remarkable chapter on this subject in his *Polynesian Researches*.³

He describes the system of Tabooing; and shows how it was connected with the idolatry of the South Sea Islanders. And he affords abundant evidence to show that the system was maintained, and its violation vindicated by supernatural means. But he adds, that neither upon the Missionaries themselves, nor upon their converts as soon as they were baptized, were the devils ever able to produce any effect; and that the Priest of Oro, their chief god, from the first, confessed this to be the case. But it would be exceedingly easy to accumulate facts which would fill volumes upon this subject. And we must proceed with our inquiry.

It will be advantageous to examine the records of some of those periods, when the diabolical agencies of which we are speaking, would seem to have been most actively in operation. The age immediately preceding the Flood was clearly such a period. The time before the Flood, and the Deluge itself, were with all their dreadful accompaniments highly typical of the close of the present Dispensation, and the end of all things. “As it was in the days of Noe, so shall it be also in the days of the Son of Man. As the days of Noe were, so shall also the Coming ([Greek]) of the Son of Man be.”

S. Justin Martyr has a very remarkable passage, showing the activity of Satan and his legions during the Age before the Flood.

“[Greek]”⁴
[389]

¹ Apol, § 70—73

² See Huc’s *Travels in Tartary*, and F. Schlegel’s *Philosophy of History*.

³ φ Ellis, William *Polynesian Researches During a Residence of Nearly Six Years in the South Sea Islands* (Fisher and Jackson: London, 1829)

⁴ Apol. §. 5. See also Tertull. Apol. cap. xxii.

It is chiefly with the latter portion of this passage that we are concerned at present—[Greek]. And it is especially noteworthy that S. Justin, in speaking of the acts of the demons, uses the very word ([Greek]) which our LORD employs to describe the prodigies which happened before the Fall of Jerusalem. And we know that this event again is so lively a type of the end of the world, and our LORD'S prophecies relative to both are so intermingled and interwoven, that it is impossible entirely to disentangle them, and determine exactly what belongs to each. We may safely conclude then, that both before the Flood, and before the destruction of Jerusalem, there were fearful sights and great signs ([Greek]) *from Heaven*, sent by the Divine power to warn all such as were willing to take heed, and escape the impending Judgment: and that the demons, and the giants in the one case, and the Antichrists and false prophets, who our LORD told His disciples should arise, in the other, exhibited countersigns, so to say, to neutralize and destroy with their hellish power and wisdom the effect of GOD'S warnings. So, too, will it doubtless be before the Last Judgment. Then, as ever, Satan will presume to imitate the signs and miracles of Divine origin. He will do it by means of Antichrist, into whom he will enter; and will show such *signs* and wonders as to deceive if it were possible the very elect.

Comparing our LORD'S words in which He brings the days before the Flood, before the destruction of Jerusalem, and before the end of the world, all into close juxtaposition, so to say, with what S. Justin says, it seems impossible to doubt that these [Greek] will constitute a parallel between the period of the first general Deluge of waters, and the last universal Flood of fire.

We will proceed to consider what will in all probability constitute another parallel between the times of Antichrist, and the period of the Deluge; and on which S. Justin's words throw much light. The parallel is to be found in the worship, or system, of false religion which prevailed before the Flood. Frederick Schlegel was of opinion that this did not consist in idolatry, properly so called. It was not a brutish bowing down to stocks and stones. But it consisted in the practice of a dark and diabolical magic, an unhallowed diving into the secrets of nature, for the purpose of obtaining a mastery over the elements.

We will quote a note of the Translator of Schlegel's *Philosophy of History* which enlarges upon this subject.

“We must not suppose that the impiety of the Cainites was of a dogmatic kind. How could those primitive men, living so near the Fountain-head of Revelation, conversing with those who had witnessed the rise and first development of man's marvellous history, and engaged themselves in a close communication with the infernal powers: how could they fall into atheism, or any other species of speculative unbelief? Their impiety was of a more practical nature, displaying itself in a daring violation of the precepts of Heaven, and in the practice of a dark, mysterious magic. By the allurements of sense, and the fascination of their false science, they by degrees inveigled the great mass of mankind into their errors. Their vast powers, supported and strengthened by infernal agency, were calculated to introduce disorder and confusion in the economy of the moral and physical universe, and to let loose on this probationary world the science of the abyss. What do I say? The barrier between the visible and invisible world would have been broken down. Hell would have ruled the earth, had not the Almighty, by an awful judgment, buried the guilty race of men and their infernal knowledge in the waters of the Deluge.”

It cannot be fancy or mere imagination which is able to trace a very awful parallel between this description, and what is now going on in what is called the civilized world. It may not be generally known, but it is the case, that there is an entire literature devoted to what are

really most unhallowed and abominable mysteries. There are Publications, and Periodicals, both in England and America, which are circulated by tens of thousands, which profess to give accounts of communications with the invisible world by means of spirit-rapping, as well as by answers received from spirits who appear in certain crystals. The former species of impiety has assumed in America the shape of an actual form of worship. It is probable that every form of incantation and magical rite which was ever practised in the world is being revived at the present day, in professedly Christian lands. And what is very observable is, that the dregs of Protestantism, the followers of those fanatical Creeds which have abundant progeny of the last three hundred years, such as Swedenborgianism, are the first to be allured by any promise of communicating unlawfully with the world of spirits, and to be seduced by such frightful superstitions. It is sufficient in this place to be content with this allusion to the subject; but if it were needful, it would be very easy to bring forward most voluminous proof, and multitudinous examples, in support of what is here alleged.

Thus much for the commencement of that intercourse, or at least attempted and desired intercourse with unhallowed spirits, and the infernal powers, the revival of which is so stinking a sign of the times, and which will be yet more and more eagerly pursued until Antichrist himself appear. To proceed to another parallel between our own and antediluvian times—the diving into the secrets of nature, and obtaining a mastery over the elements.

We are far from desiring to cast any reproach upon the unprecedented triumph of modern science. At the same time we think it quite possible to discern even now, in some quarters, a growing dissatisfaction with the slow processes of inductive natural philosophy, and a desire to accelerate them by any methods, legitimate [391] or otherwise. Again, is it not a kind of impiety, which, though not indigenous to our own age, is making ever more and more rapid and gigantic strides, we mean the presumption, with which whole schools of natural science assume to sit in judgment upon the facts of Divine Revelation? And is it not a truth, that in the memory of even comparatively young persons the dictum has gradually developed itself, that Holy Scripture must not be considered infallible in matters of fact, especially with regard to the facts of science? And so widely does this opinion prevail that Christians seem scarcely to feel it their duty to controvert what now incessantly assails their ears on every side. If Scripture be at variance, it is said, with the conclusions of modern science—the ephemeral creation, be it remembered, of yesterday—then Scripture must be in error in those points. Or else Christians may be allowed sometimes to interpret Holy Scripture in some forced unnatural way, so as to appear to harmonize with geology, or chemistry, or astronomy, as the case may be. This is a concession made by the more liberal-minded philosophers. Thus for the present, a worldly science, instead of sitting humbly and teachably listening to the holy oracles of GOD, prefers to patronise, so to say, the precious Revelation of the Ever-Blessed Maker and Governor and Preserver of all things, both in Heaven and Earth. This is the present attitude of science in the hands of unbelieving men; but in the day of Antichrist's power, that knowledge which is not from above, but is "earthly, sensual, devilish," will seek to set her heel upon every Scriptural truth and doctrine, and to crush them altogether with the concentrated might of hell.

But the greatest parallel, perhaps, which is to be found between the miracles and wonderful works of GOD and His CHRIST on the one side, and Satan and Antichrist on the other, is in the history of the Egyptian Magicians and their enchantments. Jannes and Jambres, their two chiefs, withstood Moses by the exercise of a magical miraculous power. We are told expressly that their so doing was the means of hardening Pharaoh's heart. Thus the light

and conviction, which might otherwise have dawned upon him by the exhibition of the true miracles which were wrought by Moses' rod, were stifled in their birth.

“And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and they did so as the LORD had said: and Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and before his servants; and it became a serpent. Then Pharaoh called the wise men and the sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents; but Aaron's rod swallowed up their rods. And He hardened Pharaoh's heart, that he hearkened not unto them; as the LORD had said.”
Exod. vii. 10—13.

There is an important difference in the Vulg. Translation of the last verse.

[392]

It is, “Induratumque est cor Pharaonis, et no audivit eos.” “And Pharaoh's heart was hardened;” showing more directly that this hardness of heart was the effect of the magicians' enchantments.

Again, with respect to the turning the waters of the Nile into blood: “And Moses and Aaron did so as the LORD commanded: and he lifted up the rod, and smote the waters that were in the river in the sight of Pharaoh, and in the sight of his servants: and all the waters that were in the river were turned into blood. And the fish that was in the river died; and the river stank, and the Egyptians could not drink of the water of the river. And there was blood throughout all the Land of Egypt. And the magicians of Egypt did so with their enchantments: and Pharaoh's heart was hardened; neither did he hearken unto them, as the LORD had said.” The LXX translation for “Pharaoh's heart was hardened,” in the 13th verse, is peculiar, “[Greek”.] “And Pharaoh's heart grew strong and stout.” As though he had wavered and been softened at the sight of Moses' miracles, but that as soon as he saw that the magicians, his own magicians, did so with their enchantments, he became reassured. He looked upon the whole scene as a contest between opposing magical powers. And his heart received infernal strength to oppose GOD'S will to the uttermost of his power.

Again, in the plague of frogs. “And Aaron stretched out his hand over the waters of Egypt; and the frogs came up and covered the land of Egypt. And the magicians did so with their enchantments, and brought up frogs upon the land of Egypt.”¹

The Apocalypse, in prophecies which concern both the miracles of the Beast, and the False Prophet, Antichrist and his Instigator, and the judgments with which GOD afflicted them, has an evident reference to the plagues of Egypt, and the enchantments of the Magicians. The first of the angels who had received the seven vials of GOD'S wrath, “poured his vial upon the earth: and there fell a noisome and grievous sore upon the men which had the mark of the Beast, and upon them which worshipped his image.”² The expressions, “having the mark of the Beast,” and “worshipping his image,” show that the prediction is to be understood of Antichrist and his Times. If this be so, Dr Wordsworth can scarcely be correct in supposing that the periods of the sounding of the Trumpets, and the pouring forth of the vials are contemporary. But he has a very useful observation to the effect, that the plague of the noisome sore is equivalent to the boils and blains which broke out throughout the land of Egypt. And that the reason why this plague was the sixth in the literal Egypt, and the first in the spiritual, appears to be that this plague infested Jannes and [393]

¹ Exod. viii. 6, 7.

² Rev. xvi. 2.

Jambres the magicians, and that it is thereby intimated that the judgment in the Apocalypse will be directed principally against the most eminent false teachers and dealers in lying wonders in the spiritual Egypt.

“The third angel poured out his vial upon the rivers and fountains of waters, and they became blood.”

The waters of the Nile were turned into blood, as a chastisement for the slaying of the Babes of the Israelites by Pharaoh’s commandment to cast them into the River—a worthy retribution of the sin, as an ancient Father has observed, by the means by which it was accomplished. In like manner the angel of the waters cries in the Apocalypse, “Thou art righteous, O LORD, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because Thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets; and Thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy.”

The conclusion then at which we arrive from these passages in Exodus and Revelation, bearing upon the Advent and sway of Antichrist is this, that it will probably be a period of the most awful and terrible convulsions in the natural and physical world, and the distress and perplexity not be confined to the sphere of religion and morals only. Our LORD expresses how fearful these dreadful events will be, by saying, that “except the days were shortened, no flesh should be saved; but that for the elect’s sake the days shall be shortened.” And of what will happen in these last times the history of Israel’s bondage in Egypt will prove a most exact foreshadowing and representation.

As Pharaoh persecuted Israel, so will Antichrist as supreme Ruler of the whole earth persecute all who will not receive the mark of the beast. GOD in taking vengeance for His servants’ blood which shall be shed will plague Antichrist, his false prophet and preachers, and all who adhere to his Empire with great plagues—just as upon Pharaoh and all the Egyptians were shown signs and wonders and plagues, great and sore. Then, when the hearts of the mass of mankind begin to relent, and to perceive that they are fighting against GOD, Antichrist will show by means especially of his false prophets such infernal wonders and miracles, that those of the Egyptian magicians will be but very faint types in comparison.

Thus will the hearts of all but the elect be reassured and strengthened, to confide in the power and wisdom of “that son of perdition;” and thus, though they will not at times be able to refrain from acknowledging the Finger of GOD, Antichrist will lure them on, until the LORD JESUS shall Himself be revealed, and shall consume both him and them “with the Spirit of His Mouth, and destroy them with the brightness of His Coming.”

The next branch of our subject which remains for our consideration is to ascertain from Holy Scripture and Primitive Tradition, as far as we may, what will be the miracles and wonders which Antichrist *will actually perform*.

We shall examine the question,

1. Negatively. What miracles Antichrist will not be suffered to perform.
2. Positively. What he will perform.

[507]

WE concluded our last article upon this subject by dividing the consideration into two branches.

1. Negatively; or what kind of miracles Antichrist, as we believe, will not be suffered to perform.
2. Positively; or what miracles he will perform.

First then, negatively. There seems to be not a little ground for supposing that whatever miracles Satanic power may be suffered to exhibit in the end of time, however dazzlingly and overwhelmingly Antichrist may display the whole organized craft and might of hellish wisdom, he will never be allowed to perform miracles, involving strictly creative energy. Creation is a prerogative, which the Divine TRINITY appear to have jealously and exclusively reserved to Themselves and that not only in its more strict and primary signification of the creation of something out of nothing, but also in its more usual and general acceptation of the forming of organic out of inorganic substances; in other words, the production of any creatures which have life in themselves.

Satan has frequently had committed to him licence to destroy, never we think to create anew. In whatever instances he may have *seemed* to have done so, we are bound to seek some explanation which shall not involve even permitted creative energy.

S. Paul (2 Thess. ii. 8) says, “And then shall that Wicked ([Greek], Antichrist, the pre-eminently lawless One, as being the embodied expression of the [Greek], which was beginning to work secretly like leaven in the Church even in the Apostolic age) be revealed—even he whose coming ([Greek, the very word used of our LORD’S Coming the line above,]) is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish, because they received not the love of the Truth that they might be saved; and for this cause GOD shall send them an energizing of deceit, that they should believe the lie.” It is *the lie* ([Greek]) the grand, final, crowning lie, with which the great Liar, the father and maker of lies, shall in setting up the reign of Antichrist, deceive all nations, the lie which shall be the complement to the first lie which deceived Eve, the lie of lies in which all the deceits, and falsehoods of the devil, and false prophets and teachers, and wicked men shall be finally merged and summed up. Of this great lie, the miracles of Antichrist will form no small or insignificant part. They are the “signs and wonders of the lie,” of which S. Paul speaks ([Greek]).

508

S. Augustine after quoting at length the passage in the 2nd Epistle to the Thessalonians (De Civ. Dei, xx. 19,) proceeds to speak thus upon these lying wonders. “At that time Satan shall be loosed, and through Antichrist shall work wonderfully indeed, with all his might, but with falsehood (mendaciter.) About these words of S. Paul, there is usually understood to be an ambiguity—whether they are called lying signs and wonders (signa et prodigia mendacii) because Antichrist will deceive the senses of men by means of phantasms, that he may seem to do what he does not do; or because the wonders, though they be real, will lead to a lie, that men who are ignorant of the devil’s strength, especially at a time when he shall receive greater power than he ever had before, will believe that they would not be possible unless they were done by Divine Agency.” How terrible this power will be in the hands of Antichrist is well shown by S. Gregory in many passages, besides those we have already quoted.

“His fierceness makes him break forth into cruelty, yet the Divine pity confines him with fewness of days. Hence the Truth says by Itself—Then shall be great tribulation, such as was not from the beginning of the world to this time, nor shall be. Again it says—Except those days should be shortened, there should no flesh be saved. But it must be greatly considered, in what way that Behemoth, when he raises his tail as a cedar, (Job xl. 17) arises with greater fierceness than he now exerts himself. For what

kind of punishment do we know, at which we rejoice not, as having already exercised the strength of the martyrs? When, therefore, this Behemoth expands his tail more fatally in the end of the world, what greater cruelty can spring up in these torments, except that which the Truth says Itself in the Gospel—There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, so that if possible, even the elect may be led into error. For now our faithful ones do wonders when they suffer wrongs, but at that time the ministers of this Behemoth are about to do wonders even when they inflict wrongs. Let us consider therefore, what will be that temptation of the mind of man, when both the pious martyr submits his body to tortures, and yet the torturer works miracles before his eyes! Whose resolution would not then be shaken from the very bottom of his thoughts, when he who tortures with the scourges, glitters also with miracles. Let it be rightly said then—He setteth up his tail like a cedar, because he will doubtless be exalted from reverence for the prodigy, and harsh with the cruelty of his torture.”

And again—

“He is then exalted, not only in power, but is supported also by the display of miracles. Whence it is also said by David—He lieth in wait in secret as a lion in his den (Ps. x. 9.) Because this enemy is unchecked in all his strength—he is let loose in contest against the Elect, both by [509] fraud and strength; in strength by his power, in fraud by his miracles. He is rightly said therefore, to be both a lion, and lying in wait; lying in wait by the splendour of his miracles, a lion by his secular power. For in order to draw those who are openly wicked, he displays his secular power; but in order to deceive even the just, he pretends sanctity by his miracles. For he persuades the one by the height of his greatness, he deceives the other by a display of sanctity..”

And again: “what he says in his craft, he supports by working wonders; for whatever his lying tongue pretends, that does the hand of his work set forth as if true.” (Moral. Vol. iii. pp. 528, &c. Oxf. Trans.)

Nothing can show more strongly S. Gregory’s belief that Antichrist will be permitted to work real miracles of *some* kind, than the preceding quotations. By the aid of S. Augustine, we shall proceed with our present inquiry of endeavouring to distinguish between what he will have power to perform, and what he will not. S. Augustine says thus—“When indeed fire fell from heaven, and at one impetus consumed the whole family with so many flocks and herds of holy Job, and a whirlwind rushing upon and overthrowing their house, killed his sons, these things were not illusions. They were the very works of Satan, to whom GOD had given such power.”

This is in accordance with what we have previously remarked, that Satan with permitted power can destroy life; but GOD alone, the FATHER, and CHRIST, and the HOLY GHOST; preserve life and living creatures, even as they are their only source and Creators. S. Augustine has another most curious and most valuable passage in the *De Civitate*, (Lib. xviii. c. 18) in which he altogether denies the possibility of any creative power being ever really exercised by the demons. After quoting the “*Asini Aurei*” of Apuleius he proceeds—

“These things are either false, or so unusual as not to deserve credit. This, however, is firmly to be believed, that Almighty GOD can do all things whatsoever He pleases, both of right, and by actual performance; and the demons cannot perform anything to the potency of their own nature, (for they are really angelic by creation, but evil by their own fault) save what is permitted by Him Whose judgments are often secret, never unjust. The demons in truth cannot create any beings, (*naturas*) even if they can do any

of those things which we are at present discussing, but can only change the appearance of things which have been created by the True GOD, so that they should appear to be what they are not. I would never, therefore, by any means believe that either the mind, or even the body of a human being could by any device or power of demons be really changed into the members and lineaments of a brute.”

He then in a passage too long to quote, proceeds to show that any metamorphosis which may have ever taken place, may possibly have arisen from [510] that part of man’s mind called the fancy, which is so active in dreams, assuming for a time some visible shape.

We shall find then that the whole instinct of the early Catholic Church was altogether opposed to the idea that Satan, or any evil power or principle could by any possibility, under any circumstances, create, or call any beings really to life. And to maintain this principle, we know that she battled manfully against the more than hundred-headed Hydras of Gnosticism and Manicheism. To enter into any of the tenets of these heresies, which bear largely however upon this very question, would take us too long. We will only quote a passage from S. Jerome about the Marcionites (Comment. in Isa. L. vii. c. 17. Ed. Vallar.) “Marcionistæ quum enim recipiant Providentiam, accusant Creatorem, et asserunt Eum in plerisque operibus errasse, et non ita fecisse ut facere debuerat. Ad quam enim utilitatem hominum serpentes, scorpions, crocodilos, et pulices, cimices et culices pertinere?”

And in the acts of certain Persian martyrs under King Sapor, we see that the early Christians were ready to endure any torments, and to suffer death itself, rather than admit that there is anything in the universe which is not created by the only GOD. Among the charges brought against them by the Magians were the following,¹—“They abolish our doctrine; they teach men to worship one only GOD; they forbid them to adore the sun or fire; they permit all sorts of animals to be killed; they say that serpents and scorpions were made, not by the devil, but by GOD Himself.”

We are only aware of one or two things in Holy Scripture which seem to require any explanation as appearing opposed to this belief, that Satan, and therefore Antichrist his instrument, will neither of them be ever permitted to give life to an kind of beings, not even the very lowest and meanest in the scale of creation. Indeed we are *inclined* to doubt if this power has ever been delegated to a *creature*, either to the highest archangel, or to the prophet. And this perhaps was one reason why our LORD’S giving sight to a man who had been born blind, seemed to astonish the Jews more than His raising Lazarus and others from the dead, acts similar to what had been previously performed by Elijah and Elisha. “But since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind.” Whence S. Augustine takes occasion to say very beautifully,—“Our LORD anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay; as though He Who formed the whole man of clay, had not of it made for him eyes in the womb, so now He made them.”

The first instance which we will notice as seeming to be opposed to what we have said is in Exodus vii. 10, 11, 12—“And Moses and Aaron went in unto Pharaoh, and they did so as the LORD commanded: and Aaron cast down his rod before Pharaoh, and [511] before his servants, and it became a serpent. Then Pharaoh called also the wise men and the sorcerers: now the magicians of Egypt, they also did in like manner with their enchantments. For they cast down every man his rod, and they became serpents: but Aaron’s rod swallowed up their rods.” About Aaron’s rod becoming a serpent, it is only necessary to make this

¹ See Butler’s Lives of the Saints. March 14.

remark. It did not involve any real and abiding act of creation, because the serpent into which it was changed, resumed its original form, becoming a rod again in Moses' hand.

What requires more explanation is what occurred in the plague of frogs. (Ex. viii. 6, 7.) "And Aaron stretched out his hand over the waters of Egypt; and the frogs came up, and covered the land of Egypt. And the magicians did so with their enchantments, and brought up frogs upon the land of Egypt." Aaron stretched out his *hand* upon this and some other occasions, says Origen—"Ne virgæ vim magicis prestigiis plurimi adscriberent."

In the first place, it may be suggested that there is no mention here made of any actual creation of frogs, either on the part of Moses and Aaron, or by the magicians. It is said "they brought frogs," which may mean, that frogs which had been already formed by the Only Creator, were really but miraculously summoned to that spot by Moses and Aaron. Of what the magicians performed, there may be two explanations. The first is, that while they really did by GOD'S permission turn water into blood, they only *seemed* to create frogs. They enchanted the eyes of Pharaoh and his servants. This is an hypothesis which would hold good, even granting, for the sake of argument, that the magicians did anything more than bring frogs already in existence, from some other spot to that in which Pharaoh and his servants were then assembled. What renders this explanation the more probable is, that eminent Hebrew scholars are of opinion that the original word which expresses the act of the magicians, gives by its root and primary signification an intimation of this very kind; there is something of cheating and jugglery expressed, of casting a film upon the eyes of beholders, so as to make them appear to see what they really do not see, and what is really not in existence. It is said that there is a class of men in Egypt who possess a similar power to this very day.

A second explanation is, that it may have been a multitude of demons assuming at the bidding of the magicians the very form and appearance of frogs. As it is said in Psalm lxxviii. 49—"He sent evil angels among them." The account of the frogs proceeding out of the mouth of the dragon, and the beast and the false prophet (Rev. xvi. 13) would seem to be rather in favour of this latter supposition; since in the following verse they are declared to be the spirits of devils. These lying unclean spirits might either [512] possess or take the form of frogs, just as Satan in the beginning either possessed or took the form of a serpent.

Whatever may have been the power which at the period of the earliest plagues was conceded to the magicians, those lively types of the lying prophets and teachers who shall go before the face of Antichrist, it was very speedily brought to a termination. It is not a little singular, that they failed with their enchantments in even seeming to produce or to summon at their bidding what are perhaps the meanest and vilest of all living creatures. And in this instance we must allow that it is not said of Aaron that he *brought* lice, but that as GOD commanded, he "stretched forth his hand with his rod, and smote the dust of the earth; and *it became* lice in man, and in beast; all the dust of the land became lice throughout all the land of Egypt." (Ex. viii. 17.) Thus, in whatever way we view the matter, the failure of the magicians was the more signal, their credit the more completely blasted and overthrown.

The second thing, which it is, to say the least, probable Antichrist will not be suffered to perform amongst the multitude of signs and wonders which he will exhibit to deceive the nations, is the raising of the dead.

There are two wonders mentioned in Rev. xiii., which will be more properly fully considered when we enter upon the second branch of our inquiry—the positive miracles of Antichrist. We shall only advert to them at present. One wonder is that the first beast was as it were wounded to death, and his deadly wound was healed. The Greek is perhaps a

little stronger than our translation. “[Greek]” By this we may understand that he shall receive some such wound as without miraculous powers of healing must terminate in death; but that he will be healed by miracle. And this will be the nearest approach to raising the dead which Satan will ever be permitted to perform.¹

About the second miracle, namely that the second beast will “have power to give life to the statue of the first beast, and that the image of the beast should both speak, and cause that as many as would not worship the image of the beast should be killed”—(see verse 15.)—there is something in the very description itself, which is given by blessed John, that serves to strike us with horror and dismay, something which long before the time arrives, exhibits to us the very marks and signs by which the elect, who alone will overcome at that awful time, will discern clearly the tokens of the working of diabolical power. There will be life. The signs of life in this image of the beast will be incontestable and unmistakable. But it will be devilish and demoniacal life. The whole atmosphere will seem as it were, to breathe of hell, to be reeking [513] with the smoke and stench of the Bottomless pit. There will be life, but it will be a kind of vampire life; it will be life, such as if we could conceive it possible, a galvanised corpse moving and acting and speaking might possess. It will be as though a living spirit of the Abyss were controlling and actuating a putrefying human carcass.

The practical conclusions which we deduce from the preceding inquiry are these,—that Antichrist will endeavour by the assistance of Satan to do both these things, to create life and to raise the dead. The more strictly and jealously and exclusively GOD has reserved these things to Himself as His own prerogative, the more strenuously will Antichrist seek to usurp that prerogative. And in some terrible manner, he will contrive to present an appearance of so doing. But the strength of the saints in their contest with him will consist in this, that do what he will in that way, it will all bear evidently, on the face of it, the character of a frightful and horrible diabolical machination, and similitude of the miracles of GOD and His Prophets and Apostles.

We are now arrived at the third and concluding branch of our inquiry, namely the Positive Miracles of Antichrist, or those which he will actually perform.

The words of S. Augustine—which we quoted from the “De Civitate”—may be not inaptly applied to those two branches into which we have divided this subject.

Some of the Miracles of Antichrist will be “*signa et prodigia mendacii*” because he will deceive the senses of mankind by seeming to do what he does not do. Other signs and prodigies, though they be *real*, will yet be “*signa et prodigia mendacii*,” because they will be done by the power of the Father of Lies, utterly to overthrow the Truth of GOD. It is with these that we are now about to deal.

And it becomes us to acknowledge at the outset, that it is our duty to tread warily and discreetly; endeavouring to follow with humility and teachableness the faint indications which Scripture and Antiquity afford us. For though, as we think will be readily allowed by those who have perused our former remarks, we have the most abundant testimony possible to the fact of Antichristian miracles generally, of some kind or other, it is widely different when we come to inquire what they will actually be. We shall, however, proceed to show that we have not been left entirely in darkness.

First, there is reason to believe that Antichrist will be allowed to utter prophecies, which will be fulfilled by subsequently occurring events. There is a passage in the Book of

¹ See S. Chrysos, quoted by Corn. a Lapide, on 2 Thess. ii. 8.

Deuteronomy, (xiii. 1—5,) which proves at least the possibility of such a thing, very conclusively:

“If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the [514] sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods, which thou hast not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet or that dreamer of dreams: for the LORD your GOD proveth you, to know whether ye love the LORD your GOD with all your heart, and with all your soul.”

This of course applies primarily to the false prophets and teachers who were continually arising under the Old Law to deceive the people of Israel, such as Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah¹ who led Ahab on to perish, as the prophets Ahab and Zedekiah,² whom Nebuchadnezzar roasted in the fire, and Pashur the son of Imlah to whom Jeremiah gave a new name, and prophesied a fearful doom.³

It is to such as these S. Peter refers: “But there were also false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the LORD that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.”⁴

But that which specially as it were projects the practical bearing of the passage in Deuteronomy on to the time of Antichrist is this, that the false prophets under the Old Covenant were very much more famous for the failure, than for the accomplishment of their predictions. We do not assert positively that no instance of a false prophet, by whom we mean, one speaking after the suggestions of the lying spirits of devils, giving such predictions as were justified by the events which followed, can be produced; but if any there be, they are exceedingly few.

On the contrary, the failure of such prophets in their prophecies afforded a test to GOD’S people to discern the false prophets from the true. Thus (Deut. xviii. 21, 22): “And if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which the LORD hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the LORD, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the LORD hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.”⁵ The precept, or warning then, in Deut. xiii., evidently not having any full application before the coming of GOD the SON in the Person of CHRIST, we must seek for it afterwards; and we shall most probably and reasonably expect to find the application to refer to that period when iniquity shall come to the full, and “the king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up.”

This is Antichrist, who, according to the twofold meaning of [515] his name, shall both set himself *against* CHRIST, and place himself *in the stead* of CHRIST⁶.

¹ 1 Kings xxii. 11.

² 2 Jer. xxix. 22.

³ 3 Jer. xx. 1.

⁴ 2 S. Pet. ii. 1. I cannot help stopping for a moment to remark, how sadly our Translation misses the *point* of the original in this passage, by rendering [Greek] in so many different ways. Thus, in the compass of only three verses, [Greek] is swift destruction; [Greek], are damnable heresies; [Greek], pernicious ways; and again [Greek], in the third verse, is damnation.

⁵ See also Jer. x. 2; and Zech. x. 2, &c.

⁶ See Trench: Synonyms of the New Testament.

Just as CHRIST, both by His own Mouth, and by the mouth of His Prophets and Apostles predicted oftentimes signs and wonders which oftentimes came to pass: so will Antichrist predict signs and wonders as about to take place. And these—his command of the power of Satan, for a time unbound, will enable himself to effect, to the delusion of the reprobate, and the temporary dismay even of the elect. Thus in the time, and under the hand of Antichrist, will real and actual, not pretended or ambiguous prophecy, as it was in the case of the old oracles, and miraculous signs and wonders, be united.

Having examined this question of prophecy, we will proceed to inquire if we have any indications afforded us to know beforehand of what kind those signs and wonders are likely to be. We think that we are able to give an affirmative answer; and that the signs and wonders in question will have to do principally with the region of the air, and with appearances which will be presented in or among the heavenly luminaries. If, as we know Satan was able to draw into his rebellion a third of the angelic host, whom GOD created perfect in purity and happiness, and drag them down to hell,¹ much more, may we conceive it possible that he may be permitted to do this, which is by comparison so infinitely less.

An examination of the LXX. Trans. of Deut. xiii. at once sends us to S. Matt, xxiv. 24. Moses says, “*If* there arise among you a prophet, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder” ([Greek]). Our LORD says, “There *shall* arise false Christs, and false prophets, and they *shall* give² great signs and wonders” ([Greek]). Our LORD proceeds to tell us that His Own Coming will be preceded by the most dreadful signs in heaven and amongst the heavenly bodies: “Lightning,” doubtless far more fearful than any yet beheld by child of Adam: “The sign of the Son of Man, the wondrous Standard of the Cross beheld in mid-air: Falling Stars: The Moon becoming red as blood: The Sun dark like sackcloth of hair: The shaking of the powers of Heaven ([Greek])—[Greek] is a word, applied to the tossing of the sea in a storm; so that what is here meant, may be a violent apparent rocking to and fro of the visible heavens, that firmament or framework of the sky in which the stars seem to rest, as though both it and they were about to be dissolved, and reduced to primæval chaos. With this may be compared Rev. vi. 13, where the entire heaven is likened to a fig-tree shaken by a mighty wind ([Greek]): an unnatural and ominous [516] twilight, by which all things will be enveloped, or shrouded rather, in the dim and sickly and unearthly darkness of an eclipse.³ Of the inspired prophecies relative to this, there is doubtless a tradition in those old Norse Sagas, which describe so grandly, yet sometimes so quaintly, the end of all things, when they mention amongst other signs the Rogmarok, or twilight of the gods. These signs, and such as these, being the *heavenly* indications that the Son of Man is about speedily to be revealed, if we bear in mind that principle of imitation, which we have already discussed, we shall feel it not improbable that Antichrist will endeavour, as it were, to forestall them all; and none are to be surprised if, in a great measure, he be successful in his efforts.

When Josephus records the fall and ruin of Jerusalem, which fulfil to the very letter our LORD’S predictions, he has a passage too well known to be necessary to quote it, on the signs and wonders which preceded, and which were in the judgment of all, tokens of the unparalleled miseries which followed.⁴ He describes the many great signs and fearful

¹ See Rev. xii.. 7—9

² It may of course be simply coincidence; but it is a little remarkable that both Moses and our LORD use the same word, “give” here. The LXX. has also “give.”

³ S. Matt. xxiv. 29, &c. Zech. xiv. 6, 7.

⁴ Joseph. Bell. Jud. vi. 5.

sights which there were from Heaven, and which were doubtless sent by GOD both to warn His own people, and to leave His enemies without excuse. Josephus also mentions the fact of the numerous false prophets who rose up at this period, and lured on the Jews to utter destruction by promising them victory. And he says expressly that they performed wonders and prodigies; but singularly enough, he does not inform us of what they actually consisted. Had he done so, it would have been of much use to us in helping us to draw out from analogy a probable theory concerning the wonders and signs of Antichrist. But in lack of this, we are thrown upon other resources.

We must again revert to Rev. vi. 12. The Prophet says, “And I beheld when he had opened the sixth seal, and lo, there was a great earthquake, and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood, &c.”

What we are especially concerned with in this passage at present is, that the prodigies here described occurred at the *opening of the sixth seal*.

The opening of the previous five seals are all prophetic of tribulations or persecutions about to come upon the Church: and of this 6th seal we may use the words of an ancient writer, quoted by Dr Wordsworth, and say, “*Ipsa est persecutio novissima in tempore Antichristi.*”¹ And the strength of our position will be readily perceived. All the great crises and catastrophes in the world’s history, such as the Deluge, the Plagues of Egypt, the Fall of Jerusalem, which were types of the last days, and which were marked [519] in their earlier stages by persecutions of GOD’S people, have been distinguished by a display of signs and wonders sent from heaven. These have been more or less successfully imitated by hellish wisdom. The last persecution of Antichrist, referred to in the opening of the 6th seal, is accompanied likewise by heavenly prodigies of the most stupendous description. And Satan, acting as he has ever done before, will, through the agency of that accursed man whom he will then assume, imitate those signs and wonders and prodigies. And it is quite in accordance with what we know from Revelation, that Satan should be permitted to exercise such powers: he was able to destroy the sheep of holy Job by fire from heaven, and his children by a tempestuous wind.

Subsequent to our LORD’S Incarnation, up to the time of Antichrist, such permitted power seems to be withheld: which gives one important meaning to our SAVIOUR’S words, “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven.” And yet, even in this his period of greatest restraint, S. Paul calls him the “Prince of the power of the air.” And it would seem to be expressly intimated to us that the very power which he exercised in the earlier ages, of causing fire to fall from heaven, will be restored to him in the days of Antichrist. For so we understand Rev. xiii. 11—14. “And I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth; and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon.” By this beast, S. Gregory understands the band of false preachers, who, uniting the art of persuasion to the support of the temporal powers of this world, bring almost all mankind to the feet of their master, the first beast, or the real Antichrist, “And he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him,” ([Greek]) that is, in his presence: for an examination of the whole chapter will show that these two beasts are intended to be described as contemporaries, not as one succeeding the other, in the sense that the first became extinct. S. John proceeds, “He causeth the

¹ See Wordsworth’s Lectures on the Apocalypse: a work of which we feel compelled to say that we differ from it in most points, where the author arrives at conclusions which are not supported by the ancient expositors.

earth, and them that dwell therein,”¹ to worship the first beast; and he doeth great wonders so that he maketh fire to come down from heaven on the earth in the sight of men, and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those miracles which he had power to do in the sight of the first beast.

We forbear in this place to speak of the fiery prodigies exhibited by Simon Magus, first, because the First Canon of S. Augustine, by which he explains “*signa et prodigia mendacii*,” clearly applies to them; and secondly, because we hope in one or two subsequent papers to speak of some of the personal historical types of Antichrist, amongst whom we should include Simon Magus.

[520]

GOD keep us watchful and prayerful, with loins girt and lamps burning, and we ourselves, like unto men that wait for their LORD, knowing, indeed, that He will not come until “The Apostasy” has taken place, and that Man of Sin been revealed whom He will slay with the Breath of His Mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His Presence.

¹ We cannot refrain from pausing for a moment to remark how fully this expression, “the *earth*, and them that dwell therein,” bears out the theory so ably advocated in the *Ecclesiastic* some time ago, that not merely individual Christians, but that the Church herself shall become apostate in the time of Antichrist: “*earth*,” in the Apocalypse, signifying the Church, as the sea the world.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 20. (Joseph Masters: London, 1858)
[207]ANTICHRIST

THERE are probably few things in which we perceive so great a difference of *tone* between the Patristic writings, and the theology of modern times, as in the whole of the important and awful question—Who or what is Antichrist?

The difference is one rather to be felt and understood by such as are accustomed to compare the two, than capable of any full and adequate expression in words, except perhaps in some one or two main features.

Modern theology would seem in its idea of Antichrist to point chiefly to the development of a *system* of false religion—occasionally, as for instance, where Antichrist is identified with the Papacy, to a *series* of persons, no one of whom can, for that very reason, be said to be himself individually “Antichrist,” “*the Antichrist.*” Patristic writers on the contrary, who speak when the solemn warnings concerning Antichrist, given by our LORD and reiterated by the Apostles, were sounding trumpet-tongued in the ears of the early Church, point rather to the development of Antichrist as being the appearance, or the revelation of some one individual person. And they say he will be known and recognized by the elect by means of those indelible marks which prophecy has stamped upon him.

Shadowed forth by types, designated by prophecies—many dark and obscure, a few to be understood even by babes in CHRIST—“that reprobate Person” as S. Gregory the Great calls Antichrist, will thus be able to be discerned and rejected by the Saints of [208] God, when in his time he shall be revealed, just as our Lord in His time was recognized by them with adoring love.

It is truly wonderful to observe the constant parallelism, and antagonism, so to say, between our Lord and Antichrist, which pervade Holy Scripture in all its parts alike, history and prophecy, the Psalms and moral writings, the gospels and the epistles—interwoven like threads of varied hue and texture, and running all through the mighty web of the revealed purposes of God. As though it were that what our Lord was to be for good, Antichrist should be for evil: the One the Incarnation of Uncreated Goodness; the other the embodied Impersonation of the utmost development of the powers of the world, the flesh and the devil: the One endued “without measure” with the Gift of the Holy Ghost; the other possessed in some strange mysterious way by “the Prince of the devils,” beyond any former precedent, and really working miracles, and showing signs and wonders such as to “deceive if it were possible even the elect.” And it is not a little remarkable, and a point in proof of this parallelism, that the same terms should be, as they are, not unfrequently applied to these two, Christ and Antichrist, and to none besides. For instance, not to go more fully into this branch of the subject at present, the terms “Revelation” and “Revealed”¹ are thus applied to both. So again “Mystery,” as though the Incarnation of Christ, the great “Mystery of Godliness,” and of the heavenly world, were only to be paralleled by the rising of Antichrist, the fearful and terrible mystery of hellish wisdom and malice, and of the world of devils.²

¹ 2 Thess. i. 7; ii. 3, &c.

² 2 Tim. iii.; 2 Thess. ii. 7, &c.

It will be the object of the present article to trace out one of these Scriptural parallelisms. In so doing, we shall endeavour to follow as closely as possible the guidance of the Early Church, and the path traced out for us by its great doctors and luminaries.

This point is the connection of Antichrist with one particular tribe of the children of Israel, the tribe of Dan. As it “is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah,” and that thus the prophecies which marked out that tribe for the honour of His Birth were literally fulfilled, so it would seem not altogether unreasonable that the intimations which appeared to the Fathers to foreshadow that Antichrist should arise out of Dan should have a literal fulfilment likewise.

It will not be necessary here to do more than allude to the consternation which was spread through Europe in the Middle Ages, and even later, by the report that Antichrist had actually appeared, and set up his standard in the tribe of Dan. We rather pass on to the consideration of the fact that every mention of Dan in the Scriptures, with scarcely an exception, bears, if we may be allowed the expression, somewhat at least of a sinister character. And [209] the exceptions are not more difficult to be accounted for than those of an exactly opposite character with regard to Judah. For instance, although *generally*, in a typical view, Judah and his tribe foreshadow the MESSIAH, yet in Gen. xxxvii. 27 he is clearly a type of Judas the traitor. He is represented both as covetous, and the prime mover in the scheme to sell his brother for twenty pieces of silver.

To return to Dan: we will commence with his birth. He is not only the son of one of the handmaids of Jacob’s wives, which was common to him with three others; but he is the first-born of Rachel’s handmaid. His birth therefore, closely followed Rachel’s passionate speech to her husband, “Give me children, or else I die.” The child then who is born, and which she adopts and considers as her own, she names Dan, saying, “GOD hath judged me, and hath also heard my voice, and hath given me a son.” (Gen. xxx. 6.) As though the words addressed to the children of Israel might be here applied to Rachel, “I gave thee a king in Mine anger:” I gave thee a son in Mine anger. We know that there are many similar instances of GOD’s answering prayers like Rachel’s in wrath and judgment, granting the thing prayed for, and at the same time making it an instrument of His most righteous vengeance. See two remarkable instances, Numb. xxii. 20, and 1 Sam. viii. 7—9.

The next important notice of Dan is in Gen. xlix. 16, 17. In this chapter is recorded Jacob’s blessing of his sons. Or rather he shadows forth in mysterious prophecies the temporal and spiritual destinies of their respective descendants. “Dan shall judge his people as one of the tribes of Israel. Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder by the path, that biteth the horse heels, so that his rider shall fall backward.” On these words, S. Greg. Magn. comments as follows: “For some say that Antichrist is coming out of the tribe of Dan, because in this place Dan is asserted to be a serpent, and a biting one. Whence also when the people of Israel were choosing their position in the partition of the camp, Dan most rightly first pitched his camp to the north:¹ signifying him in truth who had said in his heart; “I will sit upon the mount of the Testament; in the sides of the north. I will ascend above the height of the clouds. I will be like the Most High.”² Of whom also it is said by the Prophet, ‘The snorting of horses was heard from Dan.’ (Jer. viii. 16.) But he is called not only a serpent, but a horned serpent (cerastes). for [Greek] in Greek are called *cornua*

¹ Num. ii. 25.

² Isa. xiv. 13.

in Latin. And this serpent, by whom the coming of Antichrist is fitly set forth, is said to be horned: because together with the bite of pestilent preaching, he is armed also against the life of the faithful with horns of power. But who can be ignorant that a path is narrower than a way? Dan [210] therefore becomes a serpent in the *way*, because he compels those whom he flatters by seeming to spare them, to walk in the broad way of the present life: but he bites them in the way, because he destroys with the poison of his error those upon whom he confers liberty. He becomes a horned serpent in the *path*, because those whom he finds to be faithful, and to be confining themselves to the narrow path of the heavenly precepts, he not only assails with the wickedness of crafty persuasion, but also oppresses with the terror of his power. And after the kindness of pretended sweetness, he employs the horns of his power in the torture of persecution. In which passage, the ‘horse’ signifies this world, which foams through its pride in the lapse of passing times. And because Antichrist strives to seize the latter end of the world, this horned serpent is said to bite the horses’ hoofs. For to bite the horses’ hoofs is to reach the ends of the world by striking them: *That its rider falleth backwards*. The rider of the horse is every one who is exalted in worldly dignities; who is said to fall backward, and not on his face, as Paul is said to have fallen. For to fall on his face, is for each one to confess his own faults, in this life, and to bewail them with penitence. But to fall backwards, where we cannot see, is to depart suddenly out of this life, and to know not to what punishment he is being led. And because Judæa entangled with the snares of its own error, is looking for Antichrist instead of CHRIST, Jacob in the same passage, rightly turned round suddenly, in the language of the elect, saying, ‘I have waited for Thy salvation, O LORD;’ that is, I do not, as the infidels, believe in Antichrist, but I faithfully believe Him Who is about to come for our redemption, even the true CHRIST.” S. Greg. Magn. Moral. III., 457, 458, Oxf. Tr.

We must not omit to notice the form of the expression, “Dan shall judge *his people*, as one of the tribes of Israel,” as though Dan were not *really* a part of the “true Israel of GOD; but as though Antichrist, who should spring from Dan, should have his people, whom he shall rule and judge,—even the whole multitude of the reprobate; just as CHRIST and His twelve shall sit on thrones judging and approving His Own elect.

What S. Gregory says of the words with which Jacob concludes this prophecy, agrees very plainly with the comment of another of the Fathers: that Jacob looking forward to the time of Antichrist, and discerning in his spirit something of the horror and misery which should then overflow the earth as an irresistible flood, was overcome with the thought, and only supported himself by the recollection that even then the faithful would be in the Hand of GOD, and that though salvation might tarry long, it would surely come at length to those who waited for it. Therefore he said, “I have waited for Thy salvation, O God.”

The fact of Dan being the tribe which gave a name to the hindermost camp of Israel in the wilderness, has been already noted by S. Gregory. The hindermost was also the tribe which pitched northward. The north is the quarter which in the mystical language of Scripture is appropriated to the dominion of Satan, just as the south is the region of Heaven and of the Church.

Again, it is not a little significant that the Captain of the host of Dan, the Prince of his tribe in the wilderness, was Ahiezer, the son of Ammishaddai.¹ Ammishaddai signifies in Hebrew, “*My people is the ALMIGHTY*.” just as though Antichrist were to gain his power by a deification of the popular will. That he should make flattery of the people’s

¹ Numb. i. 12.

omnipotence be the stepping-stone whereby he should be by them in turn lifted up above “all that is called God or worshipped.” And surely it is not very difficult to detect many traces of such coming “signs of the times” as this, even now in the world.

Again, with reference to the northerly location of Dan, it is to be observed that when Ezekiel mystically redistributes the whole of Canaan amongst the tribes of Israel in equal and parallelly-conterminous portions, the extreme north of all is assigned to Dan. Possibly, it might be said, because of the geographical position of the city Dan. But then it is not to be forgotten that Dan being originally located within the confines of the portion of Judah, the southernmost of all the tribes, and hard by the Temple and Altar of GOD, afterwards migrated to a spot north of all the other tribes, and almost, if not entirely, without the boundaries of the Holy Land, properly so called. This, therefore, is quite in accordance with the typical character of the tribe. “I saw the wicked . . . who had come and gone from the place of the holy, and they were *forgotten in the city* where they had so done.” (Eccles. viii. 10.) And S. John says,¹ “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.” And these words are the more appropriate to the case in point, because S. John is speaking expressly and by name of the times of Antichrist. And they show us that he will in all probability be a recreant and a traitor from the fellowship of the saints and from the communion of the Church, of which he will at first, without doubt, profess himself a member.

So completely is the tribe of Dan identified with the northern city, that it became eventually their chief seat. In fact, in the later Israelitish history we lose all trace of southern Dan.

The account of this migration from the south to the north, as related in Judges xviii, shows that it included a system of organised rebellion against the GOD of Israel: and that the very foundation of their civil polity was based on a kind of *national establishment* of idolatry. “And the children of Dan set up the [212] graven image,” (which together with an ephod and teraphim and a molten image, they had taken out of Micah’s house.) And Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his sons were priests *to the tribe of Dan*, until the day of captivity of the land. And they set them up Micha’s graven image, which he made, *all the time that the house of God was in Shiloh.*” This passage establishes two important points: First, that this northern Dan was thus early considered the representative of the tribe: and secondly, the enormity of this apostasy is surely intended to be represented as greatly enhanced, by contrasting it with the fact, that the true temple of GOD and the ark of the covenant where the Divine service of typical sacrifices was conducted, was at Shiloh, in the south. Shiloh, we know, is one of the earliest and most famous names of our LORD—“until Shiloh come.”

So it is seen that within the short space of twenty years, according to the received chronology, after Israel’s establishment in Canaan, a system of false worship was fully organised in that tribe, from whence Antichrist is to spring, and in open and glaring defiance of JEHOVAH’S worship at Shiloh.

The next important passage to be noticed relative to Dan occurs in Moses’ blessing of the tribes, Deut. xxxiii. 22. “And of Dan he said, Dan is a lion’s whelp: he shall leap from Bashan.” Taken by themselves, the words are of course susceptible either of a benedictory

¹ 1 S. John ii. 19.

or a maledictory interpretation. We must in such a case be guided by the light which a comparison of the rest of the notices concerning Dan will throw upon what is of itself ambiguous. If then we remember that there is about almost every other passage in which this tribe is mentioned, something fearfully, yet mysteriously significant, pointing it out as in some way or other connected with the powers of hell, a kind of fount whence moral evil was ever springing up to be a snare and a trouble to the rest of Israel, we shall not be at a loss for the true interpretation of Moses' words.

The connection of Dan with Bashan is seen at once on a consideration of their migration to Laish, or Leshem. And he shall leap as a lion's whelp. For as our LORD is "the Lion of the tribe of Judah:" so we know there is another lion, "who walketh about seeking whom he may devour." And Antichrist is a "lion's whelp," as it were the progeny of that other lion—see Ps. x. 9; xvii.12—passages which S. Augustine explains of Antichrist, and his instigator and possessor the devil. And he in Dan. leaps from Bashan. He in the north sets himself against the King of the south; against that Incarnate GOD Who "stooped, and couched as a lion, and as an old lion,"¹ on Calvary, before He arose in the might and glory of His resurrection in the same holy hill. This Lion, this King it was, Who was born amongst the hills of Judah; [213] Who received His first earthly homage in the hill country of Hebron in the South, when S. John the Baptist leapt in his mother's womb for joy at the presence of His Incarnate GOD; and Who, from Olivet, another Mount of the south, leapt as it were heavenward, when his earthly work was accomplished. In opposition then to this "King of the south," Antichrist unfurls his banner in the north. He is the lion's whelp who leaps from Bashan. And still further, to connect Bashan with the enemies of our GOD, and with Satanic power, we read in Ps. xxii. 12, that in His Passion "strong bulls of Bashan beset Him around." He was then sore beset with legions of devils. As then Dan was the first tribe of Israel which fell into idolatry, from which at no subsequent period in Old Testament history was it ever purged, so also, immediately upon Jeroboam's defection it became one of the two chief seats of the worship of the golden calves, by which Israel was made to sin, and which ultimately brought about the final apostasy of the ten tribes, their utter ruin, and as far as we can learn from observation, their complete extinction. But if it indeed be that Holy Scripture points to their restoration at a day known to Him Who "gathereth together the outcasts of Israel," and "brings them back from the *north* country whither He had driven them;" then may we well conclude that Dan will return with them and play no unimportant part in the world's future history.

To sum up the actual history of Dan as a tribe. It was the first which fell into idolatry, and the first which was carried captive² to Assyria. It was, as we might conclude, one of the six tribes who stood upon Mount Ebal to curse.³ It was the tribe which was made use of as an instrument by the prince of darkness to overthrow GOD's ancient Church; and in which he succeeded so far as to draw ten out of those twelve "tribes of Israel to whom the Word of the LORD" came, into an apostasy which has lasted fully three thousand years, since Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin, set up the two golden calves, one at Bethel and one at Dan. In another respect Jeroboam only followed the example which had been set at Dan four hundred years previously—making Priests of those who were not of the seed of Aaron to minister at the High Places.

¹ Gen. xlix. 9.

² 1 Kings xv. 20, &c.

³ Deut. xxvii. 13.

Lastly; though Dan is apparently to return with the rest of the tribes, and to be located again in the land of Israel,¹ it will, if the testimony of antiquity be true, be once more the seat of an apostasy which shall seduce all but the elect. And we may remark in passing, that this very mention of Dan in connection with the restored city and temple, in the latter part of Ezekiel, is partly a proof that the Prophet is not speaking of the city Zion which is above, nor of the new Jerusalem, in which S. John saw no temple; but that it is rather a prophecy descriptive in mystical language of [214] the restored polity of the children of Israel, when they shall return to their own land, and GOD shall feed them “upon the mountains of Israel.” Thus we have examined, with scarcely an exception, every mountain of Dan in the Old Testament Scriptures, and we have found them uniform in the hints which they give, and the light which they seem to throw upon some mysterious connection between this tribe and the powers of evil throughout the entire course of Old Testament history and prophecy.

We are come now to examine if there be anything in the New Testament which may assist us in our inquiry. It is at once obvious that there is no mention, by name, of either the city or the tribe of Dan in any part of the New Testament Scriptures. Cæsarea Philippi, as the ancient Laish was then called, is mentioned upon one occasion.² But it was one of the very highest importance. It was when S. Peter pronounced his memorable declaration in answer to the question of our LORD, “Whom say ye that I, the Son of Man am?” “Thou art the CHRIST, the SON of the living GOD.” And then CHRIST Himself replied immediately, “Verily I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”

Thus, if we have been correct in our previous conclusions with respect to Dan, we see that the tribe and the locality which are especially connected with the rise of Antichrist were chosen by the Providence of GOD as the very spot above all others, where the Incarnate SON should be confessed and proclaimed in the most solemn manner, by express revelation from the FATHER, as emphatically “The CHRIST.”

We come now to what is, perhaps, the most significant of anything which has been adduced, the omission of any mention of the tribe of Dan in the seventh chapter of Revelation, which records the sealing of the 144,000 out of all the twelve tribes of Israel. These are they who correspond to and represent the innumerable company of the faithful, which no man could number, out of every nation, and tribe, and people, and tongue. All are found there except the tribe of Dan. Here it finally disappears, and another is found in its place, the tribe of Manasses. All the rest are there, the other tribes, sinful and wayward as their course had been, still of them all it might be said as in the early prophecy of the destiny of Gad, “The troop of false gods shall overcome them, but they shall overcome at the last.” Even so the name of Judas, hypocrite and traitor though he were, appears in all the catalogues which are given in the Gospels of the twelve Apostles, until at last he falls for ever, and his “place is no more to be found.” Then the prophetic curse is fulfilled, “Let his habitation be desolate, and his bishopric let another take.” His name occurs no more in the sacred story, and Matthias takes the place “from which Judas by [215] transgression fell.” So it is with the tribe of Dan. The long-suffering GOD bore with it through all the long course of Scripture history. The tribe is restored with the rest, and obtains an honourable position in the renewed earthly Zion; if indeed, as most probable, this be the meaning of

¹ Ezek. xlviii.

² S. Matt. viii. 13, &c.

Ezekiel xlvi. 32, "And at the east side three gates; one gate of Joseph, one gate of Benjamin, one gate of Dan." But without doubt he will still be the "serpent in the way, the adder by the path." From him, as S. Gregory says, *that Antichrist*, of whom all other antichrists have been but faint types and shadows, shall arise to "bite the horse heels," that is, to afflict the bodies of the faithful; to vex, and make war against, and "wear out the saints of the Most High." But the Apocalypse looks onward still beyond the fulfilment of all the prophecies which concern the earth. It looks onward to the heavenly and eternal life of the saints. It gives us blessed glimpses, and opens out to us glorious vistas of the New Jerusalem, the city "not made with hands," the eternal spotless "Bride of the LAMB." Then, when its blessed possessors are numbered finally in mystic numbers, as 144,000 of all the tribes of the true "Israel of GOD," who are without guile, Dan is no longer amongst them. His name is blotted out of the Book of Life. The beast and the false prophet, Antichrist and his members and followers, all who have obeyed them and all whom they have seduced are cast together into the lake of fire, and the smoke of their torment goeth up for ever and ever.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 21. (Joseph Masters: London, 1859)
[465] **RECENT SERMONS: KINGSLEY AND STANLEY.**

The Good News of God: Sermons by CHARLES KINGSLEY, Rector of Eversley.
London: J. W. Parker. 1859.

The Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Sermons preached mostly in Canterbury Cathedral, by ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, &c. &c.
London: Murray. 1859.

THE present is a Sermon-reading age. Probably there never was a time when so large an amount of this class of religious literature was issued from the press, or was, on the whole, so favourably received. We regard this, in the main, as a healthy sign; as an indication that that powerful, mysterious entity, "the Public," is not unwilling to be instructed in religious matters, and looks with a sort of respectful satisfaction and deferential complacency upon the laudable efforts ever being made by its accredited teachers, to "do it good."

Under these circumstances, when writers of known ability, who have obtained a large measure of popular favour—who are looked upon as, in some sense, oracles, and leaders of thought, by considerable portions of the intelligent community—take upon themselves to give forth their "views" on religious subjects, write sermons, assume the responsible position of theological teachers—there is always real ground for serious and anxious solicitude that their teaching should be sound and salutary; in strict, uncompromising conformity with the "faith once delivered."

We confess, that volumes of sermons by popular writers always inspire us with a vague sense of apprehension: and we freely acknowledge that it was with feelings somewhat of this nature—by no means diminished by a recollection of former theological speculations by their gifted authors—that we applied ourselves to the perusal of the two volumes of Sermons named at the head of this Paper. We rejoice, however, at once to state that our original grounds of apprehension have been only very partially confirmed.

Mr. Kingsley's volume will occupy the greater part of our [466] space; his sermons being marked with a stronger character, and offering more points for special notice than those of Professor Stanley.

It cannot be denied that "*the Good News of God*" contains passages, (on some of which we shall have occasion to animadvert,) the presence of which is deeply to be regretted. Nevertheless—despite all blemishes—the sermons undoubtedly possess great merit: and, what is more, afford unquestionable evidence of a more decided and respectful bearing, on the part of the Rector of Eversley, towards the teaching of the Catholic Church. Their style is singularly attractive. Not that we admire the easy off-hand manner too often employed, even upon the most sacred and solemn subjects—at times degenerating into mere flippancy. This is a grave defect. But saving this, the style is hearty, vigorous and genial. There is a reality, and manly earnestness of tone pervading the sermons—a bracing freshness and energy—which renders them peculiarly effective and impressive. They are plain, straightforward, and practical; not unfrequently enlivened with glances of a somewhat keen irony; and occasionally betraying warm and deep feeling.

But we must leave the author for a while to speak for himself.

And, by way of commencement, we are glad of an opportunity for hearing Mr. Kingsley express himself on an important subject, on which he has not always spoken so distinctly and so well; and concerning which his sentiments have not unfrequently been unfavourably misrepresented.

We have heard and seen it laid to the charge of Mr. Kingsley, that he speaks and treats of men as good by nature, as “born good.” The present volume contains an admirable sermon, entitled “Human Nature,” on the text, “So GOD created man in His own Image,” in which this subject is handled. The preacher maintains forcibly, that even man’s original goodness before the Fall was no inherent goodness; but only the result of a supernatural endowment, viz. the sustaining and life-giving Presence of GOD the WORD; that this endowment could only be maintained by faith and obedience; that man forfeited this “gift “ at the Fall; and that it is only by union with our LORD JESUS CHRIST, in Holy Baptism, that the gift is restored to him.

”What then does Holy Baptism mean? It means that GOD lifts us up again to that honour from whence Adam fell. That as Adam lost the honour of being GOD’S son, so JESUS CHRIST restores to us that honour. That as Adam lost the supernatural grace in which he stood, so GOD for CHRIST’S sake freely gives us back that grace, that we may stand by faith in that CHRIST, the WORD of GOD, Whom Adam disbelieved, and fell away.

“Baptism says, You are not true and right men by nature; you are only fallen men—men in your wrong place: but by grace you become [467] men indeed, true men; men living as man was meant to live, by faith, which is the gift of GOD. For without grace man is like a stream when the fountain-head is stopped; it stops too—lies in foul puddles, decays, and at last dries up. To keep the stream pure and living and flowing, the Fountain above must flow, and feed it forever.

“And so it is with man. Man is the stream; CHRIST is the Fountain of Life. Parted from Him mankind becomes foul and stagnant in sin and ignorance; and at last dries up and perishes, because there is no life in them. Joined to Him in Holy Baptism, mankind lives, spreads, grows; becomes stronger, better, wiser year by year; each generation of His Church teaching the one which comes after; as our LORD says, not only ‘If any man thirst, let him come to Me and drink;’ but also, ‘He that believeth in Me, out of him shall flow rivers of living water.’

“Heathendom is the foul and stagnant pool, parted from CHRIST, the Fount of Life. Christendom, in spite of all its sins and shortcomings, is the stream always fed from the Heavenly Fountain. And Holy Baptism is the River of the Water of Life which S. John saw in the Revelation, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the Throne of GOD and of the LAMB, the trees of which are for the healing of the nations. And when that river shall have spread over the world, there shall be no more curse, but the Throne of GOD and of the LAMB shall be in the City of GOD

“Then—when all men are brought into the fold of CHRIST’S Holy Church—then will they be men indeed; men not after nature, but after Grace, and the likeness of CHRIST, and the stature of perfect men,” &c. &c. Pp. 217—219.

The whole of this sermon is so good, and the practical duties flowing from its subject-matter so strikingly enforced, that we are loth to yield to the necessity of quoting so limited a portion.

The same subject is pursued in Sermon XXIX., “GOD’S Creation;” from which we extract the following:

“Yes: we may say boldly now, Whatever has been; whatever sin I inherited from Adam; however sinful I came into this world; GOD looks on me now, not as I am in Adam, but as I am in CHRIST. I am in CHRIST now, baptized into CHRIST, a new creature in CHRIST; to CHRIST I belong, and not to Adam at all; and GOD looks now, not on the old corrupt nature which I inherited from Adam, but on the new and good Grace which GOD meant

for me for all eternity, which CHRIST has given me now. It is that good and new Grace in me which GOD cares for; it is that good and new Grace which GOD is working on, to strengthen and perfect it, that I may grow in grace and in the likeness of CHRIST, and become at last what GOD intended me to be when He thought of me first before the foundation of all worlds, and said, ‘Let Us make man in Our Image, after Our likeness.’”—p. 272.

But this doctrine of our re-creation in CHRIST made to minister to carelessness and inaction? By no means. Numerous [468] and earnest are the appeals to practical, personal godliness, scattered throughout the volume.

We will quote a characteristic passage from the Sermon on “True Repentance,” directed against those who are for claiming the privileges of the Christian life without honestly striving to fulfil its duties; who console themselves with the idea that they are converted characters, because they like the excitement of hearing sermons and reading good books; who delude themselves with the notion that their sins are done away by CHRIST’S Blood when they are yet consciously living on in their sins.

“ Now, my dear friends, I complain of no one going to hear all the good they can; I complain of no one reading all the religious books they can: but I think—and more, I know—that hearing sermons and reading tracts may be, and is often, turned into a complete snare of the devil by people who do not wish to give up their sins and do right, but only want to be comfortable in their sins.

“Hear sermons if you will; read good books if you will: but bear in mind that you know already quite enough to lead you to repentance

“Now, my dear friends, let me ask you as reasonable beings, do you think that hearing me or any man preach, can save your souls alive? Do you think that sitting over a book an hour a day, or all day long, will save your souls alive? Do you think that your sins are washed away in CHRIST’S Blood, when they are there still, and you are committing them? Would they be here, and you doing them, if they were put away? Do you think that your sins can be put away out of GOD’S sight, if they are not even put out of your own sight? If you are doing wrong, do you think that GOD will treat you as if you were doing right? Cannot GOD see in you what you see in yourselves? Do you think a man can be clothed in CHRIST’S righteousness at the very same time that he is clothed in his own unrighteousness? Can he be good and bad at once? Do you think a man can be converted—that is, turned round—when he is going on his old road the whole week? Do you think that a man has repented—that is, changed his mind—when he is in just the same mind as ever, as to how he shall behave to his family, his customers, and everybody with whom he has to do? Do you think that a man is renewed by GOD’S Spirit, when except for few religious phrases, and a little more outside respectability, he is just the old man, the same character at heart, he ever was? ‘Be not deceived, GOD is not mocked. What a man sows, that shall he reap.’ Let no man deceive you. He that doeth righteousness is righteous even as CHRIST is righteous, and no one else.

He who tries to do as CHRIST did, and he only, has CHRIST’S righteousness imputed to him He who does righteousness, and he only, shall save his soul alive: not by *feeling* this thing, or *believing* about that thing, but by *doing* that which is lawful and right.”—Pp. 119—121.

The following beautiful passage occurs in a Christmas Day Sermon, entitled “CHRIST-Child.” [469]

“Yes, my dear children, you may think of GOD as a child now and always. For you, CHRIST is always the Babe of Bethlehem. Do not say to yourselves, ‘CHRIST is grown up long ago; He is a full-grown Man.’ He is, and yet He is not. His life is eternal in the Heaven, above all changes of time and space; for time and space are but His creatures and His tools. Therefore He can be all things to all men, because He is the Son of Man.

“Yes; all things to all men. Harken to me, you children, and you grown-up children also, if there be any in this church—for if you will receive it, such is the Sacred Heart of JESUS—all things to all; and wherever there is the true heart of a true human being, there, beating in perfect answer to it, is the Heart of CHRIST.

“To the strong He can be strongest; and to the weak, weakest of all. With the mighty He can be the King of kings; and yet with the poor He can wander, not having where to lay His Head. With quiet Jacob He goes round the farm, among the quiet sheep; and yet He ranges with wild Esau over battle field, and desert, and far unknown seas. With the mourner He weeps for ever; and yet He will sit as of old—if He be but invited—and bless the marriage feast. For the penitent He hangs for ever on the Cross; and yet for the man who works for GOD his FATHER, He stands for ever in His glory, His eyes like a flame of fire, and out of His mouth a two-edged sword, judging the nations of the earth. With the aged and the dying, He goes down for ever into the grave; and yet with you, children, CHRIST lives for ever on His Mother’s bosom, and looks up for ever into His Mother’s face, full of young life, and happiness, and innocence, the everlasting CHRIST-Child, in Whom you must believe, Whom you must love, to Whom you must offer up your childish prayers.

“The day will come when you can no longer think as a child, or pray as a child, but put away childish things. I do not know whether you will be the happier for that change. GOD grant that you may be the better for it. Meanwhile go home, and think of the Baby JESUS, *your* LORD, *your* pattern, *your* SAVIOUR; and ask Him to make you such good children to your mothers, as the little JESUS was to the Blessed Virgin, when He increased in knowledge and in stature, and in favour both with GOD and man.”—Pp. 179, 180.

We cannot withhold the following touching extract from Sermon XXXIII., “The Friend of Sinners.”

“O blessed Charity, bond of peace and of all virtues; of brotherhood and fellow-feeling between man and man, as children of one common FATHER. Ay, bond of all virtues—of generosity and of justice, of counsel and of understanding. Charity, unknown on earth before the coming of the Son of Man, Who was content to be called gluttonous and a wine-bibber, because He was the Friend of publicans and sinners!

“My friends, let us try to follow His steps; let us remember all day long what it is to be *men*; that it is to have every one whom we meet, for our brother in the sight of GOD; that it is *this*, never to meet any one, however bad he may be, for whom we cannot say, ‘CHRIST died [470] {#6} for that man, and CHRIST cares for him still. He is precious in GOD’S eyes; he shall be in mine also.’ . . .

“And if any of you have a neighbour or a relation fallen into sin, even into utter shame; oh, for the sake of Him Who ate and drank with publicans and sinners, never cast them off, never trample on them, never turn your back upon them. They are miserable enough already, doubt it not. Do not add one drop to their cup of bitterness. They are ashamed of themselves already, doubt it not. Do not you destroy in them what small grain of self-respect still remains. You fancy they are not so. They seem to you brazen-faced, proud,

impenitent. So did the publicans and harlots seem to those proud, blind Pharisees. Those pompous, self-righteous fools did not know what terrible struggles were going on in those poor sin-tormented hearts. Their pride had blinded them, while they were saying all along, 'It is we alone who see. This people, which knoweth not the law, is accursed.' Then came the LORD JESUS, the Son of Man, Who knew what was in man; and He spoke to them gently, cordially, humanly; and they heard Him, and justified GOD, and were baptized confessing their sins; and so, as He said Himself, the publicans and harlots went into the kingdom of GOD before those proud, self-conceited Pharisees." . . .

"And now, I will give you one lesson to carry home with you And my lesson is this. When you go out from this church into those crowded streets, remember that there is not a soul in them who is not as precious in GOD'S eyes as you are; not a little dirty ragged child whom JESUS, were He again on earth, would not take up in His arms and bless; not a publican or a harlot with whom, if they but asked Him, He would not eat and drink—now, here, in London on this Sunday, the 8th of June, 1856, as certainly as He did in Jewry beyond the seas, eighteen hundred years ago. Therefore do to all who are in want of your help, as JESUS would do to them if He were here; as JESUS is doing to them already: for He is here among us now and for ever seeking and saving that which was lost."—Pp. 319—324.

But we might easily multiply striking passages did our space admit of it. Among the Sermons deserving special commendation we may mention a deeply touching and beautiful one entitled "Dark Times;" an admirable Sermon on "True Prudence;" another equally valuable, headed "Heroes and Heroines;" and also a peculiarly suggestive and original one on "Music." For the interesting and ingenious line of thought contained in this last, as to the respective powers and functions of 'Melody' and 'Harmony' in musical composition, and the fundamental Archetypal Verities of which they are severally the earthly symbols and expressions, every devout musician, who reads the Sermon, must feel thankful.

In fact, throughout the whole volume there is so much to admire, that we feel loth to apply ourselves to the less grateful task of finding fault. But we have no alternative.

And first, we cannot but repeat our objection to the light and trifling manner in which subjects of the gravest import are occasionally handled. We are far from entertaining any rigid desire [471] to see all vivacity of style banished from the pulpit. By no means. Only let due care be taken that the subject-matter be such as will fairly admit of a lively treatment. To hear solemn and momentous themes referred to in a careless, indifferent tone is simply distressing. It is necessary for the preacher, it is necessary for his hearers, that the very approaches to these regions of awe and mystery should be guarded with scrupulous reverence; that the command, "Loose thy shoe from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground," should ever be devoutly regarded.

Now what subject can be conceived, in connection with which the faintest approach to levity would be more painfully unbecoming than the terrible theme of the final doom of the impenitent. And yet Mr. Kingsley seldom refers to that dread subject but in an easy half-joking way, which strikes us as singularly deplorable.

Thus, he disfigures one of his best Sermons by the following flippant dissuasive against people needlessly distressing themselves whether they shall be saved or not.

"In the first place, my friends, the Devil was a liar from the beginning, and therefore the chances are a million to one against his speaking the truth in any case; and if he tells

you that you are going to be damned, I should take that for a fair sign that you are *not* going to be damned, simply because the Devil says it, and therefore it *cannot* be true.” P. 282.

In fact, the salutary fear of future judgment—the personal application of the terrible warning, “The wicked shall be turned into Hell”—seems to be, throughout the volume, generally attributed to the suggestion of the Devil himself, “the Devil who slanders and curses GOD to men, and men to GOD.”

“And men [so he continues in his last sermon]—men who preach the Devil’s doctrine, will talk to us likewise, and say, ‘Yes, GOD is very dreadful, and very angry with you. GOD certainly intends to damn you. But *I* have a plan for delivering out of GOD’S hands; *I* know what you must do to be saved from GOD—join *my* sect or party, and believe and work with me, and then you will escape GOD.’

“But, after all, would it not be wiser, my friends, to hold our own tongues, and let GOD Himself speak.”—P. 372.

In another place he contrasts himself with other teachers in these words:

“I am here to talk to you about what is really going on in your soul, and mine; not to repeat to you doctrines at second-hand out of a book, and say, ‘There, that is what you have to believe and do; and if you do not, *you will go to Hell;*’ but to speak to you as men of like passions with myself,” &c.—P. 259.

Here is another passage, the mischievous exaggeration of which strikes us as extremely painful:

[472]

“If I were to get up in this pulpit, and preach the terrors of the law, and Wrath of GOD, and Hell fire: if I tried to bind heavy burdens on you and grievous to be borne, crying—you *must* do this, you *must* feel that, you *must* believe the other—while I, having fewer temptations and more education than you, touched not those burdens with one of my fingers; if I tried to make out as many sins as I could against you, crying continually, This was wrong, and that was wrong, making you believe that GOD is *always on the watch to catch you tripping*, and telling you that the least of your sins deserves endless torment—things which neither I nor any man can find in the Bible, nor in common justice, nor common humanity, nor elsewhere, save in the lying mouth of the Great Devil himself;—or if I put into your hands books of self-examination (as they are called) full of long lists of sins, frightening poor innocents, and defiling their thoughts and consciences, and making the heart of the righteous sad, whom GOD has not made sad;—if I, in plain English, had my mouth full of cursing and bitterness, threatening and fault-finding, and distrustful, and disrespectful, and insolent language about you my parishioners: why then I might fancy myself a Christian Priest, and a minister of the Gospel, and a very able, and eloquent, and earnest one; and might perhaps gain for myself the credit of being a ‘searching preacher,’ by speaking evil of people who are most of them as good and better than I, and by taking a low, mean, false view of that human nature which GOD made in His own Image and CHRIST justified in His own man’s flesh, and soul, and spirit: but instead of being an able minister of the New Covenant, or of the Spirit of GOD, I should be no such man, but the very opposite,” &c. &c.—Pp. 128—129.

Now this unfortunate passage indicates, only too clearly, one of the dangerous tendencies of this attractive volume. What is its title? “*Good News of GOD.*” Hence those parts of GOD’S revealed mind and will, which are not supposed to come under the category of

‘good;’ which are not likely to commend themselves to the acceptance of that mixed mass of characters composing an ordinary congregation—as for instance, His hatred of sin, and assured future punishment of the sinner—these must be either veiled, or gilded over. The revealed character of GOD is, in this volume, only *partially* represented; and is therefore *misrepresented*. The “good news of GOD,” is not GOD’S *own* ‘good news’ concerning Himself.

GOD is represented, indeed, (we quote Mr. Kingsley’s irreverent language,) as “an *honest*, and *honourable*, and *fair* GOD: not a deceiving or unfair GOD, who lays snares for His creatures, or leads them into temptation. That would be a *bad God*, a cruel GOD.” But there seems to be no adequate recognition of the august and awful *Holiness* of GOD; of the terrible malignity of sin—necessitating the ineffable Mystery of the Divine Atonement—and of the consequent and inevitable “fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation” for those who reject the Mercy held out to them.

[473]

Consistently with all this, Repentance is represented as the easiest possible work:—

“As soon as man turns round, and, instead of doing wrong, tries to do right, he need be under no manner of fear or terror any more. He is taken back into his FATHER’S house as freely and graciously as the prodigal son in the parable was. Whatsoever dark score there was against him in GOD’S books, is wiped out *there and then* (!), and he starts clear, a new man, with a fresh chance of life. And whosoever tells him that the score is not wiped out, lies, and contradicts flatly GOD’S Holy Word.”—P. 122.

Here is no mention whatever made of “godly sorrow” for past sin, of lowly contrition, or confession. The “Ministry of Reconciliation” is simply and entirely ignored. These humbling doctrines seem to form no portion of the “Good News” which Mr. Kingsley feels commissioned to announce to a flock, who are “most of them as good, and better than himself.” It is only necessary to add, that if Mr. Kingsley’s statement of the doctrine of the “Remission of Sins,” viz., that, “as soon as a man turns round, and instead of doing wrong tries to do right . . . whatsoever dark score there was against him in GOD’S books is wiped out there and then,” be a full and sufficient statement, then such passages as (e.g.) S. John xx.

23, Gal. vi. 1; S. James v. 14—16; 1 S. John i. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 7, 10; vii. 10, 11; together with others of a similar character, which illustrate or enunciate the conditions of Evangelical Forgiveness, and the ordinary channels through which it is conveyed, have no abiding meaning, and might never have been written.

We have no wish to misrepresent Mr. Kingsley. We doubt not his object is to show GOD’S loving readiness to forgive; and, at the same time, to insist on the necessity of a change of life, to render forgiveness possible. Moreover, that the grant of forgiveness is for the alone “sake of JESUS, the Lamb slain,” he distinctly assures us. But still, this doctrine of Repentance and remission is of far too momentous a nature to be treated so carelessly and imperfectly, and in a way so likely to mislead, as is unfortunately the case in the present volume. The only allusion to the Ministry of Reconciliation, and to the “good news of GOD”—that “He hath given *power* and commandment to His Ministers” (acting in their Master’s Name) “to declare and *pronounce* to His people, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins”—occurs in a foolish and uncharitable attack upon the practice of Confession in the Church of Rome. (p. 117.)

But the most reprehensible portion of Mr. Kingsley’s “Good News” is, where he dares to intimate to his flock that repentance and forgiveness may take place even in *Hell*

What else is the meaning of the following passage, from a striking Sermon, entitled, “the Measure of the Cross?” He is [474] descanting upon the wide-extending efficacy of the Cross of CHRIST. After speaking of the *breadth*, and *length*, and *height* of the Cross, he proceeds:—

“And how *deep* is the Cross of CHRIST?

“This is a great Mystery, and one which people in these days are afraid to look at . . . But if the Cross of CHRIST be as high as Heaven, then, it seems to me, it must also be as deep as Hell, *deep enough to reach the deepest sinner in the deepest pit to which he may fall*. We know that CHRIST descended into Hell We know that when the wicked man turns from his wickedness, and does what is lawful and right, he will save his soul alive. We know that GOD tells us that His ways are not *unequal*—that He has not one law for one man, and another for another, and one law for one year, and another for another. It is possible, therefore, that *He has not one law for this life, and another for the life to come.*” (The italics are our own.)—P. 152.

Now what, we repeat, is the plain purport of this passage, but to intimate that after this life—in Hell itself—in the abodes of the lost—there is a prospect of Repentance¹ and Recon-ciliation; that the Cross of CHRIST may save those who are there suffering the everlasting penalty irrevocably attached to the wilful rejection, in this life, of Salvation by the Cross; that GOD in fact, may, after all, deny Himself: and that the dread threatenings of Holy Scripture, which tell of the “wrath to come,” and the hopeless anguish of those who shall be subjects of that wrath, are, perhaps, a *fabrication*.

We can only enter our warm and indignant protest against this style of preaching, which, without daring overtly to deny the simple statements of GOD’S written Word, and the plain teaching of the Church, yet sets itself to invest them with an atmosphere of doubt and uncertainty; which satisfies itself by *insinuating* that probably GOD does not really mean what He says; which whispers “Peace, peace, when there is no peace;” which seeks to blunt the edge and weaken the force of GOD’S merciful, but awful warnings; which hints that Everlasting Death is not, perchance, an object of such woeful dread, as we have been led to imagine, for that it *may*, possibly, come to an end—Eternal Death *may* be but the vestibule [475] of Eternal Life—the Great Gulf *may* have been bridged over by this time, and a passage have been discovered from the abyss of Hell, and the company of devils and lost souls, into the realms of the Blessed, and the Presence of the chamber of GOD?

How does S. Chrysostom address those who seek to weaken the force of Divine threatenings?

“Why deceive thyself, O man, and put cheats upon thy soul? Why fight with the *Love* of GOD toward man. For through *Love* it was that He threatened Hell, to the end that we

¹ [Greek]—*S. Clem. Rom. Ep. ii. c.8*

“Quando istinc excessum fuerit *nullus* jam *pœnitentiæ locus* est, nullus satisfactionis effectus: *hic* vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur; *hic* saluti æternæ cultu DEI et fructi fidei providetur.” *S. Cypr. ad Demetr.*

We sincerely regret to observe the same objectionable line of thought (suggesting a “*locus pœnitentiæ*” for the damned) stealthily reappearing, and introducing itself in a most attractive and seemingly unexceptionable language, in the Sermon “*De Profundis*.” In fact, so far as we are able to penetrate into the not very manifest meaning of this Sermon, it appears to us that the hope of final deliverance from the very abyss of Hell, even after the departure from this life, underlies its whole teaching. We notice an explanation of the parable of Dives and Lazarus casually volunteered, which refers to “torments” of the former merely to this world. Vid. p. 71.

might not be cast into it, having by this *fear* become better. And, thus, he who does away with speaking on these subjects, doth nothing else than covertly thrust us into Hell, and drive us thither by this deceit. Slacken not the hands of those, then, that labour for virtue, nor *make the listlessness of the that sleep greater*. For if the many be persuaded that there is no Hell, when will they leave off vice?"—Hom. xxvi. in Ep. ad Rom.

And again,—

"Let us continually bear in mind the awful Judgment-seat, the stream of fire, the indissoluble chains, the darkness with no ray of light, the gnashing of teeth, and the venomous worm." . . . And this torment shall last for ever. . . . "For, that there shall *never* be any termination, hear His own words: 'Their worm shall *not* die, neither shall the fire he quenched.' And, ' These shall go away into everlasting Life, the other into everlasting punishment.' Now if the *Life* be *eternal*, the *punishment* is likewise *eternal* . . . Let then those that talk in this way; [i.e. weakening the force of GOD'S threatenings,] leave off deceiving both themselves and others: since even for these words of theirs will they be punished, for detracting from those awful things, and undoing the awe of many who are minded to be in earnest."—Hom. xxv. in Ep. ad Rom.

It will be at once seen from this brief extract from S. Chrysostom, as it might be shown from multitudes of kindred passages from the great Fathers and Doctors of the Church, how entirely they were ignorant of the modern gloss of Mr. Maurice and his sceptical school, which seeks to evacuate of their force and terror the dread warnings of Scripture with regard to the *Eternity* of punishment, and Eternal Death, by ruling that all idea of time must be eliminated from our conception of the word Eternal; that the word must be scrupulously dissociated from any notion of *duration*, else we shall utterly fail in apprehending its signification.

We venture to think that the great Saints of bygone times, "mighty in the Scriptures," are more to be trusted on such points than the shallow self-confident speculators of modern days.

To refer for instance to the passage just quoted. What does S. Chrysostom mean, when he argues from our LORD'S own words, that the punishment in store for the ungodly is no less *eternal* than is the Life which shall be the reward of the righteous? Does he [476] *intend* us to disconnect Eternity from any conception of duration? On the contrary, the very question he is answering is one in which endless continuance is the uppermost idea. "How is it [argues the objector,] that we are to be the subjects of a *deathless* punishment ([Greek]) hereafter, after having sinned here only a short time ([Greek])?"

In like manner, in another place (How. xxxiii. in I Ep. ad Cor.) he writes: "As the punishments here cease with the present life; so the future punishments continue for ever ([Greek])."

Elsewhere he writes of the [Greek] (Hom. v. ad pop. Antioch.)

How, again, does S. John Damascene define "*Eternal*" punishment in his Treatise [Greek] (Lib. ii. Orthod. Fid. e. 1.)? He says that the word "*Eternal*" describes the *interminable condition* ([Greek]) of the future state. "After the Resurrection," he adds, "there will be no more computation by days and nights; rather one day without evening; . . . but to sinners a night profound and *endless*." ([Greek])

The following passage from S. Gregory is much to the point:

“Sunt enim nunc etiam, qui idcirco peccatis suis ponere finem negligunt, quia habere quandoque finem futura super se judicia suspicantur. Quibus breviter respondemus: Si quandoque finienda sunt supplicia reprobatorum, quandoque finienda sunt ergo et gaudia beatorum: per semetipsam namque Veritas dicit, ‘Ibunt hi in supplicium: æternum, justi autem in vitam æternam.’ Si igitur hoc verum non est quod minatus est, neque verum ets illud quod promisit.” (S. Greg. Magn. Moral. Lib. xxxiv. cap. 19.)

And the following to the same effect, from S. Augustine.

“Si *utrumque* ‘æternum;’ profecto, aut *utrumque cum fine diuturnum*, aut *utrumque sine fine perpetuum* debet intelligi. Paria enim relata sunt, hinc ‘supplicium æternum,’ inde ‘vita æterna.’ Dicere autem in hoc uno eodemque sensu, ‘vita æterna’ sine fine erit, ‘supplicium æternum’ finem habebit, multum absurdum est. Unde, quia ‘vita æterna’ Sanctorum *sine fine* erit, ‘supplicium’ quoque ‘æternum’ quibus erit, *finem* procul dubio *non habebit.*”¹

But it is needless to multiply quotations, or to look elsewhere; for Holy Scripture itself, not only nowhere leads us to disconnect the idea of endless duration from our conception of eternal punishment, but absolutely compels us to recognise it as one awful and [477] inevitable constituent of that punishment. “There is no comfort” (writes Archer Butler,) “in those unsubstantial shadows which the impatient curiosity, or secret terrors of man have interposed between himself and the inevitable truth. They leave us unsheltered, unreprieved; naked and trembling before the terrible simplicity of Revelation—of those unambiguous Oracles in which that GOD, Who is a ‘consuming fire,’ hath described Himself in the very volume of Mercy, as bidding the cursed into ‘everlasting fire,’ into a ‘fire that is not quenched,’ that is ‘unquenchable,’ whose ‘smoke ascendeth up for ever,’ whose ‘torment is *day and night for ever and ever.*”

That we are unable to grasp the appalling reality, here threatened, in its absolute truth, is unquestioned. In order to do this—in order to apprehend it ‘in the way of direct perception’—we should need ‘faculties on the scale of Eternity itself.’

But what we maintain and what not all the mischievous sophistry of Mr. Maurice and his sentimental school² can prevail to disprove—is this;—that Holy Scripture does deliberately exhibit Eternal punishment under the aspect of an endless duration of woe;—that (if language is designed to convey any idea whatever), this representation of the *perpetuity* of happiness or misery, and of the fixed and irreversible nature of the sentence pronounced at the Judgment, is a representation which the GOD of Love and Truth Himself *intends* to press upon us, as at once a stimulus to our sluggish exertions, and also as the best

¹ In the same chapter he writes: “Ceterum, eos qui putant *minaciter* potiusquam *veraciter* dictum: ‘Discedite a me, maledicti, in ignem æternum;’ et, ‘Ibunt isti in supplicium æternum;’ et, ‘Cruciabunt in *secula seculorum;*’ et, ‘Vermis eorum non morietur, et ignis non extinguitur;’ et cætera hujusmodi; non tam *ego*, quam ipsa Scriptura Divina planissime atque plenissime redarguit et refellit.”

But see this melancholy question, as o the hopeless perpetuity of the woe of the condemned, discussed in the “*Summa.*” Suppl. Q. 99.

² We must not be understood to make Mr. Kingsley responsible for all Mr. Maurice’s hollow speculations on the word ‘eternal.’ How far he would endorse them we know not. We merely know that, by whatever theoretical processes, they both *seem* to arrive at the same practical conclusion, that the Catholic Church, in teaching unhesitatingly for eighteen hundred years the everlasting and unalterable woe of the damned, has been teaching erroneously.

It is only right to add that, in one of his sermons, Mr. Kingsley does emphatically *connect* the idea of perpetual duration with the word ‘eternal.’ He says that nothing can be designated ‘eternal’ but what has *already* existed from everlasting—in fact, but GOD Himself. And yet he seems to speak (p. 215) of our LORD’S *human* nature as “eternal.” He surely cannot mean to intimate that It has existed from everlasting.

expression and translation into the language of our finite conceptions, of an inconceivable and inexpressible Reality;—that it becomes, therefore, the solemn and imperative duty of those who wish to conform their teaching with that of GOD’S Revelation, faithfully and fearless to proclaim this Truth in GOD’S own language;—and that those who, presuming to be wiser, or more just, or more merciful than GOD, in any measure seek to conceal, or improve upon, this portion of His Revelation, are in so far, grievously dishonouring GOD, trifling with their own souls, and imperilling the souls of those whom GOD has entrusted to their keeping.

We have dwelt at length, perhaps, on certain objectionable features in Mr. Kingsley’s sermons, than their prominence in the [478] volume seemed to call for. But error is not less dangerous because it does not thrust itself obtrusively forward; because it presents itself in seemingly unexceptionable guise, and in company with much that is truly good and excellent.

In conclusion however, we still have pleasure in recording our conviction that, with all its failings alike in style and matter, this volume possesses sterling merit, and is replete with what is noble in thought and forcible in expression. Many of the sermons are such as few can read without benefit; without feeling themselves braced up to a more cheerful and vigorous discharge of their duties, and actuated by a more loving trust in GOD, and more lively sympathy with their fellow men. Nor must we fail to notice with satisfaction, the many expressions of genuine unaffected reverence for the Church of England spontaneously and unobtrusively presenting themselves throughout the volume. Neither, lastly, can we withhold an expression of pleasure at the tokens which the book affords, that, notwithstanding his occasional theological aberrations, this able and vigorous writer is steadily gravitating towards a deeper and more unreserved submission to the teaching of the Church Catholic; that he is losing somewhat of his over self-reliance; is becoming more humble, teachable, receptive; and thus qualifying himself for greater usefulness, and for the attainment of larger measures of that True Wisdom, whereof the Eternal SPIRIT is the alone Inspirer, the Sacred Scriptures the sole infallible depository, the “Holy Church throughout all the world,” the one only divinely authorized mouthpiece and exponent.

Mr. Kingsley’s sermons have detained us so long, that we have small space for those of Professor Stanley. Nor need the latter occupy us long. In their general cast and complexion they are utterly dissimilar to those of Mr. Kingsley. Instead of practical, homely discourses, characterized by a terse pointed brevity, and rugged energy, we meet with carefully elaborated and finished compositions, pervaded by a tone of chastened refinement, and graceful gentleness, but, withal, deficient in force and point. The language, we need hardly say, is thoroughly unexceptionable—at times, peculiarly felicitous and picturesque: but most of the sermons are too fragmentary and discursive, too indefinite in aim, for the pulpit; and are far more suited for quiet reading in the study.

We consider the somewhat ambitious title of the book as unfortunate. It awakens expectations which are doomed to disappointment.

As a treatise on the ‘Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching’—an attempt (so we should interpret the title) to exhibit, in some sort of systematic and scientific manner, the absolute oneness of Evangelical and Epistolary portions of the New Testament, underlying their diversity of style and matter; to point [479] out the essential identity of ‘the Gospel,’ as proclaimed in the perfection of its Divine integrity by our LORD, and as expanded, developed, applied in the teaching of His Inspired Apostles; to exemplify how the explicit ‘doctrinal’ announcements which meet us in the writings of the latter, are all contained,

implicitly and in germ, in the living, pregnant utterances of the Incarnate WORD—regarded in this light, the book strikes us a complete failure.

In fact, as in any sense a contribution to pure, or exegetical theology, (as the title would lead us to anticipate) the work is thoroughly disappointing. Professor Stanley's mind is eminently unscientific and untheological. As for dogmatic theology, he evidently shrinks, with pious horror, from the very name of the thing. It is rather amusing to observe how instinctively he recoils from committing himself to any doctrinal statement whatever. Nay—he is ever seeking to impress upon us that 'doctrine' merely means 'teaching,' i.e., '*practice*;' and that practical Christianity is purely independent of speculative questions.

Hear the easy, gentle way in which he sums up the general "object he has had in view in these discourses:"—

"It is not that I wish to disparage creeds or sacraments," [we feel duly grateful for the admission] "or ceremonies, or absence of ceremonies, or circumcision or uncircumcision,[!] or clergy or congregation, anything else that GOD has given, or that man has invented for the support and the nourishment of *faith*¹ within us. All and each of these in their place *may* be most worthy of attention, of study, of explanation. But what the Apostle teaches, is that all these things are means to an end; and this end is the making of men, women, and children wiser, happier, and better—in one word, more like CHRIST, and more fit for Heaven. This is the proportion of faith, as it is set forth in Scripture. Compared with this, all other things are as nothing," &c., &c.—Pp. 270, 271.

To like effect he writes in another passage, in a most jejune and superficial Sermon on the "New Creation." He is alluding to our religious "differences," and thus delivers himself:—

"Think of those differences in the *gravest* form in which you like to put them; think of the Church, the *party*, the *sect*, the *opinions*, against which you feel most keenly. And then remember that 'in CHRIST JESUS' they 'avail nothing at all.' They may avail, they may be of importance, socially, ecclesiastically, politically, philosophically but not 'in CHRIST JESUS' because they *belong not to the* [480] *essentials* of religion, not to its substance, not to its life, but only to its outward accidents, its bulwarks and defences. We do not find them in the life of CHRIST in the Gospels; we do not find them in the parts of the Epistles which most nearly resemble the Gospels, and which are *most near to the Spirit of CHRIST* (!)."—Pp. 193—194.

Now, in so far as this paragraph has any meaning at all, (which we venture to doubt,) it is deserving of the severest possible censure. It is simply a repetition of Pope's famous distich:—

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight:
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right."

Any comment upon the lax and mischievous tendency of the above extract would, we are persuaded, be superfluous.

We merely notice, in passing, the last clause, in which Dr Stanley speaks of certain portions of the Epistles being "*more near to the Spirit of CHRIST*" than others: and we ask, Does he believe, or does he not, that it was One and the same Divine SPIRIT who "spake by

¹ This barren Zuinglian conception of the Holy Sacraments, that they are mere aids to *faith*, appears to be the only one entertained by Dr. Stanley. As for any recognition of their being the Divinely ordained means of joining us to, and incorporating us with CHRIST, of communicating to us "of His fulness," and making us "partakers of the Divine Nature"—we look in vain for it. Thus, we read again in the 7th Sermon: "They" [sacraments, &c.] "are all means to an end; and that end is to give us a firmer and fuller *belief* in CHRIST." Cf. pp. 94, 95.

the SON,” (for “He whom GOD hath sent speaketh the words of GOD, *because* GOD giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him,”) and who “spake by” the Apostles—does he not believe, moreover, that the same plenary Inspiration pervades all their canonical writings *equally*; or does he hold that some portions of the Epistles are more inspired than others?

We ask this, because the incidental allusions to Scripture Inspiration scattered throughout the volume, are most perplexing. Whether the accomplished Professor has any definite ‘views’ on this important subject or not, we are hopelessly unable to discover. We trust the following expression of opinion may be more intelligible to our readers than it is to ourselves.

“We sometimes ask, what is meant by Inspiration. This is Inspiration. It is Inspiration, it is the Gift of GOD’S Spirit, that through the whole of the Scriptures there is, though expressed in divers manners, the same unmistakable *mode of speaking* ‘with authority, and not as the scribes.’ We feel as we read that there is in the Scriptures a solemnity, a simplicity, a dignity which ordinary writers have not. They command our attention,” &c., &c.—P. 70.

But it would, unfortunately, be easy enough to multiply instances of lax, careless, superficial, or defective theological teaching dispersed throughout this volume. Let us rather turn, for one moment, to a more grateful task, and acknowledge, as we cordially do, the real excellence of much that is contained in it.

There is a spirit of gentle wisdom, of persuasive and thoughtful earnestness pervading the hortatory and practical portions of these discourses (which occupy a considerable portion of the book) which lends a value and charm to the whole volume, and which greatly tends to atone for its grave deficiencies, and to counterbalance the [481] disappointment awakened by its inadequate fulfilment of its professed object.

Again: although in the sacred domain of Scripture Exposition and Interpretation, into which the author’s subject-matter necessarily conducts him, we meet with nothing profound, nothing indicating any far penetrating spiritual intuition; still, in the lower regions of illustration and application, we meet with much that is valuable, interesting, original and suggestive.

We feel that a writer who can pen such sermons, as, for instance, the admirable one on the “Wisdom of CHRIST,” with others of nearly equal merit, contained in the present series, is one from whom the Church has a right to look for much true and useful service. GOD grant that such expectations may even yet be realised!

We rise from the perusal of both these volumes with the same mingled feelings; of having been, on the one hand, interested, instructed, (we trust) benefited; but yet, on the other, pained and disappointed.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 22 (Joseph Masters: London, 1860)

[62]GALTON'S LECTURES ON THE BOOK OF REVELATION

Notes of Lectures on the Book of Revelation, delivered in the parish church of S. Sidwell, Exeter. By JOHN LINCOLN GALTON, M.A., Incumbent. Two Vols. London: Masters.

THE increased attention paid by sober-minded and devout men in all sections of the Church to the study of the Apocalypse, is unquestionably one of the significant marks of the present time.

That the minds of Christians will be more and more turned to this "Sure Word of Prophecy" as the world's twilight grows on apace; that the necessity for its Divine guidance will be more anxiously felt, as the evening closes in—is to be fully anticipated; nor can it be doubted but that, amid the deepening gloom and lengthening shadows, the Light shining from its pages will ever appear, to those who "take heed to it," to burn with a more clear, steady, and welcome radiance.

The Author of the present Lectures seems to us to have undertaken a good and seasonable work, in endeavouring, in a thoroughly sober and catholic spirit, to popularise the study of the Revelation of S. John; and, by employing it as a vehicle for earnest practical teaching, to demonstrate how replete it is—even notwithstanding its mysteries—with matter for "doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction."

Mr. Galton's volumes take the form, not of a commentary, but of a continuous series of short, earnest, practical sermons (delivered extempore, and taken down in short-hand by one who attended the course) during the progress of which the preacher boldly conducts his hearers through the entire range of the Revelation of S. John.

To say that the work loses, in a strictly exegetical point of view, by its homiletic character; that, as an exposition of the whole Apocalypse, it bears traces of lack of system and precision; that it somewhat fails in continuity, clearness, definiteness; that it suffers from its discursive and fragmentary character—is only to say what might have been more or less anticipated of an attempt of this nature.

We cannot but feel, moreover, that the "Notes" would have gained by compression and retrenchment. The frequent digressions—whether explanations of other portions of Holy Scripture, or allusions to matters of ephemeral or local concern, or applications of the several Sermons to the successive seasons of the Christian year in which they chanced to be preached—although often striking and felicitous, interesting doubtless to those who heard [63] the Sermons, and calculated to impart a life-like reality to the whole, are yet hardly possessed of sufficient permanent and intrinsic importance to warrant their reproduction, in a published form, in a work devoted to the elucidation of the most mysterious and difficult of all books. These extraneous accretions swell the volumes needlessly, arrest the regular flow of thought; and, by increasing the labour of reading, and the difficulty of reference (there is no index), in some measure detract from the value and usefulness of the book to the ordinary Apocalyptic student.

Still we not the less regard Mr. Galton's "Notes" as a valuable and successful attempt, as abounding in beautiful and suggestive matter, and well worthy the perusal of all thoughtful Christian people.

In Mr. Galton's general system of interpretation we find so much with which we cordially coincide, that, in adverting to one or two points wherein we are compelled to differ from his conclusions, we do so, not with any view to depreciate his work as a whole; but rather, by suggesting differences of opinion, to contribute, in however slight degree, in forwarding the common aim of author and reviewer—namely, the clearing up of some of the multitudinous difficulties which encompass the Apocalyptic Visions.

The very first verse of the Revelation presents two points on which we are unable to accept the conclusions of the Lecturer:

“The Revelation of JESUS CHRIST, which GOD gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass.”

Now the Lectures open with the consideration of the question: What is the meaning of the expression, “The Revelation of JESUS CHRIST?” Does it signify that our LORD Himself is the *Revealer*, or that the object of the Revelation is to reveal *Him*? Is it “CHRIST the Revealer, or CHRIST the Revealed?”

Mr. Galton decides, erroneously as we think, in favour of the latter. “The Revelation of JESUS CHRIST,” he says, “is the Revealing of JESUS CHRIST: that is, the subject-matter of the book is to unfold Him in His glory, even as the Gospels do in the main unfold Him in His humiliation.”

But if this be the meaning, what (we would ask) is the force of the accompanying words, “*which God gave to Him?*”

We must remember that our Blessed LORD, in the days of His humiliation (as our Author forcibly reminds us) was a participator in human ignorance. The mysteries of the latter days were hidden from Him as man. In unutterable condescension He “took upon Him the form of a servant.” But “the servant knoweth not what His LORD doeth.” Hence in that Gospel which peculiarly reveals our LORD under the aspect of the Servant,¹ we meet with the [64] astounding announcement, “Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the Angels which are in Heaven, *neither the Son*; but the FATHER.”

But with His Resurrection and Ascension, His Human Nature received new and transcendent capacities. It became penetrated and invested with “all the fulness of the Godhead.” “GOD highly exalted Him.” That Dignity and Divinity which, as GOD, He had possessed from all eternity, as Man, He received from the FATHER as a reward for His meritorious obedience and sufferings. And as one evidence of this exaltation, and forming part of the vast endowment, GOD gave to Him, as Mediator and Head of the Church, this Revelation as to the future of His Visible and Mystical Body. No sooner does He receive the Revelation than He communicates it to His Church, in conformity with His own previous words, “All things which the FATHER hath showed to Me, *I have made known* unto you.” We conceive then that the expression under notice evidently brings before us “CHRIST as the *Revealer*.”

The orderly and mysterious chain of communication between Heaven and earth in the Economy of Grace, as indicated in this verse, is not a little worthy of attention. The

¹ The Gospel according to S. Mark; vide *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xv. p. 362—4.

FATHER gives the Revelation to the SON. The SON communicates the Revelation to an Angel. The Angel in turn, by means of a marvellous system of symbols, exhibits it to the entranced gaze of the Holy Seer of Patmos. The Apostle transcribes these symbols, and bequeaths them to the reverent contemplation of the Church.

The other point on which we differ from our Author in this verse is his interpretation of the words [Greek]. He rejects the ordinary rendering, “the things which must shortly come to pass,” and substitutes, “things which are to come to pass *in a short space of time:*” i. e., things which, when GOD begins to work them (whether shortly or long hence) shall be all “consummated within an incredibly brief period of man’s history.” This rendering is adopted in consequence of its agreeing, better than the ordinary one, with the general scheme of interpretation advocated throughout the book.

Here are two features of that scheme against which the common translation appears to militate.

The first—that the whole cycle of events up to chap. xx. refers wholly and exclusively to a very brief critical period immediately preceding the Second Advent.

The second—that, *previous* to this period, chap. xx. predicts the thousand years reign of CHRIST and His saints; of which anon.

It is obvious, then, how much more favourable to both these points of exegesis, is the suggested, than the ordinarily received interpretation of [Greek]. For, first, all reference to the great events of former times, as (e. g.) the Downfall of Heathen Rome, the Rise of the Mahomedan power, the Revival of the Empire under [65] Charlemagne—so earnestly insisted on by varying commentators—will be at once excluded, by the fact of their having extended over a long series of years: whereas the cycle of events which it is the particular province of the Apocalypse to disclose, is one which, once entered upon, must be consummated [Greek], in “an incredibly brief period of man’s history.”—And, secondly, the *previous* position of the thousand years will be thus found to be in strict accordance with the other Revelations of the Book; inasmuch as the Interpreting Angel gives no reason for supposing that this dread series of events shall be fulfilled either *before* or *after* the expiration of a thousand years; but merely affirms that whensoever (whether shortly, or after a protracted period) “these things *begin* to come to pass,” they will be evolved with amazing rapidity.

Now without any reference to the supposed exigencies of any system of interpretation, we must merely express our full conviction that the common translation is the correct one. The expression occurs in several places in the New Testament. Take an example from this very book, “The Lord God hath sent His Angel to show to His servants the things which must shortly ([Greek]) be done. *Behold, I come quickly.*” (Rev. xxii. 6.) Surely this is a note of preparation for the *speedy* accomplishment of what is here revealed. In like manner, Rom. xvi. 20, “The God of Peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly,” ([Greek])¹

In fact, our Lord’s *speedy* approach forms the whole burden of the Revelation of S. John. “Blessed are they that hear the words of this Prophecy . . . for the time is *at hand*,” (i. 3.) “Behold, *I come quickly*; hold fast that which thou hast,” (iii. 11.) “Behold, *I come as a*

¹ Cf. Acts xii. 7; xxii. 18; xxv. 4.

thief.” (xvi. 15.) “Behold, *I come quickly*: Blessed is he which keepeth the sayings of the Prophecy of this Book.” (xxii. 7.) “He which testifieth of these things saith, *Surely I come quickly, Amen.*” (xxii. 20.)

And the other New Testament writers frequently express the same truth: “It is the last time.” “The night is far spent, the Day is at hand.” Upon us “the ends of the world have come.” “The Judge standeth at the door.” “Yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry.” “The Lord is at hand.”

Now it will not do for us to part with this idea. The attitude of the Church is to be one of constant watching and expectation of a Lord Who is always coming.¹

And this, we may add, is one of the many reasons why we cannot accept the interpretation of the 1000 years reign—which yet has so much to recommend it, and is advocated with so much ability and modesty in the present volumes—which identifies it with the hidden, spiritual reign of Christ and His Saints in the Heavenly places, during the period intervening between the first and second Advents. Surely the broad announcement that 1000 years at least had yet to elapse before our Lord’s second Appearing seems altogether inconsistent with the uniform language of the rest of the New Testament, and the reiterated warnings, “The Lord is at hand:” “Behold, I come quickly.” But we shall refer to this again.

With regard to our Author’s explanation of the successive sequences of Seals, Trumpets, Vials, we believe he is right in regarding their main fulfilment as still future; but not so as excluding all partial, precursive, and lesser accomplishments. His lectures on these do not offer much material for special notice: their only fault is, the somewhat superficial mode in which they deal with their very difficult subject-matter.

The series of sermons on the allegory of the Woman and the Beasts we take to be the most valuable and successful part of the work. Mr. Galton adopts, though with independent exercise of judgment, the general line of interpretation advocated, on one or two occasions, in these pages, maintained by Mr. Isaac Williams, Professor Auberlen, and other eminent writers—which regards the Mystical Babylon as a representation of corrupt Christendom.

“The Harlot,” he writes, “represents nothing short of the whole of the visible Church at the time of the end; with the exception of a small remnant prefigured by the suffering Church of Smyrna, and the loving Church of Philadelphia.”

In connection with this sad subject we will quote a passage as at once affording a specimen of our Author’s style, and also well demanding our anxious attention. He is referring to that awful feature in the Apostle’s description of the Harlot—her being “drunken with the Blood of God’s saints.”

¹ True it is that, notwithstanding the reiterated announcements of CHRIST’S speedy return, there are yet many hints scattered throughout the New Testament, of His coming being *actually* delayed—that (to speak after the manner of men) our LORD’S plans of mercy would be disconcerted by the faithlessness of His Church and of the “ministers and stewards sent to prepare His Way.” “While the Bridegroom *tarried*, they all slumbered and slept.” “I gave her *space* to repent of her fornication; and she repented not.” But these incidental intimations do not negative the general assertion made in the text.

“If the view given by some, that this Woman represents heathenism, were correct, the Apostle would not have *marvelled* when he saw her ‘drunken with the blood of the saints and martyrs of Christ.’ But if this Woman be a symbolical representation of the whole Church of the last days, the Apostle might indeed be surprised to behold her, who once seemed the Spouse of Christ, drunken with the blood of His children. There is a passage, which, after every successive perusal, impresses the mind with a deeper conviction of its amazing awfulness, in S. Luke xii. Our Lord had been speaking of the necessity of watchfulness, because He would come at an hour when men would not expect Him: and when ‘Peter said unto Him, Lord, speakest Thou this pa[67]rable unto us, or even unto all? the LORD said, Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his lord shall make ruler over his household. . . But and if that servant say in his heart, My lord delayeth his coming, and shall begin to *beat* the menservants and maidens, and to eat and drink, and to be drunken, the lord of that servant will come in a day when he looketh not for him, and will cut him in sunder,’ &c.

“Now if we look at these words, it appears that our LORD designed to intimate, that the Church, at first faithful and wise, as a steward fully conscious that he must give an account of his stewardship, would ultimately pass into the condition of one who would disregard his master’s commands, and ‘begin to beat the menservants and maidens, and to eat, and drink, and to be drunken.’ For evidently there is *no change of person* when our LORD is describing this awful transition from one state to another. So that what S. John says in the address to the Seven Churches, comes out with fearful distinctness. In the seven Churches we saw that five were corrupt: only the suffering Church of Smyrna, and the loving Church of Philadelphia were faithful, and had promises without threatenings. All the rest exhibited, in some particular form, alienation from the living GOD. And to these were addressed the following denunciations ‘I will fight against thee with the sword of My mouth.’ ‘I will spue thee out of My mouth.’ What awful words! S. John then naturally *marvels*. It is the only passage in the whole book where it is said that he did marvel.” —Vol.ii. pp. 94—96.¹

With regard to the symbol of the Beast, Mr. Galton adopts, what we conceive to be the true interpretation, which sees in it a combined “exhibition of the powers of the world, put forth in opposition to CHRIST; beginning with the earliest times.” “ If,” he continues, “we believe that the Number 7 in Scripture is a keynote, implying perfection, the expression, 7 heads, must be interpreted as representing all the dominions which the world has ever seen.” (Vol. i. p. 500.)

As this first Beast symbolised the *Power* of the world, so does the second, the *Wisdom* of the world: this latter exhibiting the same diabolic counter-relation and antagonism to the Blessed Spirit, as the former to the Incarnate SON.²

The Image of the Beast he regards (correctly, as we believe; and as we have heretofore maintained in these pages³) as symbolising the Personal Antichrist.

¹ We have been compelled slightly to compress this extract for want of space.

² Vid. *Ecclesiastic*, Vol. XIX. (June, 1857) pp. 282—285. φ ‘Auberlen on Daniel, and the Apocalypse’, pp. 258ff *supra*).

³ *Ibid.* Vol. XX. (October, 1858) pp. 437—440. φ ‘The Voice of the Last Prophet’ pp. 280ff *supra*).

The Beast's deadly wound, he holds to have been the death-stroke inflicted on the world and its Prince on Calvary.

In the 5 fallen heads, he sees the old Monarchies of the world which preceded the Apostle's

time;¹ in the then existing head, the [68] regnant power of Rome; in the head yet to arise and "continue a short space," the future kingdom of Antichrist.

On the expression, "He is an eighth," the lecturer does not appear to us very intelligible. In fact to explain such an enigma in a sermon, is obviously no easy task: to say nothing of the difficulty of explaining it *at all*.

Does not the following seem the true solution of the Mystery?

It would appear that the 7th, or Antichristian, head or kingdom passes through two distinct phases. When it first emerges—i.e. when the powers of the world throw off their Christian character (as there are but too evident signs of their becoming gradually less unprepared to do), and avow open antagonism to CHRIST and His Church,—when the deadly wound is healed, and the Beast, energised anew from the abyss, rises to life again when Anti-Christianity becomes the religion of the civilised world;—in all this we see the *first* development and manifestation of the yet future 7th head, which is to "continue a short space."

This head differs from its predecessors in being 10-horned, 10-crowned. The old monarchical forms of the World Power have passed away: and now follows a *divided* sovereignty—a joint reign of many co-existing kingdoms. Though not acting in concert in other matters, in one cause they shall all unite, and the Herods and Pilates become friends: "The kings of the earth and the rulers shall take counsel together *against the Lord and*

¹ Without seeing our way clearly to the answer of the question, we would yet ask, Does the Apostle's *own time* come here into consideration *at all*. Does not the "five are fallen, one *is*," refer to the ideal time represented in the vision, when the Harlot has reached that particular stage in downward and God-renouncing career in which S. John here pictures her, when her "sins have reached to Heaven," when, in the full bloom of carnal security, she is saying, 'Peace and safety,' and when just on the very eve of destruction? We strongly suspect this to be the case.

We see the exact state of the world's history at this period, indicated by the following marks.

In the first place: we find that the 7th, or Antichristian head, has not arisen. This is evident, not only from the words of the Angel, but also from the fact that, at this crisis, and so long as the woman is quietly seated on the Beast, enjoying the '*friendship* of the world,' the 10 horns are not crowned. As soon as the new power emanates from the Abyss, and the horns receive their crowns, they at once dispossess, mutilate, tear, and burn the Harlot.

Hence it is evident that chap. xiii. represents a time posterior to chap. xvii. For in the former chapter, the horns are *crowned*, the false Prophet has succeeded to the Harlot, and the Anti-Christianity of the resuscitated Beast taken the place of the pseudo-Christianity of the wounded Beast.

But another mark also shows the time. It is a period in which two apparently contradictory conditions can be satisfied.

1. The Beast "*is not*," and yet
2. Notwithstanding his non-existence, his sixth head "*is*."

And therefore it is evident that it is the wounded head, the head during which the whole Beast received a death-stroke and became non-existent, the "*caput mortuum*," that "*is*," and that the period of the vision, therefore, as we have stated, is shortly anterior to the Beast's Anti-Christian revival in its 7th phase.

against His Christ.” In this unholy object they shall all “have one mind”—to uproot the Christian name, and establish the worship of the Prince of the world. It is now that Babylon is overthrown. For [69] we must remember, it is not Antichrist himself, it is the “Horns” which “hate the whore and make her desolate”—the various apostate powers of the world—GOD’s ministers of vengeance upon His faithless, infatuated Church; who, having put her trust in the strength of Pharaoh, finds the strength of Pharaoh her ruin.”¹

It appears to be out of the turbulent billows of anarchy, confusion, lawlessness which succeed the fall of Babylon, that the dread Autocracy of the Personal Antichrist arises. GOD’s faithful servants have not perished with Babylon. Warned by a supernatural voice they have “come out of her:” they have been constrained to sever themselves from her, lest sharing in her impieties, they should participate in her doom. Their secession, and the consequent departure of the Divine Restraint, the SPIRIT of Life, renders her destruction not only possible, but inevitable. Thus they survive her fall: for a higher honour awaits them, viz., to witness and suffer during the awful times of Antichrist himself. “The Beast shall overcome them.” “He shall wear out the Saints of the Most High; and they shall be given into his hand.”

With the rise of the personal Antichrist to power, ensues the *second* stage of the career of the 7th head. “Among the 10 horns of that head,” says Daniel,—i. e., among the 10 apostate kingdoms which together constitute the 7th phase of the world power—“there shall arise a little horn,” which shall uproot 8 of the horns—thereby becoming “an eighth.” Thus, then, though this little horn is identified with the seventh head—inasmuch as he *belongs* to that head, and springs from it; and his career is but the continued evolution of that head; and the entire interest of [70] that head finally settles in him—still he is something *more*: he is something beyond the 7. For he ultimately merges into a very embodiment, epitome, reproduction, recapitulation of the *whole* godless power of the world—the *entire Beast*.

¹ On this subject—the future spoliation of the secularised Church by the World-Power, to whom she has given her heart and confidence, and whom she has hitherto found her faithful supporter and ally; and on the present indications of such an issue, we cannot forbear quoting the following characteristic passage from our author:

“Because Christendom has forgotten her great dignity, because Christendom has been sporting with flesh, it is first to be made desolate by those with whom it has been seen to be conversant, to be stripped naked, and burnt with devouring fire.

“Surely one seems to find some intimation of a state like this already exhibited: for what is the world doing for. GOD’s professing Church?

“*Why the world is preparing to make her as desolate as the world can make her:* the world is preparing to strip her as naked as it can. The world envies the riches which the Church was led once to covet, and which she contrived to get from the world: the world is envying the Church those high places in which the world has helped to place her;—and is it not now the desire of the world to pull down that which it took centuries to build up? It took centuries to place the Church in the position which enabled her to claim a great portion of this earth’s dominions as her own. It took a long time to make her bishops vie with princes and nobles, decked in fine linen, purple and scarlet, gold, silver, and precious stones, having ample possessions, lands, and costly equipages, with the power to gratify ‘the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life,’ things which speak not of CHRIST, but of Antichrist. It required centuries for this. But it will require but a little time comparatively to make those who have coveted these things desolate and to strip them naked. Thus the world will be found eating the flesh of the Church. It is torturing her now, and it is preparing to eat her.”—(Vol. II. pp. 122, 123.)

And hence the Number 8, or symbol of Resurrection, attaches to him; not only because he becomes the 8th *horn* on the 7th head (this is but an outward visible expression of a deeper inward mystery); not only because, in counting the heads of the Beast, though belonging to the 7th, he is yet something *beyond* the 7th; not only, because in him is fulfilled our LORD's parable of the dispossessed Spirit, who, having been cast out of the world, ultimately gains re-possession, "with 7 other spirits more wicked than himself," and thus re-enters his old tenement as "an *eighth*;"—all this is included; but chiefly because he is the very embodiment of diabolic and bestial *Resurrection*. He is the full Satanic realization of that mystery whereof the Number 8 is the recognised numerical signature. In his miraculous resuscitation we see the Devil's counterfeit of the central Mystery of the Christian Religion. Faith in CHRIST Who died and rose again, will be superseded by a blind infatuated belief in the Beast who died and rose again, and who by his rising to life has extirpated Christianity ("he shall make war against" the witnesses, "and *overcome* them,") and proved it to be a failure and a fable, and unworthy the credence of intelligent men. And GOD shall send a strong delusion, and men shall believe the Lie; and "great shall be the multitude of the preachers" of this New Gospel from Hell.

We repeat, then, that although this Octave Head is really and truly "one of the seven" heads of the old world-historical Beast,—being the seventh head in its last and most intensified form; still it is none other than the *whole* "Beast, which was, and is not, and shall appear," "with 7 heads and 10 horns," all reproduced, all revived and epitomized. It is the entire monster, in the full bloom of its power, wisdom, malignity, impiety; recapitulating, in the compressed period of three and a half years, and in the person of one Human Organ—the Image of the Beast—the whole dark "Mystery of Iniquity" slowly and progressively evolved in former ages, "at sundry times and in divers manners," from the very beginning—in order that, in this its one final and concentrated form, it may be eternally judged.

We were anxious to add a few words on other portions of the present interesting "Notes;" and especially on Mr. Galton's interpretation of that which he characterizes as "confessedly the most difficult part of this wonderful Book,"—the mysterious vision of the binding and incarceration of Satan, and the 1000 years reign, in chapter xx. We must reserve the subject, however, till our next Number.

[106] In proceeding to a brief examination of Mr. Galton's exposition of Rev. xx., we fully agree with him that the subject is beset with difficulty. We question, however, whether this difficulty arises so much from any real ambiguity in the language wherein the revelations are clothed, as from the mysterious nature of the revelations themselves.

The chapter tells us of things which, with our present limited view, our contracted range of experience and apprehension, we find it supremely hard to grasp: but it tells us these things in language tolerably plain and intelligible. Hence it appears, to us that not a few of the difficulties here encountered by expositors, are of their own making; arising from the prepossessions with which the passage is studied—from a conviction that it cannot and must not mean what it plainly says, and from a consequent endeavour to force upon it a signification which it will not bear.

Of any *conscious* attempt on the part of the author of the present Lectures, to bring this chapter into conformity with his own preconceived opinions, we at once and entirely acquit him: his whole tone is that of one anxiously and sincerely searching for the truth and he frankly confesses that during the “thirty years through which his attention has been directed to this part of Holy Writ, he has been at different times inclined to different opinions.” Still, the lecturer himself will, doubtless, be the first to admit how powerful an influence such preconceptions and prepossessions may unconsciously have exercised over the conclusions at which he has ultimately arrived.

We will first endeavour to state, as concisely as possible, what appears to be the general system of interpretation in reference to chapter xx., at present advocated by our author; and will then refer to some of the considerations which appear to ourselves to militate against his theory.

The “binding of Satan,” the lecturer regards as “dating from the Ascension of our LORD.”

His casting down and degradation, is the same as that described by our LORD in the words, “I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven.”

The enthronization of the Saints, is a symbolical description of “the condition which the Church acquired in virtue of our LORD’s Ascension.” (p. 246.)

The “first Resurrection,” is that to which Holy Scripture elsewhere constantly refers; e.g., “If ye be risen with CHRIST:” “GOD hath quickened us together with CHRIST and made us sit together in heavenly places;” “GOD hath translated us into the Kingdom of His dear SON:” &c. &c.

The loosing of Satan after the expiration of the thousand years, is contemporaneous with the manifestation of the personal Antichrist, and with the coming of those times of unprecedented trouble and tribulation which shall immediately precede the Second Advent of the SAVIOUR.

Now to this scheme of interpretation, which we have very imperfectly sketched, one insuperable objection at once seems to present itself.

What is the precise *time* of Antichrist’s manifestation, according to this view? It is immediately on the *expiration* of the thousand years; in accordance (so it is assumed) with the following passage, “When the thousand years are *expired*, Satan shall be loosed from his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations,” &c. But is this really the time of Antichrist’s manifestation as revealed by S. John? In describing these two great events, the reign of the Saints and the persecution under Antichrist, is *this* the relative order in which the Inspired Seer introduces them—first, the Christian reign; and afterwards, the Antichristian persecution? Not so. The order is just the reverse. The prophetic narrative expressly signifies, that it is not till *after* the time of the “great tribulation”—not till after Antichrist and his host have been destroyed—that the peaceful reign of the Saints commences. Just as Isaiah predicts: It is when “the extortioner is at an end, and the spoiler ceaseth, and the oppressors are consumed out of the land” that *then* “in mercy shall the Throne be established, and HE shall sit upon it.” (Isa, xvi. 4, 5.)

For who are they whom S. John represents as reigning with CHRIST *during* the thousand years? The *only* class specially mentioned, are they who have passed through the Church's last "fiery trial." "If we suffer with Him, we shall also reign with Him." Yes: the Saints who receive the honour of signal and peculiar notice, as sharing the Dominion of their LORD during the thousand [108] years, are they who have suffered under Antichrist. And yet, according to the system of interpretation advocated in the present Lectures, Antichrist is not manifested until the thousand years have terminated. This objection appears to us, of itself, fatal to the system.

What unprejudiced reader (we would ask) carefully and honestly perusing the Apocalyptic Record, can fail to see that the following is the revealed sequence of events:—The persecution of Antichrist (closing the present Day of Grace); the Parousia of our LORD, and the immediate destruction of Antichrist and his Host; the "gathering together unto HIM" of all the members of His Mystical Body, whether "quick," or "resting in their beds;" the binding and incarceration of Satan; the "Regeneration;" the reign of CHRIST and His Saints over the untempted nations of the earth during the mystic period of a thousand years; the loosing of Satan from his restraint, prior to his everlasting doom (the inexplicable mystery attaching to which event, and our utter inability rightly to conceive of it, must not interfere with our humble reception of it as a revealed fact, or drive us to a preposterous dislocation of the whole narrative in order to evade it); the Resurrection and the Judgment of [Greek];¹ the Eternal State?

That the whole sequence of events is replete with mystery, and opens out questions of which it is impossible at present to offer any adequate solution, we earnestly admit. Still we cannot the less feel persuaded that this is, on the whole, the real revealed order of occurrences, and that only by preserving it, can we make the Passage consistent with itself, or in harmony with other parallel portions of the Inspired Word.

The vision of the thousand years' reign has doubtless a bearing upon all times, and is intended as an encouragement to all who at any season, or in any manner, suffer for CHRIST, or resist the seductions or tyranny of the World and its Prince; but it is no less assuredly designed, in some special and particular way, as a support and consolation to those who shall have personal experience of the terrible trials of the latter days.

But we must proceed to a further objection to the system of interpretation advocated in the present Lectures.

We are expressly told that, during the thousand years, Satan shall be so bound that "*he shall deceive the nations no more* till the thousand years be finished." But can it possibly be said that this state of things is being realized at the present time? Has it been ever true, since the Ascension, that Satan has been so bound for any length of time as to be unable to deceive the nations? Has he not been ever prowling about "as a roaring lion seeking whom [109] he may devour?" What are the Beast, the false Prophet, the Harlot, but Satan's various *organs*, whereby he carries on his work of destruction and deception on the bodies and souls of men?

¹ Cf. S. Matt. xxv. 31, 32. This must not be confounded with the terrible judgment on the visible *Church* (S. Matt. xxiv. 44—51; xxv. 1—30) which occurs at the close of this present Day of Grace, immediately upon the Parousia of our LORD. Judgment begins at the House of GOD.

True, the Prince of the World received a terrible blow on Calvary. He was then potentially slain—just as our first parents *died* in the day they partook of the forbidden fruit. But the full effects of the enemy's death-blow are not yet realised. His *power* is curtailed; but his *craft* and deceptive influence are still unabated. What says the Angel with regard to the Harlot—Satan's organ of seduction *inside* the Church? "By thy sorceries were *all nations deceived.*"

It is indisputably true, as our Author maintains, that Satan *was* "cast down" at the Ascension, that his power was curtailed, that he was in a measure "bound." But this binding is only *one stage* in his gradual binding and degradation. It is plainly a *second* and further stage in his humiliation and confinement (though not the final one) which is recounted in the first verse of the 20th chapter.

The history of the Arch-Enemy presents an ever deepening downfall.

Up to the period of the first coming of our LORD, he is powerful, not in earth only, but also in *Heaven*. He has access (as we learn from the book of Job) even to the Throne of GOD.

At the Ascension, he is "cast down" from *Heaven* to *earth*. This fall is referred to in such passages as the following. "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from Heaven." "Rejoice, ye Heavens and ye that dwell in them; for the Accuser of the brethren is cast down. Woe to the inhabitants of the earth and the sea, for the Devil is come down to *you.*"

At the Second Advent he will be cast down from the *earth* into the *Abyss*. The earth and the happy inhabitants of the earth will be entirely freed from his malignant influence. He will be fast bound and "sealed" in Tartarus. *This* is the stage of his degradation referred to in the passage under review: and it is of the last importance to the right interpretation of the whole chapter, that these separate stages of the enemy's downfall should be kept distinct and unconfounded.

We are all experiencing the effects of the first "binding" and fall. "The Accuser of the Brethren has been cast down." Entrance into Heaven has been everlastingly closed against him. And hence, all whose "conversation is in Heaven" are free from his assaults. He is powerless to hurt them. His temptations and persecutions merely "work together for their good." He is ever, therefore, striving to allure them to "cast themselves down" from Heaven to earth, and thus to place themselves in the sphere of his permitted power and influence. For the "earth" is as yet, we repeat, his peculiar domain. Here he still reigns. Satan is still the [110] recognized "Prince of the World." It is most true that the World has been "wounded to death." The Beast—the visible organ, representative, vicegerent of the unseen "Prince of the World"—seems to have failed and deserted his master. It has itself turned religious. Instead of openly fighting for Satan against "the LORD and His CHRIST," it has itself been overcome for a time by the Sword of the SPIRIT, and has become Christian. But (as Mr. Galion truly remarks) "although the world has become religious, it is the *world* still." The wounded Beast has not been transfigured, or become MAN. It is still the *Beast*. And by the joint instrumentality of this wounded Beast and the Harlot, i.e. of religious worldliness and worldly Religion, does the Old Serpent still terribly and successfully deceive the nations of the earth.

But are the nations to be always so deceived? No: another stage of the Tempter's humiliation has shortly to ensue. "I saw an Angel come down from Heaven, having the key

of the *Abyss*, and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the Dragon, that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years: and cast him into the *Abyss*, and shut him up, and set a seal upon him, *that he should deceive the nations no more*, till the thousand years should be fulfilled: and after that he must be loosed a little season.”

Here then, we have an entirely new order of things introduced.

The Adversary has encountered a new and more decisive defeat than any he has heretofore experienced. He had put forth all his energies in the times of Antichrist. The “mystery of iniquity,” silently working and preparing for centuries, has come to a head: the grand universal attack upon CHRIST and His Church has been made; and its author has but secured for himself a lower and more hopeless depth of degradation. His trusty organ and vicegerent the “Beast” has now failed him for ever. The GOD-opposing Dominion of the World—mortally wounded on Calvary—is now at an end for evermore. There is a glorious return of the Theocracy. “The kingdoms of the World have become the Kingdom of our LORD and His CHRIST.” The rightful Heir and “Prince of the world” has taken to Himself the power and reigned. While His impotent Foe, once powerful in *Heaven*, then east down to *earth*, is hurled still lower down, and fast chained in the *abyss*. Meanwhile the earth is at quiet. The Sabbath him come; that blessed seventh day of Rest—of rest on earth for the nations of the earth— that joyous time of “freedom from temptation” and “deliverance from the Evil One.”

One further chapter in the history of the great Enemy of GOD and man yet remains, before he receives his eternal doom; and the Everlasting Octave of Blessedness dawns. For “a little season” he is to be again loosed; and then, finally and for ever, consigned to the dismal “lake of fire and brimstone” where the Beast and [111] the False Prophet—cast in before him—are already “suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.”

And now, with regard to the First Resurrection.

It is most true, as our Author beautifully impresses upon his flock, that the Christian is even now raised with his SAVIOUR, and made to “sit with Him in Heavenly Places.” It is most true that he has already undergone a real and most blessed Resurrection.

But the question is, Is *this* the particular Resurrection referred to in the chapter now under consideration, under the title of “the First Resurrection?” We cannot believe it.

Professor Stewart, in reference to this portion of Scripture, remarks “The exigencies of the passage absolutely demand the sense of a bodily Resurrection. Indeed if this be not a position in the interpretation of Scripture which is fully made out by philology, I should be at a loss to designate one which *is*, from among the many difficult passages of the Sacred Volume.”

It is objected, that the Seer only beholds “the *souls* of them that were beheaded,” living, reigning, enthroned, judging. Therefore the whole vision refers exclusively to a *spiritual* Resurrection.

But does not S. Peter, when referring to the analogous case (plainly typical of the present) of those who were saved of old, from the watery deluge, describe them as “few, that is

eight *souls*?” Why then should not those who are preserved to inherit domination over the renovated earth after the fiery deluge, be similarly designated as “*souls*?” In fact, the use of this word tells neither for nor against either theory of interpretation?¹ The word is merely indicative of personality; and seems to be here employed mainly for the purpose of expressing the absolute *personal identity* of those who are now seen reigning with CHRIST, with those who have heretofore suffered with Him—notwithstanding any outward change, transfiguration, glorification, that may have passed over them.

That the regenerate one of GOD are not only risen with CHRIST but do now and ever reign with Him, is a most sacred truth. But this vision refers us to the “*manifestation* of the sons of GOD:” it reveals to us that glorious time when the Kingdom, originating from within, and in the realm of spirit, shall have unfolded and developed itself *outwardly*; when CHRIST and His Saints shall be *visibly* exalted, “heirs of the world,” rulers of the earth. And Holy Scripture uniformly teaches, that this exaltation and manifestation shall take place as soon as, and not until, CHRIST Himself appears a second time, for the destruction of His enemies and the salvation of His people.

As this is a point of considerable importance to the right un[112]derstanding of the chapter before us, we will mention one or two out of the numerous passages where the particular *time* of the setting-up of the Kingdom is referred to—with a view to corroborate our position that it is posterior to, and consequent upon, the destruction of Antichrist at our LORD’s Second Advent.

And first—as we have seen—S. John categorically affirms, that the enthroned victors are they who “have gotten the victory over the Beast and his Image.” Therefore their reign *must succeed* the overthrow of the Beast—“whom the LORD shall consume with the Spirit of His Mouth, and destroy with the Brightness of His Coming.”

Again. CHRIST has not yet assumed His own Throne. He is still seated on His FATHER’s Throne; and we pray, “Thy Kingdom *come*.” He has promised, moreover, that He will grant to him that overcometh to sit with Himself on His own Throne, even as He overcame, and is seated with His FATHER on the FATHER’s Throne. As, therefore, it is unquestionably an exaltation with their LORD to *His own* Throne, which the Apostle sees here granted to CHRIST’s fellow-sufferers and victors, (“they lived, and *reigned with CHRIST*”) and as this exaltation and reward are not to be realised till the LORD again appears, we see additional reason for removing the period and sphere of the vision, from the *First* Advent (as maintained by our Author,) to the *Second* Advent.

Isaiah, as we have already seen, fixes the period of the inauguration of the Kingdom at the same critical juncture; not at the First Advent, but at the Second. It is “when the extortioner is at an end,” and “the spoiler ceaseth, and the oppressors are consumed out of the land,” (i.e. when Antichrist and his hosts are destroyed,) that “in Mercy shall the Throne be established, and He shall sit upon it.”²

¹ Cf. Acts ii. 4. “The same day there were added to then three thousand *souls*.” ib. vii. 14, “Joseph called his father Jacob to him and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen *souls*.” xxvii. 37, “And we were in all, in the ship, two hundred three-score and sixteen *souls*.”

² Although this passage refers primarily to the reign of Hezekiah, yet its ulterior reference to a greater King is obvious. In the Douay Version it is thus rendered: “The dust is at an end; the Wretch is consumed. He
{cont.}

In another place the Prophet specifies the *time* when the earthly glories of the Kingdom shall be revealed. It is when the earth is “clean dissolved” and “removed,” when the “City of Confusion is broken down,” when the LORD of Hosts has “punished the host of the high ones” and “the kings of the earth:” *then* it shall be, that the “moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed when the LORD of Hosts shall reign in Mount Sion, and in Jerusalem, and before His ancients gloriously.” (Isa. xxiv.)

Just as in chap. lix., we read of the Enemy coming in like a flood, and the Spirit of the LORD withstanding him. Immediately after which we are told that “the Redeemer shall *come* to Zion,” (a yet unfulfilled Prophecy, as S. Paul assures us, Rom. xi. 26,) and shall establish that Kingdom of Peace and Righteousness, the [113] earthly and Israelitish glories of which the succeeding chapter (Isa. lx.) depicts in such bright and glowing colours.

And Daniel’s testimony is precisely to the same effect; who clearly reveals that it is only *after* the destruction of Antichrist and his host, that the “Dominion and glory and kingdom” are given to the “Son of Man, Who comes in the clouds of Heaven to take possession of them” (Dan. vii. 13, 14). And *who* shall share the kingdom with Him? The Prophet proceeds to add, that at the same period—the time of the *end*, when the judgment shall sit (“I saw Thrones, and they sat upon them,”) and Antichrist’s dominion is taken away—“the kingdom, and dominion, and greatness of the kingdom under the whole Heaven, all be given to the people of the Saints of the Most High.”

But the whole of Old Testament Prophecy attests this: that the Kingdom, which S. John refers to in the 20th chapter of the Revelation, has not yet come; and that the present Dispensation is but a short prelude and preparation for it. The Kingdom belongs to Christ and His Saints; but the Saints are not yet gathered in; the number of the Elect is not yet made up; the sacred Company in Paradise are waiting for their “perfection,” which cannot be theirs until the full complement of their brethren, still in the flesh, or yet unborn, is added to them: meanwhile the Kingdom is deferred. The coming Royalty belongs jointly to the Bridegroom and the Bride. But the loving Bridegroom assumes not His Throne, till His “Bride hath made herself ready,” and till she is fully prepared to share the Dominion with Him. As the Prophet Zachariah declares, “The Lord my God shall come, and all *the Saints with Thee;*” and *then*, he adds, “The Lord shall be *King* over all the earth.”

And do not our Lord’s own words agree precisely with this order of events? He promises to His Apostles, and to those which have “followed Him,” that they shall “sit on Thrones, judging,” (cf. Rev. xx. 4; “I saw Thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them.”) But when is this judicial enthronization to take place? During the present Dispensation? In Heaven, before our Lord’s Second Coming? No: but hereafter. “In the Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the Throne of His Glory, ye also shall sit on Thrones.” (S. Matt. xix. 28.)

The “Son of Man,” we repeat, is not yet seated “on the Throne of His Glory.” He is still “seated with the Father on *His* Throne.” The Saints, therefore, cannot yet have taken their Thrones, or received their Dominion. For this they are still in anxious expectation. “Do ye not know that the Saints shall judge the world?” “Do ye not know that we shall judge

hath failed that trod the earth under foot. And a Throne shall be prepared in Mercy, and One shall sit upon it in Truth in the Tabernacle of David, judging.”

Angels?" "They shall be Kings and Priests, and shall reign on the earth." "For unto the Angels He hath not put in subjection [114] the world to come." He hath put "*all things* under the feet" of "*man and the Son of Man:*" although (as the Apostle adds,) this universal subjection to CHRIST and His Saints, is not yet actually realised, "We see not *yet* all things put under him."

The blessed ones seen by S. John in the vision before us, are plainly those "faithful and wise servants," elsewhere spoken of by the Evangelist, "whom their LORD *when He cometh* shall make rulers over all that He hath."

The whole Church, struggling, and at rest, is earnestly looking for the coming back of the Nobleman, who hath "gone into a far country to receive for Himself a kingdom, and to return" in order to enter upon His Royalty. He will shortly reappear to take His Throne: and then, and not till then, will He make the faithful ones who have been true to Him during His absence, partakers of His Dominion; giving one, authority over five cities; another, authority over ten cities: according to their several capacities, and degrees of fidelity. "This parable," says S. Luke, "He spake, because *they* thought that the Kingdom of GOD should *immediately* appear."

We think, then, that the above passages are amply sufficient to show that the sequence of events as given by S. John in the 20th chapter, is simply in strict and accurate accordance with the relative positions of those same events as predicted in other portions of GOD's Word.

The Seer represents the time elapsing between our LORD's First and Second Advents as a short, uncertain, broken period—a half week—three years and a half (a number of mystic significance)—a period which shall doubtless terminate in a brief critical season of, *literally*, three years and a half, wherein the whole mystery of iniquity and of godlessness which has secretly characterised the era, shall come out into a shortlived but intense manifestation, and all the hidden processes of good and evil now silently working and counterworking shall be openly revealed. And what shall succeed this troublous three years and a half, this broken time of suffering and agitation and unrest? It shall give place, says the Apostle, to a thousand years of rest and peace and joy and triumph. Now, explain this we cannot; believe it we must. And we are persuaded that any attempt to dislocate the consecutive portions of the Revelation, either by making the three years and a half coincident and conterminous with the thousand years, or by placing the thousand years before the three and a half, will only be found to introduce confusion and uncertainty, and needless difficulty into the interpretation of the Prophetic Records.

But is this period of manifested triumph—this thousand years of peace and rest—the consummation of all things? Does it coincide with the eternal state of the Blessed? By no means. We must not, as so many do, confound the Seventh Day—the Day of [115] Rest—with the Everlasting Octave. This confusion is most fatal to the right interpretation of Scripture Prophecy.

If—as is so constantly maintained—the Eternal State—the endless Bliss of Heaven, succeeds immediately upon our Lord's Second Appearing, and the destruction of Antichrist; then, where and when will all the glorious predictions respecting the future dignity, universality, dominion of God's Church on earth receive their accomplishment? When shall the glad promises made to "Israel after the flesh" be realized? Plainly *never*.

By some indefinite and unsatisfactory spiritualizing process, they are evacuated of all distinct meaning, and one after another explained away.

We must remember that, to the Old Testament seers, the present Gentile Dispensation, between the fall and restoration of Israel—while the “complement of the nations” is being gathered in—appears a mere parenthesis. The course of Prophecy is, as it were, arrested till God’s ancient people again comes upon the stage. The Apocalypse fills up the hiatus; tells us of the fortunes of the Holy Catholic Church, of the great Gentile ingathering, and the coming Gentile Apostasy which shall throw the Apostasy of ancient Israel into the shade. In many other respects also does the Revelation of S. John supplement the disclosures of the Old Testament Prophets. The latter tell us of the coming terrestrial glories of Restored Israel, the former of the unutterable exaltation of the “Bride the Lamb’s Wife:” the one speak of the renewed earth, the other of the New Heavens: the one of earthly Jerusalem, the other of the Mystic City which “descendeth from God out of Heaven, having the glory of God.”

S. John’s Revelation, moreover, proceeds a whole stage further than the revelations of the Old Testament. Nothing appears to us more plain than that the “New Heavens and new earth” described by Isaiah and S. John are not identical. Old Testament Prophecy extends but to the Seventh Day, and reveals to us the earthly glories of Israel during that Seventh Day. The Apocalypse of the New Testament carries us on through that period, to the Universal Restitution and Transfiguration “There shall be no more curse.”

The Millennial state of which the ancient Prophets speak, is evidently not one of perfection. The curse is not entirely removed, or sin done, for ever, away. It is a state of things compatible with the mysterious announcement made by S. John, that ere its close, and prior to the universal judgment of [Greek], Satan shall be loosed for a little season from his prison, in order to seal his everlasting doom, and to manifest to the whole spiritual universe the tremendous justice of the sentence about to be irreversibly pronounced upon him; in order to show moreover the weakness of untransfigured human nature even in its best state, and to offer to the hitherto untempted denizens of the renovated earth a shortlived but awful crisis of probation.

[116]

That the Arch-fiend should be terribly successful in this his *last* attempt, after all his gathered experience, is not a whit more marvellous than that he should have been successful in Paradise, nay in Heaven itself!

The Old Testament Prophets tell us that, on this renovated earth during the Seventh Day, Israel shall bear rule; that Jerusalem shall be the Political and Religious Metropolis of the world; that, as “of Zion it can be reported that HE was born there,” “the Most High shall stablish her;” and that all earthly dignity and majesty shall cluster round that centre of life and health and blessing to the whole earth. But S. John tells us something more. He lifts up the earthly veil, and gives us a glimpse of the mystic realities which are taking place in the Holy of Holies beyond.

Though Israel, then, is to be the head of the nations, yet the Apostle reveals to us that the real dominion of the earth shall belong to the Incarnate Redeemer, and the transfigured Priest Kings who share in the First Resurrection. The exaltation of Israel is a real, visible exaltation; but belongs merely to the earthly sphere. It is but a faint terrestrial type, expression and shadow of the glory of those exalted ones who “live and reign with

CHRIST.” They share His throne; “where He is, there are they also,” transformed after His Image, glorified with His glory. Satan is no longer “Prince of the World.” He is fast bound in Tartarus. *They* are “Princes of the World;” fellow-Monarchs, fellow-Mediators, fellow-Intercessors with their Divine LORD and Head. This once abode of their trial and probation is now the loved object and sphere of their holy interests. “It is more blessed to give than to receive.” They are privileged to participate in this highest blessing. It is their happy lot to be the constant media of graces and benedictions to the nations upon earth. The Kingdom on earth seen by the ancient Prophets, is thus intimately connected with, dependent on, expressive of, the Kingdom in Heaven as seen by S. John. The visible heads of humanity are the “twelve tribes of Israel.” But the celestial guardians, protectors, rulers of those tribes, are the Blessed Twelve in the Church above. “There shall be a blessed chain of giving and receiving—GOD; CHRIST; the transfigured Bride the Church; Israel; the world of nations.” (Auberlen.)

But we must yet add a word with respect to *the* great objection entertained by our author, and so many other devout writers, to these Revelations of S. John, interpreted according to their obvious apparent meaning. This interpretation, it is urged, involves the opinion that the Resurrection of the “Saints” shall not synchronize with the general Resurrection. Unquestionably it does. And that these two stages in the great work of Resurrection shall not occur simultaneously, is plain, no less from the teaching of [117] Holy Scripture, than from the corroborative belief of the early Church.

But this notion, it is urged, is explicitly condemned by the Creeds. Our author lays great stress upon this point. “At Whose coming” (so, he reminds us, we profess to hold) “all men shall rise again with their bodies.” Whereas, according to the theory in question, “all men” shall *not* then “rise with their bodies;” only a limited number of men.

Now as for this theory in any way controverting the Catholic Faith, be it premised, that the fact of its very general acceptance in the early Church at once proves the contrary. When S. Justin Martyr tells us, that the general system of interpretation now repudiated as “Millenarian” by Catholics, was adopted not only by himself but “by all Christians who were really orthodox” (Dial. c. Tryph., § 80); when S. Jerome witnesses to its being maintained by a “very great multitude,” and Eusabius, by “far the greatest number of Church writers;” it is idle to suppose that there is anything intrinsically heretical about it.¹ It was only the gross abuse of these doctrines, in course of years, by carnal-minded speculators, which induced S. Augustine (who at first unhesitatingly advocated them) to cast about for some other system of interpretation of Rev. xx., which should save it from the low mundane and thoroughly sensual conceptions (connected with the idea of the earthly reign of the saints) wherewith the whole passage had become inextricably associated. So he removes these predictions, respecting the binding of Satan, the thousand years, the First Resurrection, the reign of the Saints, entirely from the region of unfulfilled prophecy: he treats them as having, all of them, their sphere in present or past times; as all requiring a figurative and spiritual mode of interpretation, and as merely symbolical representations and expressions of mysteries already realized, or now in course of being realized in the unseen world.

1 That this system of interpretation is deemed not other than orthodox in the modern Church of Rome, is manifest by the recent work of Father Pagani, a devout and able theologian who occupies a post of distinction and responsibility as the Superior of the Order of Charity in this country. In his work, entitled “*The End of the World*,” he warmly advocates “millenarian doctrines,” and insists strongly on their Catholicity.

It is this novel scheme of interpretation, which the weight of S. Augustine's great name caused to be so generally received for a length of time in the Church, which finds an able and intelligent advocate in the author of the present Lectures. We do not for a moment question that the successive parts of the vision of Rev. xx., taken separately, are susceptible of the spiritual interpretation affixed to them by S. Augustine in the "*De Civitate Dei*;" but we say that the exposition, *as a whole*, is palpably insufficient; and absolutely fails to satisfy the exigencies of the passage, regarded as a continuous vision.

[118]

With regard however to the assertion, that the theory maintained in the present paper is contradicted by the Creed, it is hardly necessary to show how visionary the objection is. What says the Creed? "At whose coming all men shall rise with their bodies," &c. That is to say, the Creed tells us thus much: that *all* men shall hereafter rise; that they shall rise in their *bodies*; and that this Resurrection shall not take place till our Blessed LORD, Who is now seated on His Father's throne, shall *come* to assume His own throne and enter upon the solemn Work of judgment. Whether all the dead shall rise simultaneously, or in certain foreordained orders and detachments, the Creed says not. It merely insists on this cardinal verity, that with our LORD's Second Coming, the "Resurrection of the dead" shall commence—that this shall be a *bodily* Resurrection, and shall include *all*. Here we are met by S. Paul's statement, which distinctly affirms that the universal Resurrection shall *not* be a simultaneous work. It has three great stages. "Every man in his own *order*; CHRIST the first fruits; *afterwards* they that are CHRIST's, at His Coming: *afterwards* cometh the end." The Resurrection *from* the dead comes first; the Resurrection *of* the dead comes afterwards. We may perhaps be pardoned for quoting here a short extract from a previous paper in which we were led to refer to this interesting subject:

"The earlier Prophets, looking through the vista of futurity, seem to view all *three* stages [i.e. of Resurrection, as referred to by S. Paul] as simultaneous. We find the Resurrection of CHRIST spoken of as contemporaneous with that of His members ('Thy dead men shall live, *together* with *My* dead BODY shall they arise'); even as, by the same prophetic perspective, the two Advents of CHRIST seem constantly combined into one. It is only by little and little that the several stages of events begin to unfold themselves, and the intervals which separate them to become apparent. . . .

"Now CHRIST 'is the First-begotten *from out of* death;' '*from* the dead,' [Greek]. But His Bride is called the 'Church of the first-begotten ones.' Of *her*, therefore, is this same resurrection from the dead, or [Greek] predicated. For 'if the SPIRIT of Him that raised up JESUS *from out of* the dead, dwell in her, He that raised up CHRIST from the dead will likewise raise *her* up.' In fact, the very word, [Greek], of *itself*, seems to point to the same conclusion. The Church is called out of the living (to a higher life)—she shall be called out of the dead. The Election of GOD impressed upon her, shall follow her into the grave, and raise her from amongst the sleeping ones, not only that she may be for ever 'blessed,' but to a *higher* glory; that she may be (with her Loving LORD) the source and channel of 'Blessing' for ever."¹

¹ Vid. *Ecclesiastic*. Vol. xvii. (Aug. 1855), pp. 379—380. [φ 'The Interpretation of Psalms' pp. 163—4 *supra*.]

A few more we subjoin, from the same Paper, in further illustration of the subject. "The Seventh Day, the Day of Rest, the Day of Judgment, the Day of Resurrection, *opens* with the Rapture and revival out of death, of the living members of 'the Resurrection and the Life,' who, having already 'passed from death unto Life,' 'shall not enter into judgment,' nor be condemned with the world; yet, who shall be assessors
{*cont.*}

[119]

We conceive, then, that there is abundant warrant for disconnecting the [Greek] from the [Greek]; the “First Resurrection,” from the Resurrection of “the rest of the dead;” and that a system of interpretation, which confounds the two together, contradicts the plain teaching of the Prophetic Word.

And as with the Resurrection, so does it appear that the renovation and transfiguration of the earth shall be in like manner, progressive. This seems abundantly evidenced by a comparison between the Old and New Testament Prophets. Isaiah, S. Peter, and S. John all speak of great physical changes accompanying the renewal of the Heavens and the earth. Doubtless the language which describes these changes is profoundly symbolical, and is employed by the Prophets as the outward clothing and expression of mighty corresponding revolutions in the spiritual universe: as S. Peter’s application of the Prophecy of Joel, on the day of Pentecost, plainly shows. Still, there can be no doubt that the language includes also literal, physical changes on the earth’s surface; as S. Peter’s reference to the Deluge seems meant to teach; and that, as the revolutions in the spiritual world advance, and grow in extent and intensity, there will be a corresponding progress and gradation in the physical revolutions whereby the former are at once illustrated and accompanied. When we bear in mind the well-nigh universal conclusion of devout and competent inquirers, as to the physically local and circumscribed extent of the Deluge of Noah, we have many possible limitations suggested, which may help us to reconcile and explain the several references to the establishment of the New Heavens and New Earth, and the destruction of the Old Heavens and Old Earth, as contained in the writings of Isaiah, S. Peter, and S. John.

The subject is an attractive one; but we must desist. We have only to conclude, by expressing our cordial thanks to Mr. Galton for his valuable and seasonable contribution to the popular and devotional study of the Apocalypse. On certain points, of a more or less speculative nature, we differ from his conclusions. Possibly he may find cause to reconsider some of his opinions. Possibly we may. At all events, we rejoice to find a book on this most mysterious portion of GOD’s written Word, containing so much which we cordially sympathize with and approve.

with Christ on the Judgment-Seat, and ‘judge angels.’ It *closes* with the Resurrection of the dead, and the judgment ‘according to their works,’ of all the nations (1 Cor. vi. 2, 3; S. Matt. xxv. 31, 32; Rev. xx. 12, 13); multitudes of whom shall receive a merciful sentence of acquittal; and shall be rewarded with a joyful entrance into the Kingdom of everlasting Peace, as happy *subjects* of the King and glorified Bride, as members of those ‘saved nations’ who shall ‘walk in the light of the Golden City.’”

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol 22 (Joseph Masters: London, 1860)
 [293] **CURZON'S SCRIPTURAL KEY TO THE REVELATION OF S. JOHN**

The Scriptural Key to the Revelation of S. John, presented to us in the 24th Chapter of S. Matthew's Gospel; and the whole subject clearly explained from Scripture references alone. By the Hon. JOHN ROPER CURZON. London; Wertheim, Macintosh, and Hunt.

THE Writer of this little Manual appears to have had a twofold object in view, a general as well as a particular one—his general object being to elucidate, by reference to Holy Scripture, the meaning of the occult language and imagery employed by S. John in the Revelation; his particular object, to establish a certain theory as to the scope and interpretation of the whole Book. So far as he has adhered to the former of these, and contented himself with simply illustrating S. John's mystic phraseology by the light thrown upon it from other portions of the Inspired Volume, he has rendered a useful service to the ordinary reader of the Apocalypse: so far as he has occupied himself with the advocacy and application of his private scheme of interpretation, he has simply wasted his time and labour, and done what in him lay to evacuate this most Divine Book of all its beauty, majesty, and significance, and reduce it to a mere senseless congeries of arbitrary symbols, and objectless images.

Mr. Curzon states his general object in his preface; and his reader has a right to anticipate, from the statement, that he will derive some solid satisfaction and profit from the ensuing pages.

“The principle of the self-interpretation of Scripture has been relied upon exclusively in this work. Careful search has been made for the places in the Sacred Writings from which S. John has adopted his imagery and his language; and these, together with the numerous explanations given by the Inspired Writers, both of the imagery and of the prophecies themselves, seem alone capable of leading us to a full apprehension of this remarkable Book. And with this assistance it will be found that the whole subject explains itself clearly and consistently.”— Pp. 4, 5.

It is this unfortunate attempt at “clearness” and “consistency” which mars his whole performance, and renders what might have been a serviceable little manual, and guide to the figurative language of the Apocalypse, not only useless, but thoroughly perplexing and misleading.

If the simple process of affixing to a whole series of dissimilar and independent images, one and the same arbitrary signification, [294] be a mode of securing “clearness” and “consistency” of meaning, Mr. Curzon may take to himself the credit of having here offered a very clear and consistent interpretation of the Apocalypse: but not otherwise.

Let us take a very hasty glance at his work.

Prefacing his exposition with a few remarks on the 24th chapter of S. Matthew, he proceeds (passing over the seven Epistles) to an examination of the mysterious introductory Vision described by S. John in the 4th chapter, where the entranced Apostle, lifted up “in Spirit” into Heaven, is permitted, through means of a wondrous system of symbolical appearances, impressed upon his imagination by the “Angel who showed him these things,” personally to witness, and then reproduce in language for our devout contemplation, the unutterable realities which environ the very Throne of the Everlasting Trinity.

In his brief explanation and illustration of the details of this sublime Vision—the emerald Bow, the Cherubic figures, the august “Twenty-four,” the glassy Sea, the “Lamps of fire,” &c., &c., Mr. Curzon manifests considerable aptitude and ability; and had all his work

been equal in execution to his 4th Section, and had he kept his private theory as to the meaning and object of the Apocalypse in the background, he might have written a book which would have been welcomed by many.

We will give our readers the benefit of his theory by-and-by. But ere we pass on from that mysterious introductory "Scene in Heaven," to which we have just referred—that Vision of the Throne of GOD, which forms, as it were, the fixed celestial background of the succeeding Apocalyptic disclosures—we would claim permission to pause for a single moment in order to draw attention to one feature in the description which is unnoticed by our author, and which we do not remember to have seen elsewhere adverted to; a feature which (though apparently trivial and unimportant) is yet sufficiently characteristic to claim a passing word: we allude to the significant *sevenfold* nature of the representation.

A Throne was set in Heaven:

- i. And upon ([Greek]) the Throne, *One Sitting*, like to Jasper and Sardine stone:
- ii. And round about ([Greek]) the Throne, a *Rainbow*, in sight like to an emerald:
- iii. And round about ([Greek]) the Throne, *four-and-twenty Thrones*, and Elders seated thereon.
- iv. And out of ([Greek]) the Throne, *Lightnings, and Voices, and Thunderings*:
- v. And before ([Greek]) the Throne, *seven Lamps of fire*, which are the seven spirits of GOD:
- vi. And before ([Greek]) the Throne, a *Sea of glass*, like to crystal:[295]
- vii. And in the midst of the Throne, and round about the Throne ([Greek]) *four Living Creatures*, full of eyes, &c.

Nor must the *order* of this sacred Heptad be passed over without notice.

For we have here an interesting example of the symmetrical arrangement of the number (the original type of which is furnished in the seven-branched Candlestick) where its first 3 members are inversely parallel with its last 3,—the two extremes corresponding; the second and penultimate; the third and fifth: leaving a central member.

1. In this case, then, the two extremes are associated. We have the Divine Presence—the "One sitting,"—brought into connection with the Cherubic Four. This is, of course, a most familiar, and constantly recurring combination; as expressed in the well-known formula "O Thou that *sittest* upon the *Cherubims*."
2. In like manner the second and sixth members form a pair. In the former we have the "Rainbow in sight like an Emerald;" in the latter, the "Sea of glass like to crystal." Here is the familiar combination of the "*Bow* on the *Waters*," the Emerald Arch spanning the Crystal Wave.
3. And the third and fifth are no less obviously parallel. In the former (the august "Twenty-four") we see a typical representation of the Holy Catholic Church, united in one common Faith, built upon the foundation of the Patriarchs and Apostles:¹ in the latter (the "seven Lamps of fire, which are the seven Spirits of GOD,") we see a mystical image of that Holy, energising "Spirit of Life" by whom the Church is indwelt and vivified, and by

¹ "*Ecclesiam* de Patriarchis et Apostolis generatam, in viginti quatuor sedilibus cernit." Beda in loc. Cf. Rev. xxi. 12, 14.

whose quickening Influences alone her ministrations can be effectual. “I believe in the HOLY GHOST: the Holy Catholic Church.”

It is possible that the *order* and arrangement of the several members of this series, and the indication thereby afforded of their special mutual relations, may prove an important element in the interpretation of the several symbols; and may contribute something towards the elucidation of certain of the difficulties which the series opens out—especially that perplexing question as to the difference, or connection between the Twenty-four Elders and the Four Living Creatures. That they both in some way represent the Church, is obvious, and generally admitted: but in what special aspect or relation, is far from evident.

Probably their respective *positions* in the series may indicate the direction in which their discriminating characteristics are to be looked for.

The Cherubic Four, we have seen, are indirectly associated with the *Person* of the Everlasting FATHER—perhaps with the Triune [296] DEITY,¹—the awful “One sitting.” The Twenty-four are associated with the *operations* of the HOLY SPIRIT. For here there is no mysterious *Being* seen, as in the former case, but “seven Lamps of fire;” these Lamps pointing rather to the energies and gifts of the Blessed Spirit than to His *Person*.

And hence it may perhaps be, that in the one emblem we see the Holy Church in its aspect towards *God*; as indwelt by GOD; the Organ of GOD; the Tabernacle and Throne of GOD;—and that in the other we see the Church in its relation towards the *world*; the Church in its ministerial and sacerdotal capacity; the conservator and guardian of the Faith (the Twenty-four are afterwards seen as forming the foundations of the Everlasting Temple); the vehicle of the “seven Spirits of GOD *sent forth* into all the earth.”

“These seven Spirits of GOD (writes Mr. Curzon) are sent forth by CHRIST into all the earth, and so represent the Apostles and others commissioned by Him to preach the Gospel to every creature. The whole Christian Church seems thus represented as *ministering* in spiritual things: which shows its missionary character, in opposition to the restricted privileges of the Jewish system.”—P. 29.

So that while the Cherubic emblem probably symbolises the Church in its innermost essence and idea and Divine perfection, the Patriarchal and Apostolic emblem represents it in its mediatorial functions towards the world.

The Cherubim are seen engaged in no ministerial work with reference to earth. Their myriad eyes are directed to GOD alone. Their sole business is with “Him that *sitteth* upon the Throne,” who “dwelleth between the Cherubim,”—that awful One with whom they are here seen so mysteriously and intimately associated: their employment, to offer Him ceaseless adoration and worship. Their occupation is Heavenly, not earthly: they address GOD, not man.²

¹ The question whether the Dread Being seated on the Throne symbolises the FATHER, or rather, the whole Blessed and undivided Trinity, may be seen discussed in Cornelius à Lapide. Both interpretations are probably correct; and while the representation points particularly to the Person of the FATHER, it not the less, generally, includes a reference to the whole Trinity in Unity.

² The “*Come and see*” (ch. vi.), ordinarily supposed to be addressed by the four ([Greek]) in succession to S. John, forms, we believe, no exception to this statement. In the first place, the best authorities agree that the reading is incorrect, and that in each case there is but a single word uttered by the Living Creatures: “*Come.*” ([Greek])

The question next arises, To whom is this word addressed?

In each case, in answer to the summons, a Mysterious Rider appears.

{cont.}

[297]

Whereas the Elders are seen engaged in Priestly and Ministerial work; presenting the prayers of the Saints, and on two occasions administering instruction and consolation to the Blessed Apostle. (Rev. v. 5; vii. 13—47.)

The ([Greek]) appear to be an intense symbolical representation of the Human Nature of our LORD the Body of the Incarnate Redeemer—extended and imparted from Himself, by means of the Sacraments, to His Elect, who are thus taken up into Him, made one with Him, glorified with His own glory, and consecrated to be the “Dwelling” and “Rest” of GOD for ever. This is the True Temple and Throne of the Most High, the various sides, or modes of manifestation, of which, as exhibited in the perfect Life of the Redeemer, are revealed and brought out in the Quadriform Gospel.

Whereas the Twenty-four symbolise the Church as to its visible, earthly composition and organisation, made up of the 12 of the Old and the 12 of the New Dispensation, united in one Faith, ministering and mediating, as well as worshipping.

4. We have thus glanced at the first three, and the last three members of the sevenfold series, and their mutual relation.

The central member stands alone. “Out of the Throne proceeded *Lightnings* and *Voices* and *Thunderings*;¹ a collocation which may seem suggestive of the Three succeeding groups—Seals, Trumpets, Vials—which characterise this division of the Apocalypse: the *Seals* bringing to light the obscure prophetic future of the Church; the *Trumpet-Voices* (cf. Rev. i. 10; iv. 1) sounding forth their notes of warning, preparation and alarm; the *Vials* dealing out wrath, indignation, and judgment.²

And who are these Riders? The first is universally admitted to represent our LORD Himself (cf. Ps. xlv. 4-6). And probably, in some sense, the three succeeding Riders equally represent our LORD; as, speeding on His way, and mounted on His mystic Charger, His visible Church—He ever and anon appears, in different stages of His continuous Advent; coming, now in mercy, and now in His “four sore judgments.” And thus, for example, we find Him as it were identifying Himself with the second dread Rider, the Minister of War, in these words: “I am not *come* to send peace on earth, but a Sword.”

The divers *appearances* of the ([Greek]) are consequent upon the different phases through which His *Church*, as His visible representative, passes.

It is worth noticing that this characteristic word ([Greek]), so expressive of the deep heart-yearning and intense longing of the whole Church on Earth and in Paradise, occurs just seven times in the Apocalypse.

1. “I heard one of the four Living creatures saying, as with a voice of thunder, Come.”
2. “I heard the second Living creature saying, Come.”
3. “I heard the third Living creature saying, Come.”
4. “I heard the fourth Living creature saying, Come.” (Ch. vi. 1, 3, 5, 7.)
5. “The SPIRIT and the Bride say, Come.” (Ch. xxii. 17.)
6. “Let him that heareth say, Come. (Ib.)
7. “Amen. Even so Come, LORD JESUS.” (xxii. 20.)

It is to be observed that in the 5th and 6th cases the Text. Recept. has, incorrectly ([Greek]), instead of ([Greek]).

¹ Not “Lightnings and Thunderings and Voices” as in our E.V.

² May there be some secret allusion to the Three Divine Persons in this symbolic triad;—the illuminating flashes suggesting the HOLY SPIRIT; the Voices, the Incarnate Son (Rev. i. 10—13); the Thunders, the “FATHER of an Infinite Majesty?” We may perhaps see also a mystic parallelism with our LORD’s well known triad, “Sin, righteousness, and judgment:” the Lightning glances of the HOLY SPIRIT convincing of
{cont.}

[298]

But where, in this hallowed and solemn scene in Heaven, with its sevenfold group of Mysteries, is there any direct symbol of the Blessed Redeemer? We have an ineffable representation of the Eternal FATHER in the “One sitting, like unto jasper and sardine stone.” We have an emblem of the HOLY SPIRIT, as manifested in His operations in the Church, in the “Seven Lamps of fire burning before the Throne.” But where is the Great Head of the Church militant and triumphant, where is He the peculiar Object of the Love and Praises and Adoration of all the redeemed in Heaven and earth? We look in the central position of the whole group: but we see Him not. We are but dazzled by the blinding lightning-gleams, bewildered by the awe-inspiring voices and thunderings which issue from that abyss of unapproachable majesty; as though betokening the presence, hitherto undiscernible, of some peculiar and dreadful Mystery. But as yet the Mystery is not disclosed; and the remaining features of the group are recounted in order. Thereupon follows the marvellous detailed description of the “Living Creatures:”¹ then the reference to the sealed Book; and the angelic challenge to open it. At length the Apostle, strengthened and comforted by one of the Elders, is enabled to discern and gaze upon the central Mystery of all. There, in the very midst, where nought could hitherto be distinguished save awful Lightnings, and Voices, and Thunderings, is now seen the OBJECT round which the whole system of Wonders clusters. “I beheld, and lo, in the *midst* of the Throne, and of the four Living Creatures, and 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 sent forth into all the earth.” Here is the culminating Mystery of all: Incarnate GOD sacrificed for man. And now from the “thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands” peals forth the Anthem of jubilee, echoing through the everlasting vaults in its sevenfold cadence, “Worthy is the LAMB that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.”

Ere we leave this Scene in Heaven, there is one other point in connection with it, which we cannot pass over without notice. It is this: that in the wondrous sevenfold group depicted by S. John, we seem to have but a symbolic representation of the famous sevenfold sequence of Christian Verities enunciated in plain words by S. Paul in the 4th chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians. “There is

“One Body”—The Body of the Incarnate Redeemer, the Temple and Throne of GOD—(“as GOD hath said, I will dwell in It and I will walk in It.” “Here shall be My Rest for [299] ever; here will I dwell, for I have a delight therein”)—typified in the Quadriform Cherubim.

“One SPIRIT”—Doubly portrayed; in the seven Lamps of fire burning before the Throne of GOD, and the seven eyes of the Lamb sent forth into all the earth.

“One Hope”—The emerald Bow; telling of GOD’s unfailing covenant-promises, of His mercies ever fresh and new, and of the “Crown of Glory that fadeth not away, eternal in the Heavens.”

“One LORD”—The “LAMB as it had been slain.”

Sin; the Voice of the Incarnate Redeemer (through the agency of the same Spirit) telling of *Righteousness*; the Thunders of the FATHER announcing *Judgment* to come.

¹ The language in which the description is conveyed, forming itself into a succession of threes (ch. iv. 8—11); a fact which has doubtless unconsciously stamped the passage as appropriate for Trinity Sunday.

“One Faith”—The Faith of GOD’s elect, the ([Greek]) (2 Tim. ii. 19), symbolised by the twice Twelve—the Patriarchs and Apostles—the foundation stones of the Eternal Temple (cf. S. Matt. xvi. 16—18; Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 12—14.)¹

“One Baptism”—The glassy sea in whose crystal depths we are “begotten again unto a lively hope.”

“One GOD and FATHER”—The awful Being seated on the Throne, in sight like jasper and sardine stone.”

The arrangement of the two series is different. That the order of each has its own mystery we cannot doubt.²

But we must not allow these interesting and alluring (we trust not wholly idle and visionary) speculations to divert us longer from the book at present under our notice, whereby these thoughts have been suggested.

A very few words however will be necessary to dispose of this “Scriptural Key” which claims to unlock all the arcana of the Apocalypse.

Mr. Curzon’s “short and easy” method of dealing with the Revelation of S. John, is simply as follows.

Duly recognising the fact, on all sides admitted, that our LORD’s address in the 24th chapter of S. Matthew presents many parallels with the disclosures of the Loving Apostle; he first maintains that the whole of the Apocalypse is, in that chapter, contained in germ;—and possibly he may be so far correct. He next proceeds to an [300] arbitrary division of our LORD’s discourse. He maintains that it is susceptible of classification under seven heads. (Whether this again is the case or not, we are not quite prepared to say: though we certainly do not accept our author’s division.) He arranges these different subjects or heads,—these so-called *leading* statements of our LORD—in an arbitrary order of his own: not the order followed by our LORD. And then he lays down, that this (and no other) is the sequence of events opened out in the Apocalypse: that this particular series is introduced again and again (for no conceivable reason, apparently,)—veiled each time in new forms of imagery; that, commencing with the seven seals, it is seven times *repeated*, in seven different modes of typical illustration; and that it closes the whole of the Revelation.

¹ The Twenty-four are enthroned and crowned, as typical representatives of the victorious “Faith which overcometh the world;” and to which the promise is made “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with Me on My Throne.”

² S. Paul’s sequence is as follows:

1. One Body; 2. one SPIRIT; 3. one Hope; 4. one LORD; 5. one Faith; 6. one Baptism; 7. one GOD and FATHER.

Here again there appears to be an inverted parallelism.

i. The “one LORD” forms the centre of the group.

ii. “One Faith” and “one Hope” are brought into connection.

iii. “One Spirit” and “one Baptism:” “water and the HOLY GHOST:”

iv. And lastly (as in S. John’s series) the “One GOD and FATHER is associated with the mystic Cherubim in which “He dwelleth”—the one Body—the Sacred Manhood of Incarnate GOD.

For another arrangement of this celebrated sequence, vid. *Ecclesiastic*, Vol. XV: p. 374. φ ‘Williams and Hengstenberg on the Apocalypse’ p. 56 *supra*.

What a waste of language on the part of the Apostle! And what a disheartening announcement, moreover, for those who, allured by the promise of the “blessing” attached to the devout study of this Divine Book, “search diligently” into its meaning—to learn that, after all, their labour is useless. For the whole meaning lies in a nutshell; and each succeeding sequence is nought save a naked and objectless repetition (disguised in a new suit of figurative clothing) of what has gone before.

Now these seven heads, or prophetic statements, which comprise the whole of the Apocalypse, are the following:—

1. The Gospel is to be preached, with certain effects.
2. Wars are to ensue.
3. Jerusalem and the old Jewish polity to be destroyed.
4. Famines and pestilences to fall on the heathen nations.
5. The early Christians to be persecuted.
6. Heathen Rome to be overthrown.
7. The Gospel to triumph.

Now that all these events are referred to in the Apocalypse is most true; and they are doubtless introduced, moreover, as illustrations and prophetic shadows of more appalling and world-embracing occurrences yet to ensue.

But this latter truth our author steadily refuses to admit. It interferes with the simplicity, with the “clearness and consistency” of his scheme of exegesis. He maintains that these several announcements of our LORD and His Apostle have *no* ulterior reference whatever: for prophecy “has its *distinct* period of fulfilment, and to that it must be *limited*. *No double interpretations or successive fulfilments can be admitted!*”

Now to refute this monstrous assertion, or seriously examine a theory of Apocalyptic interpretation based upon such foundations, is quite beside our purpose.

We will simply exhibit, in conclusion, one or two of the results which follow from its application.

Let us take (as a simple example) the case of the *numbers*, which [301] all thoughtful students universally recognise as constituting so important, though so difficult an element in the symbolic contexture of the Book.

Here is a specimen of the “short and easy,” the “clear and consistent” method of dealing with the numerical difficulties.

The Apostle speaks of a particular visitation which is to last “*five months*.” But *why* “five months?” What does this mystic period signify? Oh, it signifies *nothing whatever*, answers the clear and consistent interpreter. “This period of five months,” he writes, “is elsewhere called an *hour*, a *day*, a *month*, a *year*, *forty and two months*, *one thousand two hundred and sixty days*,” &c. Can anything be more miserably unsatisfactory?

Again: “The *third* part of the city fell.” What does the *third* part signify? It plainly signifies “the *whole*,” answers Mr. Curzon. In another place: “The *tenth* part” of the city falls. And again: “The *tenth* part” merely means “the *whole*.” Why then, we reply, did not the Apostle say so?

Again: Mr. Curzon gravely informs us that the “*thousand years’ reign*” of the saints extended from A.D. 30 to A.D. 95. (P. 170.)

Here, too, is an example of this summary method of dealing with inspired imagery, and clearing away Scripture difficulties:

“The Locusts out of the bottomless pit; the two hundred million of Horsemen from the Euphrates; the people and tongues of the Great City; the Beast out of the sea; the Water, as a flood, cast out of the mouth of Satan; Great Babylon, or the great Whore; . . . the Beast, the False Prophet, and Kings of the earth; Gog and Magog: *all these* have severally been proved to represent the *same* power, namely, the *heathen* Roman Empire.”—P. 127.

Again: the Apostle sees a mighty angel standing in the *sun*. The “*sun*,” Mr. Curzon tells us, is the same “heathen Roman Empire.” The “Lake of fire and brimstone” symbolises the destruction of the Roman Empire. The “Great White Throne” and the awful Judgment merely depict the overthrow of the same heathen empire, together with the passing away of the Jewish covenant:—with much more to the same effect.

A writer who can contrive, with such perverse ingenuity, to evacuate of all its majesty, dignity, beauty, and significance the most striking and awful imagery of Holy Scripture, in defiance of the concurrent voice of the Universal Church, and in mere deference to a private theory of his own,—a writer, moreover, who dares to call in question the Church’s doctrine of the “Resurrection of the *Flesh*,” arguing that the expression is not to be found in Scripture,¹—such a writer must not be surprised if a system of inter[302]pretation which presents itself thus commended, is deemed utterly unworthy of serious attention.

Mr. Curzon has shown, in the earlier part of his work, that, had he not applied himself to his task with a preconceived theory to establish, and with an utter contempt for the voice of the Church, he is not without endowments which might have enabled him to compile, what he undertook to furnish, a convenient Scripture help to the ordinary reader of the Apocalypse.

At present we have only to add, that if any wish to find the mysteries of this Divine Book effectually closed against them, they have but to employ Mr. Curzon’s “Scriptural Key to the Revelation of S. John.”

¹ The two bodies,” he writes, i.e. “the natural body and the spiritual body” “*do not seem to have anything in common*, except that they are successively our own bodies and the habitations of our spirits.” P. 137. Here is a specimen of the way in which Puritanism is joining band in hand with Rationalism in undermining the very foundations of the Faith.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol 22 (Joseph Masters: London, 1860)
 [585]THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE, AND THE SCOTTISH CONTROVERSY

Pastoral Teaching on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, addressed to several Congregations since Maundy Thursday, 1860. By Seven Priests of the Scottish Church. Edinburgh: Lendrum. London: Masters.

IT is the glory of GOD to bring good out of evil, to make the very errors and follies and sins of men contribute to the working out of His secret counsels of Wisdom and Love. Man's mistakes do not, in the end, frustrate His work: they are frequently the very instruments whereby that work is brought about.

We consider that the unhappy Eucharistic controversy which still continues to agitate our sister Church in Scotland, furnishes an apt illustration of this great Truth.

That the course of the controversy has been characterised by much—very much—of evil, no sober-minded Christian, we imagine, will be found to deny. It has been attended by heart-burnings, misrepresentations, bitterness, and uncharitableness.

On the side of the Scottish Bishops, we fear it has been too evident that in the case of certain of them (Bp. Wordsworth in particular) mere personal feeling has been allowed to exercise an undue influence on their official conduct; that wounded pride, impatience of contradiction, fear of incurring popular displeasure, anxiety to satisfy the influential laity, and other questionable motives, have been permitted (we trust unconsciously to themselves) to dull their spiritual perceptions, to bias them in their solemn administration of justice, and to inspire much of their action.

While on the other side, we must no less express our opinion, that the settlement of this solemn controversy has been seriously arrested by the gall and bitterness which has thus been infused into it from the opposite quarter; and that had the defenders of High Eucharistic Doctrine manifested more of Christian forbearance, more meekness and patience, more humble trust in the overruling Love and Mercy of the Great Head of the Church; had they written (when called upon so to do) with sobriety and charity, and not been so eager to fasten upon the Bishops (to many of whom the course of the discussion must have presented very serious theological difficulties) almost every conceivable form of heresy—the storm would ere this have passed over, and our sister Church be enabled to serve GOD with some measure of “godly quietness.”

The Holy Spirit of Wisdom, whose it is to “guide into all the Truth,” is also He whose nature and whose name is *Love*—who [536] is the very Personal LOVE of GOD, that Holy Bond uniting the FATHER and the SON in indissoluble, ineffable Oneness; and who is ever repelled therefore, by acts or words inconsistent with true Christian Charity. How then can He manifest His Illuminating Presence if His Holy approaches are recklessly interfered with and resisted, by those whose sacred duty it is, in every way to court His guiding Influence?

We must claim indulgence for writing in this strain: but really if the Church of Scotland is not to be rent asunder from one end to the other, the writers who take upon them to conduct the controversy—whether anonymously or otherwise, whether in journals, pamphlets, or elsewhere—must suffer a word of exhortation, that they will never write a line on this most solemn subject, without earnest prayer that they may be guided to say nothing which shall not be for the true benefit of the Church, nothing which is not

demanded by Christian charity, nothing which may cause needless pain or irritation to any, nothing which may grieve or repel the Holy Spirit of Wisdom and of LOVE.

We have hinted at some of the evils with which the present Eucharistic controversy in Scotland has been fraught. But while fully admitting this, and expressing our serious conviction that the state of the Church in that country is such, even notwithstanding the momentary calm, as to awaken anxious apprehension, we yet are very far from imagining the religious agitation to have been an unmixed evil. Far otherwise. As in the case of the Baptismal discussion, when the turmoil had ceased, and men began to collect their thoughts and look calmly about them, it was discovered that the Church of England had made an important and decisive advance in general orthodoxy of sentiment upon that great question, and had obtained a firmer grasp and more explicit recognition of truths she had always implicitly held; so will it inevitably be found in the present instance. Documents of permanent interest and value have already been given to the Church, called into being by recent disputes; men's minds have begun to open to verities to which they have hitherto been strangers; and doctrinal statements on the Blessed Sacrament of the Altar have obtained acceptance in quarters where, but a short time ago, they had no apparent prospect whatever of gaining admission.

Among the works of permanent value for which we are indebted under GOD to the present Eucharistic Controversy in the Church of Scotland, the foremost place must, of course, be assigned to the masterly Theological Defence of the Bishop of Brechin.

Although this Defence was prepared merely to meet a special emergency, and was drawn up hastily, it is our firm belief that no Branch of the Church can produce a Treatise of a similar character, of equal value. We question very much if such a one has *ever* been written. As an exposition of the real Primitive Doctrine of [537] the Holy undivided Church on the subject of the Adorable Sacrament of the Altar, disencumbered of modern errors, whether of misbelief or unbelief, its worth is incalculable. Grave, comprehensive, learned and devout, pervaded by a tone of earnest seriousness, which a knowledge of the important issues depending on it would necessarily impart—we consider it a very model of dignified and persuasive religious writing. The full value and importance of the work, as illustrating, throughout Christendom, the theological position of the British Churches, has yet to be tested. A treatise of this kind could not perhaps have been produced but in a time of anxious controversy. We must thank GOD, then, for the very controversy that evoked it.

We think this Defence should be reprinted, with the original Charge, and a few pages of explanation recounting its history. It should be broken up moreover into sections, and furnished with a table of contents, and an index, by way of facilitating reference.

It is interesting to trace the Providence of GOD silently preparing the Church for this important emergency. Had not Archdeacon Wilberforce's, Dr Pusey's, Mr. Keble's, and other works preceded,¹ and the mind of the Anglican Church by these means, and by the revived study of the ancient Liturgies, been gradually exercised in the investigation of the Eucharistic Mystery, the composition of such a Defence in so brief a period would have been a simple impossibility.

The *specialty* of the Eucharistic Controversy in Scotland, wherein it has providentially supplemented and completed the antecedent discussions in this country, has been the attention paid in it to the *sacrificial* aspect of the Holy Sacrament.

¹ We must especially mention Dr. Pusey's *Catena*—a work of really inestimable use and importance, and perhaps the greatest of all the great boons he has conferred on the Church.

On this all-important branch of the subject, Archdeacon Wilberforce's able work was singularly defective. In the Denison discussion again, the question of the *Sacrifice* did not present itself for consideration. Archdeacon Wilberforce having reminded us of—and by the help of the useful scholastic terms, pressed strongly upon us—the fundamental distinctions between the *Sacramentum*, the *Res Sacramenti*, and the *Virtus Sacramenti*, the Denison agitation expended itself chiefly on the establishment of the great truth of the objective Presence, after Consecration, of the *Res Sacramenti*, irrespectively of the qualifications of the recipient.

As a corollary from the objective Presence, the question of Adoration necessarily came under notice; although at that time it received but a secondary attention. Mr. Keble's beautiful Treatise well-nigh exhausted that question. In consequence, however, of [538] the appearance of Mr. Freeman's thoughtful and attractive though misleading "Introduction" (the influence of which upon the theological mind of the Scottish Episcopate has been very singular), and of the theory therein propounded, that the objective Presence of our LORD'S Body and Blood in the Eucharist does not necessarily involve the very personal Presence of our LORD Himself, or call therefore for any act of Adoration—it became needful that the subject should undergo still further investigation: and this, in Mr. Keble's "Considerations," in the very able pamphlet "The Modest Reply," in the powerful writings of Mr. Cheyne and the Bishop of Brechin, it has abundantly received.

This last point, then, (*viz.* the Presence and consequent Adoration of our LORD *Himself* in the Eucharist, as necessarily involved in the admitted Presence of the Body and Blood) is *one* of the points for the complete discussion of which the Church is incidentally indebted, under GOD, to the present Controversy. Another, equally important, is the vindication of the use of the word *Substantial* as applied to our Blessed LORD'S Humanity, mysteriously Present under the Sacramental veils.

But the one subject (as we have stated) which has impressed its special and distinctive character upon the Northern discussion, and rendered it so valuable a supplement to our preliminary disputations in this country, has been unquestionably the Eucharistic *Sacrifice*. And on this cardinal question, the Bishop of Brechin's Defence—ample as it is in its treatment of the other cognate doctrines (the objective Presence—the effect of Consecration—the coexistence under one subject of two real distinct though unconfused *Substances*—Adoration—reception by the wicked, &c., &c.)—is yet peculiarly ample and exhaustive.

In what sense the Blessed Eucharist is a Sacrifice, in what sense it is not; how far it is identical with, in what respect dissimilar from, the Sacrifice of the Cross—these and kindred matters are treated of with a reverence and sobriety and learning truly admirable.

The Bishop insists, as in his Primary Charge, on the importance of discriminating between the two senses, the active and passive, of the word Sacrifice; the one signifying *the act of offering*, the other *the thing offered*; the one denoting the "*rite*," the other the "*victim*."¹

He shows how that, in the latter, or passive, sense of the word, the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar are absolutely identical, inasmuch as the *thing offered* is the same—the very Body which hung on the Cross being the very Body (for there [539] can be no other) which is pleaded and received in the Holy Eucharist. Whereas in the former, or

¹ Waterland notices the same cardinal distinction. "CHRIST," he says, "performed His Sacrifice in the *active* and *transient* sense, once for all, upon the Cross. He distributes it daily, in the *passive* and *abiding* sense of it, to all His true servants, to every faithful Communicant." (Distinctions of Sacrifice.)

active, sense of the word, there can, of course, be no such identity; the Holy Eucharist being but the solemn commemoration or Memorial, before GOD and man, of the one active Sacrifice once for all made and finished on the Cross.

The unconscious confusion between these two distinct meanings of the word, has really been one cause of much of the misapprehension which has prevailed on the subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

CHRIST is not again immolated on the Altar. But CHRIST our Sacrifice is there pleaded. In other words the Holy Eucharist is a Sacrifice, inasmuch as it is a *Memorial*, or sacrificial commemoration, of the Sacrifice of the Cross.

So that whereas it is objected, It is not a sacrifice because it is only a memorial; we answer, It is the very fact of its being a real “Memorial” which imparts to it its sacrificial character.

To show this, we have but to gaze reverently upwards, and ask, What is the nature of the Sacrifice which our Blessed LORD as “Priest for ever,” is now “for ever” offering up? It is the *Memorial* of the One Great Sacrifice which He once offered with pain and Blood on the Cross. It is Himself “as He had been slain.” ([Greek], Rev. v. 6.)

The same Sacrificial Memorial, which is pleaded in Heaven, is the very same which, under Sacramental veils, is pleaded on earth: and we repeat, it is the very fact of its being really and truly a “Memorial,” which imparts to it its distinctive Sacrificial character.

There is no fresh slaying of the Lamb in Heaven: but there is the continuous and availing Presentation before the FATHER of the “slain Lamb”—the “Lamb of GOD” bearing the marks of violent Death, though now ever-living, and by the merits of that Death interceding.

So there is no sacramental mactation of CHRIST on the Altar; no repetition of the one great Act once for all effected on Calvary; no slaying, in successive Eucharists, of fresh victims to propitiate GOD—like the reiterated sacrifices of the Jewish priests (the doctrine strongly and justly condemned by our thirty-first Article, as one of the popular misconceptions of a great Catholic verity)—but a mysterious commemorative Oblation of the precious Body and Blood once offered on the Cross.

Moreover, the Divine Victim presented on the celestial and on the earthly Altar being one and the same (His earthly presence being brought about, according to His gracious promises, by the agency of the HOLY GHOST)—whatever propitiatory virtue is essentially inherent in Him, must necessarily appertain to Him, energize through Him, flow from Him, wherever His all-pleading, all-availing Presence is manifested.

The Jewish sacrifices at once exhibit and explain the *memorial* nature of our LORD’s continuous Oblation.

The sacrifice, of old, was not complete, when the act of mactation had been performed. Nay, had the service terminated there, no good whatever would have been effected. The most important part—that which alone made the sacrifice available—had yet to ensue. The *essence* of the sacrifice—i.e., the sacrifice *itself* by representation—had to be solemnly offered up, pleaded and presented before GOD. Now it was this representative sacrifice, which contained, as it were, the *essence* of the sacrifice, which attested also the fact of the immolation having taken place, and which thus put GOD in remembrance of His covenant which was ratified between Himself and Israel with Blood—this it was which constituted the memorial. If the offering was an animal, the memorial was its life-blood; if the offering was of flour, the memorial was the priest’s “handful” taken from it.

Now it was the solemn presentation of this sacrificial memorial before GOD, which gave practical efficacy to the whole service, and without which the sacrifice itself would have been useless and availing. To enter into details at present is beside our purpose. Sufficient that we see the broad meaning of the rite, and observe that the oblation of the memorial was not something of secondary moment, but the effectuating part of the whole service.

And even so, CHRIST's precious Death had proved all unavailing to the pardon of sin, had He not risen and ascended, and, as the Great High Priest, entered within the veil, there to present before the throne of GOD the one 'living and continuous' Memorial of His infinitely meritorious Death and Passion. And what is the Memorial of His Death, but His own *life-blood*—nay, His Divine and once crucified *Manhood*, in its entire subsistence—for though dead, He liveth for evermore. This He pleads. This He ever presents to GOD; with this He intercedes: as S. Paul says, "It is CHRIST that died, *yea rather*, that is risen again, Who is even at the right hand of GOD, Who also *maketh intercession* for us."

All the offerings exhibit, and have their realization in, Him. He is the great antitype at once of the sweet-savour offerings, and of the sin offerings;¹ the former class having their main fulfilment in His all-holy self-devoted life; the latter in His atoning Death.

In the entire self-consecration of His whole being to GOD, in the free, spontaneous, lifelong sacrifice of His own will to that of His FATHER, He was an "offering and sacrifice to GOD for a sweet-smelling savour." In the mystery of His expiatory Death, "He who knew no sin was made a sin-offering for us." And it is the continuous presentation in the Holy Place, of the Memorial of that great sin-offering, viz., the atoning Blood, which obtains for the [541] Church the continuous grant of the "remission of sins," justification, sanctification, and all the benefits of the sacred blood-shedding on Calvary. As S. Paul distinctly shows in Heb. xiii. 11, 12, (a passage constantly misunderstood.)

He first insists that we, in the Christian Church, have a privilege which the Levitical priesthood possessed not, viz., the right to partake of the highest grades of the sin offerings. For what became of those offerings of old? Might they be eaten? No; being wholly charged with sin, they were wholly consumed "without the camp."

But of these very offerings *we* may eat. At the Christian Altar we may *eat* of Him "Who was made *sin* for us."

The eating of the sacrifices symbolized the notion of deriving from them nourishment, satisfaction, support. Was there then, of old, such a knowledge of the "forgiveness of sins" as to impart to the penitent worshipper this support and comfort? Not so; the forgiveness of sin was shrouded in awful mystery. The sin offerings, though duly offered up, were yet not permitted to afford food or satisfaction to the sin-burdened soul, or make the offerers "perfect as pertaining to the conscience." But now, the case is far otherwise. We may eat, and are commanded to eat of them. The very "Lamb of GOD" charged with our *sins*, He it is who grants us His "Peace." Of Him Who was made sin for us, we may eat and be refreshed.

But the point immediately before us relates to the *Blood* of the sin-offering, and to the question, How does our LORD, as our anti-typical Sacrifice of expiation, secure for us continuous acceptance and sanctification?

¹ In the "offerings of a sweet savour" were included the Burnt Offerings, the Meat Offerings, and the Peace Offerings. In the "Sin Offerings" were included the Sin Offerings, properly so called, and the Trespass Offerings. The former division were offered for acceptance, the latter for expiation.

S. Paul intimates to us, in this same passage, that it is not by the act of His Death once consummated; but by Himself, as High Priest, “bringing the Blood” of Himself, as sin offering, “into the Sanctuary.”

A glance at the parallel clauses of verses 11, 12, will show this. The bodies of the sin offerings are burnt without the camp. JESUS suffered without the gate.

But in order that the “people might be *sanctified*” by the sacrifice, and participate in its merits, its “Blood was brought by the High Priest into the Sanctuary.” And in like manner, in order that His people might be sanctified by the precious Blood of JESUS, and might derive virtue from His atoning Death, *His* sacred Blood was brought by Himself into the Heavenly Sanctuary.

And in this respect, as we have before shown, does JESUS still “sanctify the people with His own Blood,” offering it to the FATHER for us in the Heavenly Sanctuary, pleading its merits, and by it procuring for us access to the FATHER, and all other ‘good things,’ specially the great gift of the HOLY GHOST. And this continuous intercessory action of our Great High Priest we see ever [542] and anon let down (as it were) from Heaven to earth, visibly embodied and represented in the Eucharistic mystery; and so brought near to us, that we may all singly participate in its propitiatory virtue.

But the mystery of our sanctification by the Blood of JESUS is not exhausted in this type. That Blood is not only presented to the FATHER to purchase our sanctification; it is also communi-cated to *us* to impart it.

To see this, we must have recourse to another type to which our LORD Himself refers us on a very sacred occasion.

At the time of the solemn inauguration of the Mosaic covenant, Moses took the sacrificial blood. Half of it he sprinkled on the altar; with the other half, “he sprinkled the people and said, *Behold the Blood of the Covenant* which the LORD hath made with you.”

Here then we see the people brought into actual *contact* with the Divinely appointed instrument of sanctification, the “*Blood of the Covenant;*” it was sprinkled *on* them. And so too with us: the “Blood of the Covenant” must not be merely presented to the FATHER for us; it must be communicated to us; we must be brought in *actual contact* with it; its cleansing efficacy must be imparted to each of us individually.

But we cannot ascend up to Heaven, in order that the true Moses, who is sprinkling it on the heavenly Altar, may also sprinkle it on us. And hence, in infinite love, He *brings it down* from Heaven to earth in order that we may in very deed and truth receive of its purifying, consecrating touch. And that our LORD *intended* us to regard the Holy Eucharist in this additional light, as the means whereby we may not only plead, but receive, be touched and sprinkled with the holy instrument of sanctification, His own blessed words plainly attest. “*This is My Blood of the New Covenant;*” “*Drink ye all of it.*”

S. Paul refers us also to the same significant ceremony. All things under the law, he tells us, were purified with blood. And hence Moses (to express this mysterious truth, and symbolize the future sanctifying efficacy of Blood), “took blood, and sprinkled *all* the people, saying, “This is the blood of the Covenant:”—where, in the words “*all,*” and “*the*

Blood of the Covenant,” it is needless to point the intentional symbolical allusion to the Holy Eucharist, and to the sacred words of Institution.¹

Well may the Apostle argue, that if the blood of the old Covenant imparted, by its contact, purification from ceremonial defilement—much more shall the “Blood of the New Covenant” sacramentally conveyed to us, operate to the purifying of our consciences: and [543] well may he foretell the fearful doom awaiting those who sacrilegiously profane this transcendent Gift, which he characteristically designates as “the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith we are *sanctified*.”

But the full Mystery of our Sanctification by the Blood of JESUS, as symbolized of old, cannot be apprehended except we take also into consideration another very strange but significant enactment of the earlier Dispensations.

The flesh of many of the sacrifices might be eaten; but not so the blood. Under the most awful sanctions was any participation of the blood interdicted. It might, we see, be sprinkled externally, but not partaken of internally. “I will set My face against the soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off. . . For the *life* of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the Altar to make an atonement for your souls . . . for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul . . . therefore no soul of you shall eat blood . . . for the life of all flesh is the blood thereof: whosoever eateth it shall be cut off.” (Lev. xvii. 10-14.)

The Mystery of *communicated Life*, i.e., *real* sanctification, was as yet unrevealed. What benefit could the communicated life of a beast convey? This solemn interdict evidently enveloped some great Divine Secret; a secret which was not disclosed till HE our Life, our Sacrifice, our GOD, transfigured and reversed the interdict into a positive command. “This is My Blood.” “Drink ye *all* of it.” For “Whoso eateth My Flesh, *and drinketh My Blood*, hath eternal *Life*.” In the “Blood is the Life:” it is the vehicle of the Lifegiving Spirit which animates the Body of CHRIST; by communion of which (as S. Paul says) “we are *all* made to *drink* into One Spirit.” No sooner had our LORD conveyed this transcendent Gift to His Church, namely the Sacred “Flesh with the Blood which is the *Life* of the Flesh,” and made her thus partaker of the “Life of GOD,” than He bids her to manifest this new Life, and call in action this Divine energy (the very nature of GOD) infused into her. “A new commandment give I unto you, that ye *Love* one another.” For “Love is *of* GOD,” and *is* GOD; and “whosoever *loveth* is born of GOD.” “He that *loveth* not, abideth in *death*.”

We can never reflect on this subject without marvelling at the mysterious infatuation which has possessed the Church of Rome, and the terrible guilt wherewith she has deliberately charged herself, and for which, except she “repent and do her first works,” condign judgment *must* overtake her, in permitting herself to presume to countermand this solemn and positive injunction of her dying LORD.

There is much, very much, in our own Branch of the Church to make us sober, anxious, and humble. But, thank GOD, we have nothing like this to disquiet us; no impious mutilation of the very [544] sources and channels of Spiritual Life. Here we see an open defiance of the clear voice of CHRIST and of the Holy undivided Church. Here we see something to constrain us to regard with profoundest suspicion other dogmas that present themselves to us merely on the authority of that Branch of the Church.

¹ It is to be observed that the “Blood of the Covenant” which Moses sprinkled on the people, was not the Blood of Sin offerings, but of offerings of sweet savour. It is interesting to notice how in the Holy Eucharist, both great classes of offerings combine.

Against this we must continue to protest with all our might. So long as the Church of Rome persists in this uncatholic and wicked innovation, union with her would be simply a sin against GOD.

CHRIST's Faithful Remnant, we know, on the express testimony of the HOLY GHOST, will be found "eating of this Bread, *and drinking of this Cup*" "until the LORD comes." The Church of Rome, then, cannot expect to be numbered amongst that little flock who at that time will be found obediently "showing forth their LORD's Death" as He commanded them—if she persists in her present unlawful practice.

From what mysterious graces she is wilfully excluding herself, we cannot tell. She may have bitterly to discover this when too late; when those graces are most intensely needed (as a protection, perchance, against "the strong delusion") but are not to be had; and when there is an earnest but, unavailing "Cry for *Wine* in the Streets."

If the Gift of the "Cup" was necessary at the first, it is so now. If it was *then* the vehicle of *particular* graces and blessings, (and if it was not so, it would not have been superadded to the Gift of the "Bread") it is so now. If it was needful to the completion of the Mystery then, and the command "Drink ye all of it," imposed any obligation on the Church then, the obligation is every whit as solemnly and inevitably binding now. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My Words shall not pass away." "The Word that I have spoken, the same shall judge you at the last Day."

We have dwelt at such length on the general subject of the Eucharistic Sacrifice (although we have been able to do no more than barely suggest one or two lines of thought upon so important a question) that we have left ourselves but small space to notice the little work at the head of our present article.

It consists of seven sermons on the Holy Eucharist by different writers, and is chiefly occupied with the sacrificial aspect of the Sacrament. The sermons vary in merit and mode of treatment, but, on the whole, handle the subject in a thoughtful, satisfactory, and reverent way. We trust that the circumstances under which the book has been brought out, may not mar its usefulness.

As to the delicate question of the prudence or charity of publishing the volume at this particular juncture, we see so plainly how much there is to be urged on both sides, that we are glad not to be called upon to express a decided opinion.

Anything looking like a challenge or defiance to the Bishops [545] under present circumstances, would of course, be much to be deprecated. And after the acquittal of the Bishop of Brechin, on the delivery of the noble Defence to which we have referred, and the important step thereby virtually gained, it would almost have seemed to us living at a distance, that the real interests of the Church had best been advanced by the Catholic party, by their laying aside hostilities for a while, abstaining studiously from anything likely to cause irritation or offence to the Bishops, by leaving the cause in GOD's hands, and praying Him, in His own good time, and in His own way, to vindicate His Truth, and restore peace to the Church.

We fear lest, if the Bishops are so ill-advised as to regard this book in the light of a challenge, and act accordingly, it may have the effect of delaying the otherwise inevitable (though not perhaps immediate) restoration of Mr. Cheyne, producing fresh complications, and throwing matters further back than ever.

It is on this account that we regret the tone of the last of these sermons. We cannot think it altogether wise, or charitable, or becoming, under the circumstances. The sermon itself is

good and valuable; but it bears too much of the appearance of a direct personal attack to be quite suitable for the place where it was preached, or for the volume in which it now occurs.

We have all of us need at these times to impress deeply on our hearts this great truth, that though we have the gift of illumination, and are able to “understand all mysteries and all knowledge,” and are even willing to give our bodies to be burned in defence of the faith, and yet are deficient in real genuine *Charity*, our wisdom and zeal will avail but little.

The two best sermons in the volume appear to us to be the first, by Mr. Harper, on “CHRIST the great High Priest;” and the fourth, by Mr. Comper, on “the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the reception of very CHRIST, as flowing necessarily from the concession of the Real Presence.” This latter is a very carefully written and comprehensive discourse.

We quote the following from Mr. Harper, on the important subject of Eucharistic Worship:

“CHRIST in His glorified Humanity . . . is the Worship of the redeemed, whether by worship we understand the Victim which we offer up to the glory of GOD the FATHER, or the Object Whom we and the countless myriads of the blessed incessantly adore. In both respects CHRIST is our Worship. Him Whom we offer up, the same do we adore, and adore while we offer. Him Whom we receive under the ‘form’ of Bread and Wine as the food of our souls, we also worship with lowly reverence. He is always and everywhere adorable—adorable in Himself and in His attributes—adorable in His Divinity—adorable in His Humanity—adorable on His Cross and in His Tomb—adorable in His Throne in Heaven—adorable in His Sacramental [546] Presence on earth: and if at the very *Name* of JESUS every knee shall bow in adoration, how shall we not adore Him, when He comes in His very Person to His Altar-throne, and gives Himself wholly to us ‘to be our spiritual Food and Sustenance in the Holy Sacrament.’”—P. 10.

And the following from Mr. Comper:

“There is one only true Body of CHRIST, and of that one Body He spake, saying of the Sacrament, ‘This is My Body.’ Even His mystical Body the Church, which seems another, is not really so. It is the outgrowth, development and fruit of His Incarnate Body, formed by It, and one with It. When, therefore, we speak of His Sacramental Body, or His Spiritual Body—in distinction to His Natural Body—we can only rightly be understood as distinguishing the *manner* of Presence. The Body of CHRIST Which was crucified, is that Which is in Heaven, and it is the same Which is in the Holy Eucharist. He has no other Body. Were it otherwise, CHRIST would be divided. The one CHRIST is bodily or locally in Heaven: spiritually and sacramentally in the Eucharist. The real Presence in the Sacrament must, therefore, mean the Presence of His one real Body. He who believes not this, virtually denies the real Presence of CHRIST in the Sacrament.”—Pp. 43, 44.

Dean Smith applies the text, “the Good Shepherd giveth His Life for the sheep,” to that Blessed Sacrament wherein the Good Shepherd still continues to feed the Church with His own Life-giving Body and Blood.

Mr. Blenkinsopp’s sermon on the text, “For their sakes I sanctify Myself,” &c. is perhaps fanciful, though at the same time it evidences a thoughtful and original mind.

Mr. Howard adds a devout, though very brief sermon on Eucharistic Worship. And Mr. McColl another, on “CHRIST’s Presence no blessing to the unworthy,” containing a useful popular explanation of the province, and receptive character of Faith, and a thoughtful note on the *nature* of our LORD’s Presence in the Sacrament, showing it to be real and Personal, though not “localised.”

Our space warns us that we must come to an abrupt conclusion.

A new Ecclesiastical year is just opening before us. The season of the Nativity—the season of “Peace on earth, and goodwill amongst men,”—is drawing on apace. May the prayers of

all who “love the LORD JESUS,” who yearn for the unity of His Church, ascend up mightily to GOD that He would restore “Peace and goodwill” to this distracted portion of His inheritance. “Turn Thee again, Thou GOD of Hosts, look down from Heaven: behold and visit this Vine.”

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol 23 (Joseph Masters: London, 1861)
 [193]RECENT ANNOTATORS ON THE APOCALYPSE: WORDSWORTH AND ALFORD

Wordsworth's Greek Testament. Vol. IV. Rivingtons. 1860.
Alford's Greek Testament. Vol. IV. Part II. Rivingtons. 1860.

WE have here the concluding volumes of two very important works—works varying considerably in their general scope and execution, characterised each by grave defects, yet both likely to prove of real and permanent value to the Church. Traversing simultaneously the same ground of sacred exegesis, the writers still pursue their journeys by totally different routes. Neither work interferes with the other: neither supersedes the other: each has a value of its own: each brings to light beauties unnoticed by the other: each supplies deficiencies to be found in the pages of the other.

Dr Wordsworth's Commentary is, as is well known, professedly Anglican and Patristic. The speciality of Dean Alford's consists in its claim to furnish a compendious *résumé* of the results of the best German and other modern criticism. Dr Wordsworth is stanchly conservative; Dean Alford progressive. Not that the former ignores the labours of recent critics, or the latter neglects all appeals to patristic authority: we are merely stating the general complexion of their respective works.

Our present object, however, is not to undertake a detailed examination of either of the volumes now under notice, but to confine ourselves to one portion of each,—the Revelation of S. John.

We own to having felt a certain measure of curiosity and anxiety to see how this mysterious Book would be handled in both these works. We have wondered, with regard to Dr Wordsworth, whether maturer reflection, and the deeper insight into the scope and language of New Testament prophecy, which his recent labours will have afforded him, would have induced him to qualify or abandon any portion of that system of Apocalyptic interpretation with which his name has become in a measure associated. We have been glad to notice occasional modifications of previously expressed opinions; but regret that in regard to the leading features of his hermeneutic scheme, his views have undergone little or no alteration.

We opened Dean Alford's notes with a vague feeling of apprehension; which, however, we are bound to say, has been considerably dissipated by their perusal. The notes are too often meagre and most unsatisfying, and in certain crucial instances vexatiously brief: still they are, on the whole, characterized by a careful sobriety of [194] tone; they evince a thoughtful and cautious recognition of the real difficulties and exigencies of the text, and occasionally exhibit in this respect a favourable contrast with the more copious and ambitious annotations of the Canon of Westminster. Dean Alford is often wise enough to acknowledge his inability to offer any solution of difficulties which present themselves: and in the case of several of the visions, merely aims at suggesting certain broad and general principles of interpretation—at indicating some of the leading way-marks which seem designed to point out the main tracks of exposition to be pursued, and those to be avoided—rather than at attempting to thread all the intricate mazes and by-paths into which the details of the text invite the reader. Dean Alford is thus often saved from the forced, far-fetched, and incongruous interpretations which occasionally disfigure Dr Wordsworth's volume: but on the other hand, he misses numberless beauties of detail, and marks of Divine perfection and design, which a more laborious analysis of the text would have disclosed to him.

I. In his exposition of the Seven Epistles, Dr Wordsworth's notes are replete with valuable and suggestive matter. This important section of the Revelation of S. John is treated by him very ably and completely; the writer appearing to take a reverent delight in tracing out the numerous tokens of Divine superintendence furnished by the very language itself, and in detecting the many indications of minute elaboration and system which are so abundantly discernible in the general structure and contexture of that sacred series.¹

We rather wonder, however, that he has not noticed the *symmetrical* arrangement of the septenary series, (an arrangement very common in the sevenfold sequences of Holy Scripture, and in this case specially indicated by its visible type, the seven-branched candlestick,) in which the *first* and *seventh* members correspond, the *second* and *sixth*, the *third* and *fifth*, leaving a fourth or central member.

That in the present instance, (amid multitudinous other traces of order and design which are constantly presenting themselves,) there exists this kind of balancing contrast, parallelism, or relation between the corresponding members on either side of the central Epistle, we conceive to be sufficiently plain.

1. Thus in *Laodicea* we see the full development of those germs of evil which were beginning to manifest themselves in *Ephesus*. Ephesus is zealous and enduring, keen-sighted in the detection of error, and able with righteous fervour to *hate*: but she is forget[195]ting. how to *love*. Here is the root of that censorious self-sufficiency which exhibits itself in the "I am rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," of Laodicea. In Ephesus we see love *waning*: in Laodicea (which seems specially to point to the latter days) we see "iniquity abounding, and the love of the many *waxen cold*." We learn from the two, that zeal if only "one-sided," eventually "loses even that one side:" all religious fervour which is not kept alive by love, soon chills: the loveless abhorrence of error degenerates into cold, self-satisfied indifference to error. We see, moreover, in the rebuke to Ephesus, "Thou hast left thy first love," the explanation of that to Laodicea, "Thou art lukewarm;" and also the ground of the peculiar loathsomeness of that state. Had the Church never received the gift of Divine Life—the supernatural infusion of Charity; were she but in her natural state of coldness and death, it had been far better. There were then far more prospect of mercy. "It had been better for them not to have known the way of the LORD, than *having known it to turn*" therefrom.² But here there is not this natural coldness: here are the decaying embers of a supernatural Flame: here are the sad tokens of a love that *has been*; of a charity that has become tepid, lukewarm, and to CHRIST loathsome and intolerable. And as all other graces die out (some earlier, some later) with love; so, even that keen-sighted sagacity in detecting error which characterized Ephesus, has now departed. Laodicea has become "*blind*;" and is exhorted "to buy eyesalve of GOD that she may be able to see." For with the absence of love, she has lost not only her true riches, and her true clothing, but also (what she specially plumed herself on) her true *wisdom*. She has become denuded of all her beauty and loveliness. And her present state of secular prosperity, so far from being a token of GOD's favour, is rather (from Him who "loves those who love Him," and Who "rebukes and chastens" all His loved ones) a token

¹ When Dr. Wordsworth, however, adduces the sevenfold repetition of the [Greek] as one of the marks of Divine order, he should bear in mind that the weight of MS. authority is very decidedly against the insertion of these words in the case of the 2nd and 3rd Epistles, and that they are there rejected by almost all recent editors.

² Dr. Wordsworth appositely refers here to 1 Tim. i. 13; S. Luke xii. 48; xxiii. 34.

of reprobation. The threat of removal denounced against Ephesus is now to be terribly realized, "I am about to spue thee out of My mouth."

2. In the Epistles to *Smyrna* and *Philadelphia*, the parallelism is even more marked. In these two Epistles, and in these only, is there praise accorded, without any admixture of blame. We see adumbrated in these, probably, the faithful Martyr-Church of the early, and the latter days. Both have fallen upon a season of *temptation*. Satan is about to *tempt* and afflict Smyrna, without harming her. Philadelphia is to be kept scatheless from the *temptation*¹ which is coming on all the world. Both the Churches are opposed by the very same ecclesiastical foes, "those who say [196] they are Jews, and are not; but are of the Synagogue of Satan" (ii. 8; iii. 9.) Smyrna has promised to her, if she continues faithful, the "*Crown of Life*." Philadelphia is encouraged to hold fast that which she hath, that no man take her *crown*.²

3. And in like manner, *Pergamos* and *Sardis*, the *third* and *fifth* Churches, present a similar kind of secret relationship or parallelism. Pergamos is established in the very seat of the world-power, the "Throne" of the "Prince of the world." Here appears to be a reference to State-establishment. Her danger, therefore, will arise from state friendship and worldly compliance. We see the developed result of this in the case of Sardis, who has lost all her higher life. Pergamos still holds fast GOD's Name, though she suffers tenets of earthly conformity to be promulgated: Sardis keeps the Christian profession, but has lost the reality: she "has a *name* that she lives, but is dead." Pergamos harbours those who teach the seductive doctrines of Balaam and tempt GOD's people to spiritual fornication: so rapidly do these insidious tenets spread, with such desolating power does the spiritual impurity propagate itself, that in Sardis but "a few names" can be found who have not "defiled their garments."

To those in Pergamos who cherish the hidden life, while traversing the world's wilderness, is the "hidden manna" promised, and also a "*white stone*."³ The possession of this latter gift—this secret token of acceptance and absolution—this "pearl of great price"—is said to be known only to its owner. The world discovers it not. But the world *shall* discover it. The glistening *white* shall yet manifest itself. The colour of the sacred "stone," and of the "Bread from Heaven" shall yet be seen by all. And thus, of the faithful in Sardis we read, that they shall walk with CHRIST in *white*, and shall be apparelled in white garments. They shall be *all white*, like their LORD on the Mount of Transfiguration.

But further: in Pergamos the white stone is impressed with a "*New Name*"—the reward for holding fast GOD's Name: and this Name is recognized by none save him to whom it is given, the SPIRIT bearing secret witness with his spirit that he is GOD's own child. But in the promise to the faithful in Sardis we see an advance upon this. The New Name is now not only the receiver's for a time; given to him engraven on a white stone, and so perhaps capable of being lost: but it is really his own—his own for ever: "I will not blot out *his* name out of the Book of Life." [197] Nor is the name any longer a secret which "none knoweth save he that receiveth it:" it is proclaimed to the whole spiritual universe; "I will

¹ Cf. ii. 10; iii. 10; the only two references to temptation ([Greek]) contained in the Apocalypse.

² Cf. ii. 10; iii. 11; the only two instances in the Apocalypse in which this word [Greek] occurs; except in reference to our LORD Himself, and certain of the symbolical personages introduced.

³ [Greek]; the distinctive colour of CHRIST in this book. It may be remembered also, that it is expressly stated (and the statement repeated) that the colour of the manna was *white* ([Greek]). In the Book of Numbers it is said to have been "like the colour of bdellium." It is not quite certain whether bdellium was a white shining gum, or a "white stone;" some pure gem, a pearl or crystal.

confess his name in the Presence of My FATHER, and in the presence of His Angels.” (Cf. ii. 17; iii. 5.)

4. In the central church of *Thyatira*, midway between Pergamos and Sardis, we see the worldliness, which in the former was beginning to manifest itself, and in the latter had resulted in spiritual death, existing side by side with active work for CHRIST; the two opposing principles, Christianity and antichristianity, for a time in energetic and loving co-operation. The Church of Thyatira is full of activity (the unnatural energy preceding the expiring life): we read of love, faith, service, endurance, and works. And yet “He whose eyes are a flame of fire” discerns that the Angel of the Church has taken to his very bosom the false prophetess Jezebel, that she is industriously disseminating false doctrines, and he tacitly permitting it.¹ Here is some unnatural and unholy alliance: and hence the denunciations of vengeance, “Behold I cast her into a bed, and those who commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of her deeds.” It is not said “of *their* deeds,” but “of *her* deeds” ([Greek]). *She* is responsible. “By *thy* sorceries (it is said to her great antitype) were all the nations deceived.” (xix. 23.)

But we must not dwell longer on this introductory heptad.

II. In his exposition of the mysterious vision of the Throne of GOD, in cap. iv., Dr Wordsworth adheres to the strange conclusion already adopted by him, that the four [Greek] represent the four Gospels, and the twenty-four elders the books of the Old Testament. Now it is on all hands admitted that there are some apparent points of typical connection between the Inspired Scriptures and the symbols in question; but to attempt to establish a bald identification of them appears to us something like a grave trifling with sacred symbolism.

How, for instance, can it be possible, without a most extravagant straining of S. John’s mystical language, to identify the Elders with the books of the Old Testament?

What are we told respecting the sacred *twenty four*?

We find them vested in white robes, enthroned, worshipping, crowned with golden crowns (iv. 4); prostrating themselves before GOD (iv. 10); conversing with, questioning, comforting, instructing the Apostle (v. 5; vii. 13—18); presenting the prayers and praises of the saints before GOD; singing a new song; sweeping the strings of their golden harps, and blessing GOD for redemption² [198] (v. 8—10); offering thanksgivings to GOD because of His dread judgments (xi. 16); chanting the “Amen, Alleluia” (xix. 4).

Now how can any sober writer endeavour to reduce these various statements into conformity with the interpretation adopted by Dr Wordsworth? In certain instances Dr Wordsworth does not even attempt any explanation (as we have occasionally noticed

¹ [Greek]

² [Greek]. Dr. Wordsworth, together with Dean Alford and other recent editors, rejects the important word [Greek]; but, we feel persuaded, on insufficient grounds. The preponderance of MS. authority seems unquestionably in its favour. See the note of Tregelles, who strongly insists upon its retention, in his useful little work, “The Revelation, from ancient authorities” (p. 11, 12.).

The translation of the genuine text appears indisputably to be, “Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the seals thereof: because Thou wast slain; and redeemedst *us* to GOD by Thy Blood out of every tribe and tongue, and people and nation, and madest *them* a kingdom and priests; and they reign on the earth.”

The Church in heaven gives thanks for its own redemption, and for the establishment of the rule of the Church on earth.

elsewhere, in cases of real difficulty): in others he does offer a solution, and our readers may judge with what success.

The elders are *crowned*, have each golden *harps*, and *present the prayers of the saints to God*. How can the Scriptures be said to satisfy these conditions?

First: Why are the elders crowned, and seated on thrones? Because (says Dr Wordsworth) "Holy Scripture has a Divine power and authority, as GOD's law. It is a *royal law* (S. James ii. 8); thus it is *enthroned*, and wears a *crown*."

But secondly: the elders sing praises and offer the prayers of the saints. How does the Scripture effect this? Because "it is expressive of man's *desires* and *praises* to GOD for His mercies in CHRIST. The Scriptures declare the *longings* of holy men for the Gospel, and they record their *gratitude* for it." (P. 182.) Can anything be more weak and unsatisfactory?

But again: on the fall of Babylon, the elders and the [Greek] fall down and worship GOD, and chant "Amen, Alleluia."

Here is the exposition:

"The voice of the Two Testaments will be lifted up in praise to GOD for His judgments executed by Him on the Harlot City, which has corrupted the Faith delivered to the Church in Holy Scripture, and has done wrong to Holy Scripture by placing unwritten Traditions on a par with it, and by exalting the Apocrypha to a level with the Canonical Books, and by withholding the Scriptures from the people, and by elevating her own Latin Version to a position of not less, even *if not greater*, authority than the inspired Originals themselves."—P. 256.

We wonder if Dr Wordsworth considers such a method of interpreting GOD's Word to be one whit more respectful towards it, than the treatment of it with which he here charges the Church of Rome? We do not.

III. In chap. vi., at the opening of the four successive Seals, Dr Wordsworth adopts what we conceive to be the erroneous reading, [Greek], and thus misses the meaning of the utterance; [199] regarding the fourfold "Come and see" as addressed by the Living Creatures to S. John.¹ The genuine reading, however, appears to be merely [Greek], the solitary word. We noticed in a recent number the sevenfold repetition of this word in the Apocalypse; embodying as it does the deep yearnings of the entire Creation of GOD, and the whole Church in Paradise and on earth. Four times it is uttered by the Living Creatures. Then we have, "The Spirit and the Bride say, "[Greek]" then, "Let him that heareth say, "[Greek]". And lastly, the Apostle himself concludes, [Greek].

To whom, then, do the Living Creatures address this word, "*Come?*" We believe, to the same Divine Object to whom the word is addressed in the other cases where it occurs in this Book.

¹ It must be borne in mind that, according to Dr. Wordsworth's interpretation, it is the *four Gospels* in succession that utter this exclamation to the Apostle. The idea of S. John's Gospel addressing S. John is somewhat a novel one. However, an explanation of the difficulty is fairly attempted. But in a subsequent vision, when one of the four living creatures is represented as giving to the Angels of the last plagues the seven golden vials full of the wrath of GOD, (xv. 7,) here his ingenuity entirely fails him, and he leaves the question, as to *which* of the Gospels presented the vials, and *how* it performed the operation, without an attempt at an answer.

We have been glad to notice that Dean Alford takes this view (which we cannot but believe to be the true one) respecting the Cherubic utterance: when we pressed it in a former paper we were not aware that any writer had adopted it.¹

As the question is one of interest, and may be new to some, we will quote an extract from Dean Alford's note on the passage:—

“To whom, and with what meaning, is this [Greek] spoken? The great majority of commentators . . . have regarded the ‘Come’ as addressed to the Seer. But whither was he to come? Separated as he was by the glassy sea from the Throne, was he to cross it? And where shall we find the simple verb [Greek] used absolutely in such a sense, ‘Draw near,’ without [Greek], or some such particle? . . . In interpreting so unusual a term of address, surely we should rather begin by inquiring whether we have not the key to it in the Book itself? And in this inquiry are we justified in leaving out of consideration such a verse as ch. xxii. 17; . . . and xxii. 22? This seems to show in my mind, beyond a doubt, what, in the mind of the Seer, the remarkable and insulated exclamation [Greek] imported. It was a cry addressed, not to himself, but to the LORD JESUS. And as each of these four first seals is accompanied by a similar cry from one of the four living beings, I see represented in this fourfold [Greek] the groaning and travailing together of creation for the manifestation of the sons of GOD, expressed in each case in a prayer for CHRIST's Coming; and in the things revealed when the seals are opened His fourfold preparation for His Coming on earth. Then at the opening of the fifth seal the longing of the martyred saints for the same great consummation is expressed, and at that of the sixth it actually arrives.”—P. 611.

[200]

We are unable also to acquiesce in Dr Wordsworth's interpretation of the four Riders, who appear on the opening of the first four Seals. He sees in the first a representation of our LORD, and in the three others various representations of Satan.

Rather: we see in these four visions the successive phases of our LORD's continuous Advent; the four-fold, or complete, judicial preparation for His great final Coming. We are assured in the first (the “Rider on the White Horse” who goes forth “conquering and to conquer”) that the ultimate and everlasting victory shall belong to CHRIST and His Church; but we are taught by the subsequent visions that this glorious result will not be brought about without ‘great tribulation,’ and the presence on earth of GOD's “four sore judgments.”

“The horses and riders,” writes Dean Alford, “are the various aspects of the Divine Dispensations which should come upon the earth preparatory to the great Day of the LORD's coming.”

“All four (he adds) are *judgments* upon the earth: the beating down of earthly power, the breaking up of earthly peace, the exhausting of earthly wealth, the destruction of earthly life.”—P. 612.²

¹ Vide *Ecclesiastic*, No. XCI., July, 1860, pp. 296, 297, *note*. φ This cross reference is inaccurate: the correct reference is to ‘Curzon's Scriptural Key to the Revelation of S. John’, Vol. 22. See p. 342 fn2 *supra*.

² Thus, in the Rider on the White Horse, Dean Alford sees, not exactly our LORD Himself, but “a Symbol of His Victorious Power, the embodiment of His advancing Kingdom as regards that *side* of its progress where it breaks down earthly power, and makes the kingdom of the world to be the kingdom of our LORD and His CHRIST.” Our LORD, in the seals, is working in “bodily absence.” In the vision, however, of chap. xix. 11, where the Rider on the White Horse again appears, there He comes in very reality—there He is
{cont.}

The distinction between the “*sword*” in the second seal, and the “*sword*” in the fourth seal (chap. vi. 4, 8,) should be carefully noticed. In the first instance the word used is [Greek]; and the meaning of the Vision, sufficiently determined by our LORD’s saying, “Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I am not come to send peace but a sword” ([Greek]). Here then is the sword of war—the ‘carnal’ weapon. But the sword introduced in the other Vision is the [Greek], a word invariably employed in the Apocalypse in a mystical sense (chap. i. 16; ii. 12, 16; xix. 15, 21,) to signify the glittering Weapon proceeding out of the mouth of CHRIST, wherewith He smites His foes. The [Greek] is CHRIST’s Word judging; as the Manna is the Word sustaining. These two types of the Word are frequently brought into connexion. Thus in the Epistle to Pergamos the faithful are promised sustentation by the hidden Manna, the unfaithful are threatened destruction by the [Greek]. In the present vision again, the same connexion is observable; the judgments denounced being *famine* (i.e., the withholding of the spiritual manna) and the *sword*—the two alike issuing in *death*. In these two emblems, moreover, we see the Church’s work, on its active and on its passive side, symbolically represented. The Church has to be fed, during her passage through the world, with the Manna; she has to fight her way and vanquish her foes with the “Sword of the LORD.” Thus, on her passive side, the faithful Church is subsequently pictured, as the poor woman in the wilderness, sustained for the space of “1260 days” by the Bread from heaven (chap. xii. 6): on her active or aggressive side, she is represented under the emblem of the “two witnesses” (the Minister of the Two Testaments, the Dispenser of the Two Sacraments) prophesying and testifying during the same space of “1260 days,” and smiting the unbelieving earth with divers plagues (chap. xi. 3—6). But *only* (be it remembered) so far as the Church realizes one emblem, can she realize the other. In order that she may be the real terrible Wonder-working Witness to GOD’s truth, she must be the poor fugitive woman in the wilderness. She can only wield her supernatural powers in proportion as she is herself supernaturally sustained, and, living in the earth, has her conversation in Heaven.

Satan will evermore tempt her to prefer the “quails” or the very “stones” to the “Bread of GOD,” and to exchange the [Greek] for the [Greek]: and appalling will be the success of his seductions.

We conceive then, that when Dr Wordsworth sees in the “sword” and “famine” and “death” of this fourth Seal, the incursions of Huns, Goths, Vandals, and other Barbarian invaders, he quite misses the scope of the vision.

The vision reveals to us the last of GOD’s four sore judgments. This final judgment is of a three-fold nature—[Greek]; and it is brought about by means of certain terrestrial agencies—[Greek]; these “Beasts of the earth” representing (according to the universal symbolical usage of the Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse) the various world-powers, the kings or kingdoms of the earth.

Where, then, do we see mention of some terrible destruction brought about through the agency of the “kings of the earth”—a threefold destruction, as indicating the wrath of the Blessed TRINITY; a destruction by death, and famine, and by the “Sword of the LORD?” We see it all in the overthrow of Babylon. There we see all the natural and supernatural elements of the judgment of the fourth Seal reproduced. There are the Beasts, or powers of the earth, who are the visible instruments of her ruin (chap. xvii. 12, 16). In the background

visibly present “with ten thousand of His saints.” φ Alford was subsequently (1867) to write the hymn ‘*Ten thousand times ten thousand,*’ for which Dykes composed the tune ALFORD.

there is the sword of the LORD—“Strong is the LORD which judgeth her:” and there are the *death* and the *famine* combined (xviii. 8.)¹

IV. We pass on to the seventh chapter.

This presents to us two visions: first, there is the sealing of a *definite* number, 141,000, from one particular people—the children [202] of Israel; and then we behold an *indefinite* number—“a great multitude which no man can number”—out of “*every* nation, and tribe, and people, and tongue.” Now we cannot agree with Dr Wordsworth that these two visions represent exactly the same thing, and that the last is merely an explanation of the first. This is a very unsatisfactory mode of interpretation.

Dean Alford thus distinguishes between these two episodaical visions which separate the sixth from the seventh Seal. The former he takes to represent the sealing of the elect on earth; the latter, the great final assemblage of the saints in heaven. So that, although the 144,000 are ultimately *included* in the great innumerable multitude from all nations and tribes, yet it cannot be said that the two represent exactly the *same* company. The former are the first fruits, the latter the great ingathering.

The two visions seem plainly designed to prepare the mind of the Apostle and of his readers for the sad revelations about to ensue respecting the visible Church and the world.

1. We are going to read of GOD’s tremendous judgments yet to fall on the visible *Church*—the Israel of GOD. But ere we witness them, we are comforted by the assurance that “the LORD knoweth them that are His;” that in every section of His Church He has His own, and knows every individual of the “seven thousand who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal.” Some of the mystic candlesticks, it is true, are seen to have been judicially removed. Dan and Ephraim appear no more. But their places are supplied, and GOD’s plans are not thereby thwarted. There is still the sacred signature, the twelve. For this chosen number—for this His true Church—for these, His “secret ones,” who have the “white stone,” whom He feeds with His “hidden Manna,” who “follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth,” who “testify” for Him, who learn and know the melodies of Heaven, and though *on* earth are ever not *of* earth—for these, the judgments about to be let loose are not designed. These are “sealed.” The rivers and fountains are about to be poisoned with “wormwood,” yea, “turned into blood,” (viii. 11; xvi. 4,) but if these “drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them.” The scorpion-locusts are coming to plant their tormenting stings in the hearts of “them that have not the seal of GOD on their foreheads,” (ix. 1—6;) but these “have power to tread on scorpions” and on all the might of the Enemy. When the Sun and Moon are darkened (viii. 12,) the LORD shall be to them a Light: when the blazing orb is commissioned to scorch men with its blood-red rays, (xvi. 8,) the LORD shall be to them a shadow. The pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, shall accompany them through all their journey. As GOD’s Witnesses they may (“when they have finished their testimony”—not before;) be put to death by the Beast; but death is no death to them, for they cannot die. They are “sealed”—they are safe, for ever safe.

[203]

2. And a like lesson of comfort is read by the other preliminary vision. We are about to hear, not only of a degenerate *Church*—of GOD’s “faithful city become a Harlot;” but also of a *world* become wholly abominable—of the “cities of the nations” all “fallen”—of all

¹ These are the only two instances in which [Greek] occurs in the Apocalypse; and in both it is in conjunction with [Greek]. (vi. 8; xviii. 8.)

the earth worshipping the Beast—of GOD looking down from Heaven and seeing that “*all flesh* has corrupted its way.”

Now what is the natural inference from all this, but that Christianity has proved a total failure? Such a conclusion, however, is checked at the very threshold of these disclosures. We have just seen a vision of GOD’s sealed ones—His Church according to the Divine pattern—His true Israel—abiding throughout all time, and about to accomplish that exact work which He has foreordained that she should do. And then we are permitted to see the *result* of that work—to see that, through GOD’s Israel, even *yet* shall “*all nations* of the earth be blessed.” We see a “great multitude” gathered in, baffling all human computation, “from all nations, and tribes, and peoples, and tongues.” We learn that Satan shall *not* eventually triumph; but that CHRIST shall assuredly see of the travail of His soul and be satisfied.¹

V. In Dr Wordsworth’s exposition of the Trumpets, we find, as is always the case with him, very much that is striking, ingenious, and beautiful: but yet we constantly feel that we are with a guide in whom we cannot place entire confidence. He is too hasty an [204] interpreter, too positive, and (more than all) too prejudiced, ever to be a safe one.

Take, for example, the fifth Trumpet. At the sounding forth of its warning blast, the pit of the abyss is opened, and the earth is darkened by swarms of scorpion-locusts which thence emerge. They have a limited commission: they are to hurt neither the grass, nor the herbage, nor the trees, but “only the men who have not the seal of GOD on their foreheads.” They are not absolutely to kill them, but to dart into them their envenomed sting, and torment them five months. So severe is this judgment to be, that men (we read,) shall “seek death” and shall “long to die;” but “death shall flee from them.” We see a sort of parallel to this terrible visitation (though of somewhat intenser description) in the vision of the fifth vial, (xvi. 10, 11.) *There* is the same supernatural darkness: in the former case “the sun and the air were darkened from the smoke of the pit;” in the latter, the “kingdom of the Beast

¹ With regard to the somewhat difficult question as to the exact difference and relation between the definite sealed number and the indefinite and innumerable multitude, it may be remarked generally, that the sealed ones seem to represent the foundation, the “great multitude which no man could number,” the *superstructure*.

S. Paul tells us that the “foundation” of GOD is impressed with a “*seal*”—the seal of GOD’s election. (2 Tim. ii. 19.) This definite company of sealed ones, then, would appear to symbolize the firm, sealed foundation, the [Greek], of the Mystic Temple;—the number itself ($10^2 \times 12^3$) pointing at once to some Divine Pattern and Predestination, and also to the fact of the Sacred Building being reared upon the “Foundation ([Greek]) of the Apostles and Prophets”—the [Greek] to which S. John refers, (ch. xxi. 14.)

The superstructure, or edifice raised upon this Foundation (the innumerable living stones heaped thereon) comprises the infinite number “out of all nations, and kindreds, and peoples, and tongues.” This last (in one sense) seems to represent what S. Paul terms the [Greek] of the nations, (Rom. xi. 25,) i.e., that complement which is required to *make up* the whole Temple, and which has to be introduced in order to supply the [Greek], or deficiency, consequent upon the rejection of Israel. (Rom. xi. 12.)

But in its full and ultimate grasp, this latter Vision seems entirely to overpass the bounds of the present Dispensation, and also of the “thousand years,” and to bring us to the great final Ingathering—the Great Feast of Tabernacles (indicated in the palm-branches)—the joy of the completed Harvest, when the whole produce of CHRIST’s labour shall be brought in. In this, which we believe to be the true sense, the “144,000” will only include those who are gathered in *before* our LORD’s second Advent. They are, in fact, those whose number we pray may be speedily “completed”—(GOD’s “elect,” His [Greek] called out of the world)—in order that CHRIST may come to take His Bride and establish His Kingdom.

Thus the innumerable Company, as *distinct* from the 144,000, will correspond to the “*nations* who walk in the Light of the *Golden City*.” They are the “Blessed Children” “who shall inherit the Kingdom;” the Blessed Subjects of the King and the glorified Bride.

became darkened.” There also is the same (or some similar) tormenting sting, “they gnawed their tongues for pain.”

Now the visitation of the fifth Trumpet Dr Wordsworth identifies with the rise and spread of the Mohammedan power: and that this dreadful scourge may have been one of the precursive fulfilments of this judgment, and that it presents, in its general features many points of apparent similarity, we do not for a moment question. But when the attempt is made to press the absolute identity of these two plagues, and to explain away much of the strong and clearly defined language of S. John with a view to removing all obstacles to the proposed interpretation—against this we must enter our protest.

That Dr Wordsworth can produce a goodly array of authorities for his interpretation, we well know. This does not make the interpretation itself more true or defensible.

What are the features of the Vision?

Here is a dense *smoke* out of the Pit, “like the *smoke of a great Furnace*,”¹ and here is mention also of an excruciating *torment*, under the agony of which men desire to die, but cannot. Now, can we fail to notice an intentional connexion between this dreadful “woe,” and *another* “woe,” more fearful, more intense, and of infinite duration; when the *smoke* of their *torment* ascendeth up for ever and ever, and escape from that “deathless death” will be to all eternity impossible?

How then does Dr Wordsworth explain the *torment* here—a torment (be it remembered) of such intensity that “in those days men shall seek death, and shall not find it: and shall vehemently desire [Greek] to die: and death fleeth from them?”

“Mohammedanism (he says) did indeed tempt men by many allurements to adopt its own creed; and this was a severe *torment*. It was, in the strict sense of the word, a [Greek]: it was a *touchstone* [Greek] of their faith.”—P. 202.

[205]

We need not stop to argue against this interpretation; for we will not do Dr Wordsworth the injustice to believe that he himself is satisfied with it.

Dean Alford writes:

“There is an endless Babel of allegorical and historical interpretations of these *locusts. from the pit*. The most that we can say of their import is, that they belong to a series of judgments on the ungodly, which will immediately precede the Second Advent of our LORD; that the various and mysterious particulars of the Vision will no doubt clear themselves up to the Church of GOD, when the time of its fulfilment arrives. But that no such clearing up has yet taken place, a very few hours’ research among histories of Apocalyptic interpretation will serve to convince any reader, who is not himself the servant of a preconceived system.”—P. 641.

Nevertheless, although we must ever earnestly protest against the custom of explaining away the characteristic details of the Apocalyptic Visions in order to reduce them into conformity with some supposed historical fulfilment: we cannot in this instance regard it as other than a true instinct, which has discerned in the Mohammedan Scourge, a strange, partial and preliminary, accomplishment of the “Woe” of this fifth Trumpet. The mysterious armament from the “pit of the abyss,” combining in monstrous and horrid confusion elements of the man, the woman, the locust, the horse, the scorpion, the lion, (thus impressed in their very nature with the number *six* of Antichrist,) has never perhaps

¹ φ Dykes would doubtless have deprecated his own grandfather’s use of this image as a metaphor for Puseyism. (King, J. *Memoir of the Rev. Thomas Dykes LL.B* (Seeleys: London, 1849) pp. 207—208.)

hitherto met with so signal a realization, as in the desolating ravages of the hosts of the Victor-Prophet, dealing out in their devastating career, not only temporal death, but also by means of their pestilential doctrines, the bitter woes of eternal death.

That the full and actual realization of this vision, however, is yet *future*; that in these semi-human, semi-bestial, semi-diabolical armaments, we see symbolically depicted swarms of “seducing spirits,” and of “evil men and seducers” their organs, industriously “preparing the way” before the Man of Sin, insinuating into men their envenomed scorpion-sting, and giving them a sharp foretaste of the gnawing torments of the undying worm—of this we cannot entertain any possible doubt.

We have referred to the fifth Trumpet, let us add a few words respecting the sixth.

And here we confess that Dr Wordsworth’s interpretation perfectly amazes us.

We have just been witnessing, in the fifth Trumpet, a fearful array of armed scorpion-locusts. The sixth Trumpet reveals to us an innumerable array of armed horsemen.

There are also many marks of similarity between the consecutive Visions. The armed array in the former Vision are “like horses prepared for war” (ix. 7); in the latter they consist of “myriads of horsemen” (ix. 16.) In the former, the horses have lions *teeth* [206] (ver. 8); in the latter, lions’ *heads* (ver. 17.) In the former, they have tails like *scorpions* (ver. 10); in the latter, tails like *serpents* (ver. 19.) Both armaments are protected with “breastplates;” the former “of iron,” the latter of “fire and jacinth, and like unto brimstone” (ver. 9, 17.) The former have stings in their tails (ver. 10); the latter have heads in their tails (ver. 19.) In the tails of both is seated their “power to hurt.”

Now will it be believed that, while in the former Vision Dr Wordsworth describes Arabians and Saracens “with their long flowing hair plaited like women;” in the latter he sees the diffusion of the Scriptures by means of the Printing Press!

Yes, to the Holy Scriptures does Dr Wordsworth in all sober seriousness apply such a verse as this, “Their power is in their mouth, and in their tails; for their tails are like serpents, and have heads, and with them they do hurt” (ix. 19)¹

Dean Alford enlivens his note here with an allusion to what he designates “the culminating instance of incongruous interpretation,”—viz: Mr. Elliott’s historical exposition of this Vision; who sees in these mystic horses with their serpent-tails reference to the “horse-tails borne as symbols of authority by the Turkish Pachas.”—P. 644.

But we really think, notwithstanding all the learned ingenuity with which Dr Wordsworth advocates his interpretation, that it far surpasses Mr. Elliott’s in “incongruity” and absurdity.

It is very easy to see what suggested it.

The multitudinous hosts of darkness of the sixth Trumpet are suddenly let loose on the issuing of a Divine command to remove certain Providential restraints which had hitherto kept them in check: “Loose the four Angels which are bound at the Great River Euphrates.” This at once sets Dr Wordsworth off: for Euphrates is the River of Babylon: and Babylon is Rome: therefore what can the four Angels be but the Four Gospels, which have been kept in fetters by the Church of Rome, but which at the Reformation were released?

“GOD’s Word has been bound. It was bound for a long time; it was not read to the people; it was chained in the fetters of a dead language; and so it remained, as it were, in prison for many

centuries. And even to this day, in many countries, the Word of GOD is bound by some who profess themselves to be Chief Rulers is the Church of GOD!

“The vision has revealed also that the Holy Scriptures, though bound as captives for a time, would be loosed by the command of GOD, and that they would traverse the world like an innumerable Army. And although they are GOD’s Army, and ministers of salvation to many, yet the vision has declared that the Holy Scriptures would be like instruments of punishment and death to the enemies of GOD...

“Thus the four angels have been loosed which were bound at the [207] river Euphrates. The Word of GOD has been translated into all languages. By the aid of Printing, copies of the Scriptures have been multiplied innumerable. The Scriptures in swiftness and strength like an innumerable Army of Horsemen are now sweeping the world.”—Pp. 205—6.

Into the details of this monstrous piece of exegesis, of which the above extract gives the general scope, we have neither space nor inclination to enter. Nor is there much necessity: as we feel tolerably certain that the Canon of Westminster will be left in solitary and undisturbed possession of his interpretation.

“This vision of the Sixth Trumpet,” writes Mr. Isaac Williams, “seems connected with the completion and fulness of the last times; the last contest between infidelity and faith throughout the world. For it has been already shown that the number *six* is of Anti-Christ: and ‘the *four Angels*’ indicate the whole world; and the number of the army is as it were infinite; all powers of evil going forth arrayed for the conflict with the good . . . The *fifth* Trumpet is expressly limited in its duration: but no termination is intimated of this array under the *sixth* Trumpet; but at the end of the description it is emphatically stated that there is no repentance. . . . Bede speaks of this sixth Angel as ‘the preaching of the last contest which will lay open the frauds of Anti-Christ.’ The innumerable army represents those spiritual forces which the Apostle describes, and against which he tells us to take the whole armour of GOD, that we may be able to withstand in the *evil day*; *i.e.* preparing for that *day of trial* to which these horsemen are tending.”—Pp. 161, 166.

That this vision of the sixth Trumpet is, in fact, the natural sequel to, and full development of, the woe temporarily let loose under the fifth, seems manifest.

In the former, however, some Restraining Force is still in operation, which has the effect of limiting and confining the visitation. In the latter this is removed.

That the mystic Babylon is in some mysterious way connected with this Withholding Power; that in the prolongation of her existence is secretly bound up the continuance of those Providential checks which hold back the myriad powers of the Enemy, seems indicated in many parts of this book.

The judicial removal of all these restraints is expressed in the command “Loose the four Angels bound at Euphrates.” Instantly swarm forth from their lurking places all the unnumbered, legions, the “200,000,000” warriors of the Fiend.

The obvious connexion, moreover, between this vision and that of the sixth vial will make it still more plain how senseless is the interpretation that would discern in these hosts of Satan and Anti-Christ, *copies of the Holy Scriptures!*

Thus, in both these visions, the sixth Trumpet and sixth Vial, we have special mention of “the Great River Euphrates.” In both [208] we see preparations for some vast and awful armament. Both are impressed with the number *Six* of Antichrist. In both, we see the propagation of infidel *doctrines*, indicated in the emphatic mention of the *mouhths* of the assailants:—and that these in the sixth Trumpet are *antichristian* “mouhths,” is expressed in the fact of their being *lion-mouhths* (ix. 17, 19); the lion-mouhth being a characteristic feature of the “Beast from the sea.” (xiii. 2.) This is that proud “mouhth which is stretched forth to

the Heaven,” and which “goeth through the world,” and whereat “the people fall.” Moreover; alike in the sixth Trumpet and sixth Vial is there the same *three-fold* mention of this word *mouth*,—as though pointing to some blasphemous doctrines against the Holy Trinity (Cf. ch. ix. 17—19; xvi. 13). Out of the “mouths” in the former vision, proceed ([Greek]) “fire and smoke and brimstone:” out of the “mouths” in the latter proceed ([Greek]) “three unclean spirits—the spirits of demons, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the whole world to gather them to the battle of the Great Day of GOD ALMIGHTY.”

Further: of the mystic horses in the sixth Trumpet, we read, that their “power” was seated not only in their “mouth” (their lion-mouth—for “their heads are the heads of lions”) but also in their “tails” (their serpent-tails); and that “with them they do hurt.”

Now does not this mention of the *tails* confirm the conclusion arrived at respecting the general drift of the vision? Was it not the “tail” of the great Serpent that of old “drew down,” and is now ever drawing down, “the third part of the stars of Heaven,” and “casting them to the earth?”

And how does the Prophet Isaiah explain the symbolical meaning of this expression? “The LORD” (he says, ix. 14, 15,) “shall cut off from Israel head and tail—in one day. The ancient and honourable he is the head; and the *Prophet that teacheth lies* he is the *tail*.” ([Greek]).

In the serpent-tails, then, we evidently see allusion to those “false prophets that shall arise, showing signs and wonders,” and indoctrinating men with their poisonous [Greek]; teaching them to deny “Him Who is come in His FATHER’s Name,” and to accept the Other who “shall come in his own name.”

We have dwelt perhaps at tedious length on the details of this vision. We referred to it chiefly as furnishing a characteristic instance of the random and far-fetched explanations which too often meet us in Dr Wordsworth’s pages. We have already said that his notes contain a vast amount of really valuable matter; but on the whole they are very disappointing and unequal, and often betray a serious lack of sound judgment and true exegetical instinct. Some passages are treated at an inordinate length. Long extracts from sermons and other previous works of the Editor are introduced which are quite out of place, and too often have merely the effect [209] of bewildering both writer and reader, and of veiling the true meaning and difficulties of the text under a showy glitter of words. In other instances, real *crucis*, in which one would be glad of a few suggestive aids from a learned Commentator, are passed over almost without notice.

We have observed however with pleasure that Dr Wordsworth has had the good sense to reconsider and abandon *some* of his former interpretations. We may specify his explanation of the “seven Thunders,” and of the command given to S. John to “seal up” what they had uttered and *not* to write it;—which he originally expounded (if our memory fail us not) of the commission given to S. John to “seal up” the Canon of the New Testament by *writing* the Apocalypse! This wild specimen of exegesis is now abandoned, and its place occupied by some sensible and suggestive remarks on the general purport of the vision. We may instance also his explanation of the death and non-interment of the Witnesses; which he interpreted in the Cambridge University pulpit as signifying the slaughter of the Two Testaments at the hand of the Church of Rome, and the endeavour on the part of that Church to prevent their dead body being put into tombs—*i.e.* into monuments; *i.e.* “not to be committed to the immortal *monuments* of Editions, Translations, and Expositions.”

“And wonderful it is,” (so continued the preacher) “that not a single Edition of the Original Scriptures has ever been printed at Rome, that great city which calls herself the Mother and Mistress of Churches.” Dean Alford in commenting on this “strange exposition” which he adduces “as showing how far men can be led, in forcing the sense in favour of a particular view,” notices the unfortunate fact “that it is now to a *Roman* printing press that we owe our only edition of the oldest published Codex of the Greek Old and New Testaments.”

Dr Wordsworth, however in the present volume has considerably modified this ridiculous interpretation. He now only writes:

“*Something of the spirit described in this Vision* is seen in those of the Church of Rome, who, on the plea of obscurity in Holy Scripture, withhold it from the people, and so virtually *kill* it; and when they have done so, will not allow it to be committed to those enduring *monuments* of Literature, such as editions, and vernacular translations; by which its words may be engraven on the memory of man, ‘in perpetuum rei memoriam.’”—P. 214.

Dr Wordsworth has written wisely and well on the subject of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. No living writer is more truly and tenderly jealous of its honour and supreme authority. We wonder if it never strikes him that the exegetical extravagancies in which he too frequently allows himself to indulge, are far more calculated to lessen men’s reverent regard for this Holy Book—to [210] impress them with the idea that, after all, it is but a “nose of wax” capable of being turned and twisted any way according to the prepossessions and prejudices of its interpreter—than the most rationalistic criticisms of sceptical writers like Mr. Rowland Williams and Mr. Jowett.

We shall hope to conclude our examination of these “Notes” in a future number.

[256]

(Continued from page 210.)

In continuing our remarks upon Dr Wordsworth’s and Dean Alford’s Apocalyptic Notes, it will be necessary for us to go over ground which has been partially traversed in these pages before; although we will endeavour to do this as little as possible.

Dr Wordsworth, in his present work, in the most solemn and emphatic manner, reiterates the conclusions adopted by himself some years ago as to the interpretation of the Beast, the Harlot, the false Prophet, &c.; insisting that all these prophetic symbols meet with their fulfilment in Rome and the Church of Rome. He affirms, with regard to the various arguments which from time to time have been brought to bear against this interpretation, that they are idle and unsubstantial, and have but served to convince him of the absolute impregnability of his own conclusions.

But he shall speak for himself. The italics are his own.

“After a careful meditation, for many years, upon these prophecies concerning the Apocalyptic Babylon, the present writer here solemnly, in the presence of the Omniscient Searcher of hearts, Who dictated these awful predictions, records this as his deliberate judgment upon them, probably for the last time. He has endeavoured seriously to examine all the *objections* which have been urged against this interpretation. He has found that these objections, as far as they have any validity, affect some minor incidents and subordinate details in the *mode* in which that interpretation is sometimes stated; but do not in the least affect the *principle*, or in any way impair the soundness of that interpretation itself. And when he has proceeded to examine other *different* interpretations of these Prophecies—such, for instance, as that interpretation which applies these Prophecies to *Heathen* Rome, or to *some Infidel* Power—he has found all those other interpretations to be so vain and futile, and so inconsistent and irreconcilable with the general scope and language of these Prophecies themselves, that even on this account he has been

confirmed in the conviction that the Interpretation adopted in these notes, is the *true, and only true Interpretation.*” P. 246.

Now let us fully admit, that convictions thus firmly and conscientiously maintained, thus (as the writer assures us) carefully weighed and tested, and thus solemnly and religiously expressed, are entitled to all grave consideration. We trust and pray, therefore, that they may meet from ourselves with nought but a candid and respectful attention.

But ere we examine Dr Wordsworth’s interpretation of that [256] portion of the Apocalypse to which we have now arrived—the allegory of the Woman and the Beasts—let us first ascertain what are the principal conclusions to which that interpretation conducts him. The chief debateable points are, the meanings (so far as ascertainable) of the Beast, the false Prophet, the Harlot Babylon, the Image of the Beast, its Mark and Number.

Now the conclusions on these several heads to which Dr Wordsworth’s long protracted investigations have led him are as follows: that the Beast symbolises the Papacy or Papal kingdom; the false Prophet or second Beast, the Roman Hierarchy; the Image of the Beast, the Pope; the Harlot, the city and Church of Rome: that the Name of the Beast is Lateinos; his Mark or [Greek], the *Cross Keys!*

Let us then proceed to inquire how this scheme of interpretation, defended as it is with all learned gravity and earnestness, will bear the test of impartial examination. We undertake this task not with the slightest hope of convincing Dr Wordsworth himself. He appears to us far too confident in the absolute certainty of the truth of his interpretation to be even capable of impartially weighing the objections with which others see it to be beset. But some there may be, who have been staggered by the solemnly reiterated asseverations of the Canon of Westminster, who may be glad to see the subject a little further discussed.

Let us, then, by way of testing the general soundness of the system of interpretation, glance at one or two of its leading results. And first (to fix on a single particular by way of example) let us turn our eyes to the characteristic symbol, the “Image of the Beast.” Now this Image, as Dr Wordsworth teaches (and so far correctly enough), is obviously the *impersonation* of the Beast—its individual embodiment or representative. But the Beast, argues our Author, is the Papacy: hence we arrive at the necessary result, that the “Image of the Beast” is the individual *Pope* for the time being.

What, then, does the HOLY SPIRIT, by the mouth of S. John, teach us respecting this Image? He tells us that—inspired and called into being through the agency of the “Beast from the Earth” or false Prophet—so absolute and so universal will be the homage that he will exact and *receive* from the world, that he will “cause *all* who will not worship him to be *killed*.” and further, that so real and binding will be his demands upon the allegiance of all the inhabitants of the earth, that “*all*, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond,” will be compelled to “receive a mark on their right hand and on their forehead,” so “that no one may buy or sell, save he that hath the mark—the name of the Beast, or the number of his name.” Now, seriously to affirm that all this is true of the Pope, we hold to be nothing short of an insult to the understanding of reasonable men. In fact, we feel [257] convinced, that if this interpretation be correct, we may as well close our Bibles at once. Dr Wordsworth may load his notes as he will with fitting extracts to show the general iniquity of Popes, and their accomplishment of these inspired predictions concerning them; but until his readers will consent to part with every vestige of common sense, he will never succeed in persuading them that the Bishop of Rome is he of whom the Prophet here speaks. If the Pope “causes *all* who will not worship him to be *killed*,” how comes it to pass that the Canon of Westminster is yet (as GOD grant he may long continue to be!) in comfortable possession of his life, his liberty, and his stall?

And this is but a solitary instance of the absolute futility of the attempt to force this monstrous interpretation upon the words of S. John.

Take another example.

What says the HOLY GHOST respecting the Beast itself? Not only that “power was *given* unto him over *every tribe, and people, and tongue, and nation;*” but also that “*all* who dwell upon earth, whose names are not written in the Lamb’s Book of Life, shall worship him:” in connection with which, the following terrible announcement meets us: “If any man worshippeth the Beast and his image, and receiveth his mark, he also shall drink of the wine of the wrath of GOD; and *he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone: and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever:* and they have no rest day and night who worship the Beast and his Image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.” (xiv. 9-11.)

And yet we are to believe that the Beast is the Papacy, and his Image the Pope! Now we must be permitted to say that a system of interpretation which makes such demands upon the credence of sober people—not to say upon the feelings of Christians in one Branch of the Catholic Church towards their brethren in another Branch—is deserving of no indulgence whatever: it merits nought save earnest and heartfelt reprobation!

Conceive for a moment what this miserable theory really involves. “*All who dwell on the earth, whose names are not written in the Book of Life, shall worship the Beast.*” So that we are called upon seriously to believe that the “reprobate” and the “worshippers of the Papacy” are convertible expressions, that eternal perdition is the inevitable consequence of obedience to the Pope, that devotion to the See of Rome is the one terrible condition of exclusion from the Kingdom of Heaven!

But Dr Wordsworth shall give his own explanation of the crucial and decisive statement of S. John, that “all who dwell on the earth whose names are not in the Book of Life shall worship the Beast.” “All who dwell on the earth,” writes our author, “that is, *the great body of worldly-minded persons, will worship him!*”

[258]

So that the great characteristic of worldly-mindedness is devotion to the Papacy!

This interpretation, of course, at once presents the two following questions:—

First, is the suggested gloss—which makes the expression, “all who dwell on the earth whose names are not written in the Book of Life,” signify no more than “the great body of worldly-minded people,” (where “great body” is used in a vague, unreal, sense, so as to have no definite meaning whatever)—is this a true and adequate explanation of, or a miserable and mischievous attempt to explain away, the terribly emphatic words of S. John; an attempt which few writers would resist more resolutely than Dr Wordsworth, did the gloss present itself for acceptance under any different circumstances?

And secondly; is it a *fact?* has it ever been the fact? or is it not notoriously opposed to fact—that the “great body” of worldly people have been those peculiarly characterised by devotion to the see of Rome? Is not the statement itself as baseless as the interpretation on which it is founded is fallacious and unworthy?

But we will turn to another of S. John’s symbolical personages, the Harlot. What does the Inspired Seer tell us with respect to her? That “in her was found the blood of ALL that have been slain on the earth.” How then does Dr Wordsworth attempt to reduce this critical statement into conformity with his assertion that the Harlot is the city and Church of Rome? In this instance he simply evades the difficulty. He does not even attempt a solu-

tion; but, instead of fairly meeting and combating the objection, he favours us with two or three columns of an “occasional sermon.”

In reply, then, to our author’s assurance that he has endeavoured seriously to examine all the objections against his interpretation, and that “he has found them vain and futile,” we must venture to express our opinion that objections of the very gravest character, and so far as we can see quite insurmountable, have been (unwittingly, we doubt not,) ignored and left wholly unnoticed by him; and that it is only by keeping these objections in the background that his theory assumes any colour of probability.

It appears to us that the homiletic (not to add the strongly controversial) tone which pervades a large portion of these notes, has been a great snare to the writer, as it is a constant and wearisome distraction to the reader; and that had Dr Wordsworth confined himself more strictly to the legitimate work of the annotator, than to that of the preacher, orator, polemic, and not been so anxious to convert the pages of his Greek Testament into a sort of receptacle for all the brilliant anti-papal passages of which he has delivered himself in earlier days—he would have arrived at very different conclusions on many most important points, and produced a work infinitely more useful and serviceable to the Church.

[259]

But it is time that we endeavoured to show *wherein* we conceive Dr Wordsworth to have missed the true meaning of the symbols now under notice. We must briefly state how far we agree with him, and at what point our lines of interpretation diverge.

Now the two leading *personæ* of the Sacred Drama are, as has been frequently noticed, the Woman and the Beast. And upon an accurate and clearly defined understanding as to the essential nature of these two, does the interpretation of this entire section of the Apocalypse in a great measure depend.

We hold it then to be an all but demonstrable truth, that these two symbols, the one human, the other bestial, represent respectively, in their abstract universality, the Church and the World. The former—whether pure or corrupt, whether typified by Philadelphia or Laodicea, whether the Woman fleeing from the dragon and supernaturally fed in the wilderness, or the Harlot ‘decked in gold and pearls, and costly array’—still the *Church*: the latter—whether tamed or ferocious, whether wounded to death or restored to a more terrible vitality—still the *world*.

But we will glance at each of these symbols separately.

I. And here, in the first place, we conceive that our author is indisputably right in insisting that the Harlot Babylon represents no heathen city—no merely worldly power—but a corrupt *spiritual* power. His error consists in his arbitrarily confining an œcumenical symbol to one particular Branch of the Church, and in his referring to present times and circumstances, predictions whose special fulfilment plainly appertains to the times of the ‘latter days.’ With regard to the attempt of Dr Wordsworth and others to identify the Harlot with the modern Church of Rome—it is sufficient to say that S. John’s whole language is a continuous and emphatic protest against any such local limitation of the symbol.

The figure is simply “the faithful City become a Harlot,” GOD’s Jerusalem carried captive to Babylon, corrupted by Babylon and finally *become* Babylon.

Two mystical women are presented to us (or rather *one*, under sadly different aspects): each of these is likened to a city. Now does Dr Wordsworth for a moment maintain that the one woman is the local city Jerusalem? just as unreasonable is it to insist that the other woman is the local Babylon or Rome. We have whole pages full of notes to inform us that

Rome is a seven-hilled city. But what has this to do with the distinctive symbolism of the Apocalypse. Are the seven Thunders, or Epistles, or Trumpets, or Vials, or Heads, literal heads, or trumpets, or thunders? Is the “great and high mountain,” on which the holy city Jerusalem stands, a literal mountain? No; then just as little are the seven mountains whereon Babylon is reared literal mountains. Such an exposition is utterly inconsistent with the mystical language of the book. The Church’s “foundations are upon the Holy Hills.” Mount [260] Sion is “GOD’s Hill in which it pleaseth Him to dwell.” But the faithless Church has established herself upon the high places of the earth—upon the Seven Hills of Babylon—upon the eminences of worldly supremacy. As Rome was in the Apostles’ time the centre of the world-power, of course there may be a passing allusion to her, as the then representative of earthly dominion; but nothing further.

We are glad to fortify ourselves on this point by a quotation from one of the most thoughtful and consistent of all modern writers on the Apocalypse, Professor Auberlen:

“The seven hills (he writes) may contain an allusion to the seven hills of Rome in which the world-power was concentrated in the days of S. John: yet this is at most a passing allusion which *ought not to be looked upon as the proper meaning of the passage*. Such a trivial geographical notice could scarcely follow the introductory remark of the angel, ‘Here is the mind which hath wisdom’ (xvii. 9); which words demand expressly the mystical exposition. Besides, it would be against all analogy to understand by the heads of the beast, mountains in the concrete sense.”—P. 269, Clark’s edit.

And again, in a passage which we shall be compelled slightly to abbreviate for want of room—

“The Harlot is identical with the Woman; who, we saw in ch. xii., is a symbolical representation of the Church of GOD in the world. This Woman has become a Harlot. The Harlot is consequently not the City of Rome—such a view is totally at variance with the spirit of this thoroughly symbolical book—but *Christendom*; Christendom, called after the name of the world city, Babylon, Rome; because she has forsaken CHRIST, and given her love to this present world.” (Page 274-5) . . . “The Harlot is not only a church here and a church there, but Christendom *as a whole*; even as Israel *as a whole* had become a Harlot. . . This universal character of the Harlot is indicated by the expressions ‘She sitteth upon many waters,’ and she corrupted the *earth* with her fornication (xvii. 1, 15; xiv. 8; xviii. 3; xix. 2.) This external extensiveness over the whole world, and internal conformity to the world, is symbolized by the name of the world-city Babylon. The woman, in influencing the whole world, permits herself at the same time to be influenced by it, thus committing adultery. The deeper the Church penetrated into heathenism the more she herself became heathenish. She then no longer overcame the world, but suffered the world to overcome her.”—P. 291.

In the words of John Michael Hahn-

“The Harlot is not the city of Rome alone, neither is it the Roman Catholic Church to the exclusion of another; but all Churches and every Church, ours included, viz. all Christendom that is without the Spirit and Life of our LORD JESUS. It is called Babylon, that is, Confusion; for false Christendom divided into very many churches and [261] sects, is truly and strictly a confiner. However in all churches of Christendom, the true JESUS Congregation, the Woman clothed with the Sun, lives and is hidden.”—*Ib.* p. 293.¹

¹ “The invisible Church is contained *within* the visible.” . . . “The Woman is the Kernel, Beast and Harlot serve as shell, as scaffolding for the Temple of the LORD. But whenever the kernel is mature, whenever the edifice is complete, the shell is thrown off, the scaffolding destroyed and what does not belong to the Temple must perish amid the falling ruins. Thus, when judgment will come upon Babylon, a voice from Heaven will say, ‘Come out of her, My people,’ (Rev. xvii. 4). Thus it was that out of the ruins of Israel
{cont.}

Had Dr Wordsworth, instead of passing over without a syllable of comment (we presume as being hopelessly incompatible with his own interpretation), the decisive and emphatic words of S. John respecting the Harlot—"In her was found the blood of Prophets and of Saints, and of *all* that have been slain on the earth"—words which absolutely forbid the limited and merely local application of this prophecy; had he seriously weighed them, and compared them with our LORD's parallel, saying with regard to her, that of old "killed the prophets and stoned them that were sent unto her," "*It cannot be that a Prophet perish out of Jerusalem;*" he could not have failed to perceive that the subject of these two fearful statements is one and the same—that the modern Babylon is essentially identical with the ancient Jerusalem—that the one is but the continuation of the other; the inheritor of the blessings no less than the terrible denunciations pronounced over her elder sister. *If* Rome, and Rome exclusively, be the Catholic Church, then may Dr Wordsworth's interpretation hold good: otherwise it must fall to the ground.

We have been glad to notice that, although Dean Alford finds it hard practically to disencumber himself of the old Protestant tradition that the Harlot is exclusively Rome and the Roman Church, yet in one passage he rises above this narrow exposition.

After stating (what we cannot admit but in a very secondary and subordinate sense) that the Harlot represents the city of Rome, he adds:

"But she is also a [Greek]. She is herself a harlot, an apostate, and faithless Church; but she is also a *mother*. From her spring, of her nature partake, with her shall be destroyed, all the fornications and abominations of the earth, though they be not in Rome, though they be not called by her name, though in outward semblance they quarrel with and oppose her."—P. 704.

We wish we could add that all Dean Alford's notes on these mysterious prophecies manifested an equal practical recognition of the true character of this and other symbols.

We must again repeat, that no consistent advance can possibly be [262] made in the interpretation of this important portion of the Revelation of S. John, unless there is a clear preliminary recognition of the essential nature of the two great Personæ whose mystical history is here recounted. We are introduced to the two ancient foes the Dragon and the Woman, and we see symbolically portrayed the various processes and instruments whereby the Old Serpent succeeds in 'beguiling' the Second "Eve by his subtlety."

The Dragon is the secret, invisible 'God of this world:' the Beast is his visible representative and vicegerent; the false Prophet, his priest. They together constitute the Diabolic counterpart of the Holy Trinity.

Thus we have two great Powers before us, one temporal, the other spiritual; one from beneath, the other from above; the former, the visible representative of Satan in this world, the latter the professed representative of CHRIST. And we find a succession of images introduced, wherein are depicted the various influences mutually brought to bear by the one Power on the other. They all tell the same sad tale; all alike reveal the same appalling result, so mysterious, so hard to be realized, of the Heavenly Power succumbing before the earthly; of Satan again visibly triumphing, and achieving for a while a tremendous success—even although the victory be but the precursor to his own more tremendous defeat and judicial incarceration in the bottomless pit. Well may the Apostle have exclaimed, after partaking of the little book which disclosed this portentous intelligence respecting GOD's Church, and making its unpalatable contents his own—"when I had

and Jerusalem came forth the first congregation of Christians, when the Old Testament people of GOD were judged. (Matt. xxiv. 18.)" *Auberlen*, p. 284.

eaten, my belly was bitter:" well may he, when beholding the second Eve at a still future stage of her career, have "wondered with great admiration."

The point to be noticed is this, that the defeat of the spiritual Power is brought about after, and by *means* of, a long and apparently successful career of victory. The triumph is the very cause of the ultimate ruin; not being a legitimate triumph, and thus becoming a secret source of weakness. The spiritual Power overcomes visibly, by being itself secretly overcome; and achieves a conquest over its foe by means which ensure and entail its own ultimate downfall.

The images which picture these two conflicting Powers are both animate and inanimate.

One while we have the terrestrial Power likened simply to a great tract of earth, to a vast wilderness expanse. Then the celestial Power is likened to a mighty City reared upon its seven eminences, towering apparently above the earth, ruling and subduing it, but really supported by and founded upon earth, and at last destroyed by it through the earthquake and fire.

Another while, we have the temporal Power figured by a huge seven-headed monster. Here then is a corresponding change in [263] the symbolism of the spiritual Power. She is now no longer a city, but a *woman*, seated upon and controlling the Beast. It had been given her, "strong in the LORD and in the power of His might," to have slain him with the sword, (for he is "covered with blasphemy,") to have "trampled him under her foot," to have "broken the heads of Leviathan in pieces." But she has not done this. True, she has achieved a signal and manifest success: to a certain extent she has vanquished her foe: the head whereon she is seated is "wounded to death." But she does not follow up her victory; she does not, like David with Goliath, "cut off his head:" nay, she makes *use* of the prostrate monster, she employs him as her beast of burden; and for a while he tamely carries her. But the deadly wound is at last healed; and with seven-fold vitality does the revived Beast, energized anew from beneath, fall upon his helpless and confiding Rider, and with ravenous ferocity tear her to pieces.

Again, the terrestrial Power is described simply as an aggregation of this world's potentates—"the kings of the earth." And here we find the spiritual Power still represented as a woman, but now as a harlot; subduing the temporal Power, but only by subjugating herself to it; reigning over the 'kings of the earth,' but only by committing adultery with them. For a time she succeeds; but her charms at last lose their force. She has demoralized them, and drugged them, and driven them frenzied, only that they may at last, in a paroxysm of hate and loathing, fall upon her and burn her with fire.

And other images there are which foreshadow the same unwelcome truths, viz., that the false church will subdue the world by conforming to the world, and becoming herself worldly. Thus, she is now represented as a great enchantress influencing and overcoming all the nations; but by "bewitching them with sorceries," poisoning them with potions from her chalice of subtle, refined, religious worldliness.

And once more, she appears as the "temple of the LORD," and drawing all people to her sacred courts; but how? Not as being the "house of prayer," but the "house of merchandise for all nations."

These and other images, each conveying its own lesson, and contributing its part to the general whole, we find blended together in S. John's mystical description of the mutual relationships between the visible Church and the world-power; the whole combining in preparing us for the reception of the mournful result shadowed forth in our LORD's words—that the mystic "Salt" designed by GOD to keep the world from putrefaction and

decay, should itself lose its power of seasoning, and arresting corruption, and should at last become good for nothing, save to be “cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men.”

It is almost needless to add that these dire predictions have not [264] yet been fully realised; that such images as the Harlot and the Beast describe the *final* stages of these two Powers, and the ultimate *result* arrived at after a long preliminary inworking of the hidden “mystery of lawlessness.” Thus, while merely glancing at former periods in their respective careers, the Inspired Seer specially introduces them to us at that critical epoch when the pseudo-Christianity of the professing Church, and the anti-Christianity of the world have reached their full development; when judgment is just about to be let fall, ‘beginning at the household of GOD’—or rather, at what once *was* the House of GOD, but is so no longer, and by the heavenly Voice, “Come out of her, My people,” has been given over to utter destruction.

When, therefore, Dr Wordsworth and others interpret the Harlot as the present Church of Rome, and the command, “Come out of her, My people,” as a call to the members of that communion to become Protestants, they are simply wresting Holy Scripture from its Divine meaning, to subserve unworthy party purposes; converting into the ‘Word of GOD’ what are the mere baseless traditions of men; and asserting, “the LORD hath said,” of that which “the LORD hath *not* said.”

We add this, not with any view of extenuating the errors of the Church of Rome, or of relieving her from any portion of that full and mysterious share in these woeful predictions which must under any circumstances appertain to her, but simply as guarding the integrity of the holy written Word of GOD.

II. Having examined Dr Wordsworth’s interpretation of the Harlot, it is time that we turned our attention more particularly, as we proposed, for a few moments, to the second principal Actor in this Sacred Drama—the Beast.

Now, if any one thing is certain in the domain of sacred symbolism, we hold it to be this—that the Beast represents the godless power of the *world*. The ‘Beast,’ in S. John’s Revelation, corresponds exactly with the ‘world’ in S. John’s Epistles. It “lieth in the Wicked One,” and embraceth all who are “not of the FATHER,” all whose names are not in the Book of Life. The love of it is incompatible with the “love of the FATHER.” It is the great visible antagonist of the FATHER; it is that great Power which, under some form or other, usurps the allegiance of all who are not ‘of GOD;’ it is “the world which is passing away,” which is doomed to destruction; to the sphere of which appertain “the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life;” it is the world which loveth its own, and which, however speciously submissive and obsequious, does ever secretly hate all who are of GOD, and are not really of the world. It is called a *Beast* as being destitute of that Divine Image which is the essential mark of man.

It is needful that we apprehend the precise being and nature of [265] this important emblem, ‘the Beast;’ otherwise we shall inevitably fail, as both our present annotators do, in assigning its true meaning to the derivative and dependent emblem, the “*Image* of the Beast.”

By Dean Alford, the true signification of the original symbol appears to be throughout correctly apprehended.

“The Beast,” he says, “is not Rome, nor the Roman empire, but a general symbol of the secular Anti-Christian Power.”

Both he and Dr Wordsworth seem to recognize in this symbol a combined representation of the four great Beasts, or World-powers of Daniel, and therefore an embodiment of the godless mundane Power in its totality. But so anxious is Dr Wordsworth to be at the Pope, that he no sooner touches on the true interpretation, than he at once abandons it; and through the whole of his exposition, practically treats the Beast as nothing more nor less than the Papacy and the Papal kingdom.

We gladly notice that he has had the good sense to abandon one very foolish piece of interpretation originally adopted by himself, which explains the heads of the Beast to be the successive forms of government of Rome, kings, consuls, &c.; and that he now expounds these, in company with every other respectable commentator, as figuring the successive phases or evolutions of the world-kingdom; although he regards them, not in their relation to the history of the Church of GOD, or to that of the world-power itself, but merely in their assumed relation to Rome, as being the kingdoms which were ultimately absorbed into the Roman Empire and were thus transformed into the 'Beast proper' or Papal Kingdom.

With respect to the question of the identification of the successive heads, although differing slightly in their account of the five fallen kings, both Dr Wordsworth and Dean Alford agree in regarding the sixth head or king as the power of Rome. In the seventh head Dr Wordsworth sees the imperial power of Germany, and Dean Alford (with Auberlen) "the Christian Empire beginning with Constantine."

The eighth king, or resuscitated Beast, or 'Beast proper,' is of course regarded by Dr Wordsworth as the Papacy. Dean Alford, on the other hand, truly writes:

"There can be little doubt in the mind of the student of Prophecy *who* is thus described; that it is the ultimate Anti-Christian power prefigured by the little horn of Daniel, and expressly announced by S. Paul. 2 Thess. ii. 3."—P. 706.

But the one important question that at this point arrests us, is the following:—What does the deadly wound, or temporary nonexistence of the Beast signify?

Because the monster, we find, is first alive; then to all appear[266]ance dies; and lastly, shortly before its final consignment to perdition, arises from the Abyss with new diabolical powers. And in this its final revived manifestation does the entire interest of its godless career ultimately centre. It is the Beast that 'died and rose again,' which is the universal object of the world's worship, xvii. 8; xiii. 3, 8, 12; the 'Resurrection from the dead' being the great crucial doctrine of Anti-Christianity, no less than of Christianity.

Now Dr Wordsworth tells us that the death of the Beast took place in the year 476, when Romulus Augustulus abdicated the imperial dignity; and that its resuscitation was coincident with the rise of the Papacy.

Whether the Monster was alive or dead during the sprouting forth and continuance of its seventh, or Germanic, head—which intervenes *between* its death and resurrection—our author does not inform us.

But the point to which we beg serious attention is this: that we have here a Christian writer gravely representing the *Christian* kingdom, i.e., Rome Papal, as something infinitely more awful and godless and Anti-Christian, than even *heathen* Rome!

The Beast, we must remember, is represented as dying, and then coming to life in some far more terrible and devilish state; rising, not from the 'sea' as before, but from the "bottomless pit" or "Abyss," suffused with blasphemy, abjuring the Name of GOD; the very visible embodiment of the GOD-bating dominion of Hell. And this Power it is which

Dr Wordsworth identifies with the Papacy—a Power so far worse than Rome heathen as the “bottomless pit” is deeper than the “sea,” and as the “seven spirits” (according to the parable which distinctly foreshadows this subject,) are “more wicked” and terrible than the “unclean spirit” which originally held the man in bondage.

This learned writer may strive as he will to defend this conclusion, he may bring the whole of his ingenuity into exercise in order to fasten on that great Branch of CHRIST’s Holy Church—which, however fallen from her pristine state, and committed to grave errors, is yet owned by GOD, and used by Him as an organ of His Holy Spirit, and a means, and the only means, of bringing the souls of thousands and tens of thousands to CHRIST—all the emblems and attributes which the Sacred Scriptures affix to mere devilish GOD-repudiating Anti-Christianity: for our part, we can but say, that we regard his attempt with horror; and that it is only our strong conviction that the Christian sense of all thoughtful and devout sons of the Church of England will instinctively reject such a perverse misapplication of GOD’s Holy Word, which qualifies our profound feeling of the mischief likely to ensue from the dissemination of such fearful interpretations.

Dean Alford, we are glad to observe, has seized what is unquestionably the true view of the “deadly wound.” He regards (with Auberlen) the wounded condition of the Beast to be synchronous with the external Christianization of the world-power, and to continue throughout the whole period of the Christian kingdom, during which time, “the Beast in his proper essence, in his fulness of opposition to GOD and His saints, ceases to be.”—P. 706.

This abnormal state of the Beast is expressed in two ways: He is said to have *ceased to exist*; and he is said to have been mortally *wounded*. Three times we are told, absolutely and without qualification, that the Beast “*is not*.” (xvii. 8, 11.) And this state of non-existence is predicated of him even while his sixth head is still in being.

And three times again, he is said to have received a ‘*wound*.’ It is a ‘*deadly wound*,’ (xiii. 8); it is a ‘*wound with a sword*,’ (ver. 14); it is inflicted on ‘one of his heads,’ (ver. 8); but it affects his whole self, (ver. 14).

Now, in reference to the former expression (‘*he is not*’), his future manifestation is described in the words, “He shall be present,” ([Greek]¹) and, “he shall ascend out of the Abyss and go to perdition.”

In reference to the latter expression, (the mortal ‘*wound*’), his future state is spoken of as a *healing* of the deadly stroke, and a restoration of *life*.

We learn from the whole, that the Beast for a time loses its bestial vitality, and ceases to be a Beast. But the two sets of expressions seem to us to deal with two distinct aspects of this change. The first tells of the Beast’s invisible, the second of its visible defeat. The former we take to refer, chiefly, to the actual death which passed upon it, when the world and its Prince were vanquished on Calvary. Just as Adam *died* in the day when he ate the forbidden fruit, so the Beast really died when JESUS “by His Death destroyed him who had the power of death.” Thus the expression, “he is not,” is deeply and absolutely true, even although the final terrible death struggle has not yet been actually realized. The ‘world’ is now ever ‘passing away.’ But this its essential non-existence is not as yet manifested: it is a secret realized only by GOD’s people: it is a mystery communicated by the angel to S. John.

¹ This word reminds us of the [Greek] of Anti-Christ, of which S. Paul writes. (2 Thes. ii. 9.) In like manner the expression, “he shall go to perdition,” ([Greek]) connects the prophecy with S. Paul’s [Greek].

The other expression, however, which speaks of the deadly *wound* recounts something which is obvious and manifest: it tells of the *visible* victory achieved by the Church over the world; of the *visible* defeat sustained by the Beast, when ancient heathenism was wounded to death by Christianity (from which wound it shall yet triumphantly recover, to the ‘astonishment’ of ‘all the world’). Our Blessed LORD Himself potentially slays and vanquishes the [268] Beast: but He leaves it to His Church to carry this victory into full effect—to “trample the young lion and the dragon under her feet.” As in the parallel case of Holy Baptism, the old Adam in us dies, and is thenceforth potentially slain, and yet we have ourselves laboriously to kill it; else it will destroy us; so does our LORD essentially, and once for all, destroy the Beast; and yet commissions His Church, for herself, to vanquish and destroy him—to “overcome the world.”

He bequeaths to her “the Faith:” with this she is to gain her victory. “The weapons of her warfare are not to be carnal,” but spiritual; the only weapons which are really “mighty to the pulling down” of the world’s “strong holds.” Power was given her to say to the world’s seven mountains, “Be ye removed, and be ye cast into the sea.” Power was given her to “bruise the serpent’s heads;” yea, to “break them in pieces.” But no: she established herself upon the mountains; she seated herself upon the heads. True, in the fervour of her early faith she made a noble attack upon her enemy. The “great mountain rolling down into the depths of the ocean” (ix. 8), and the “head wounded to death,” tell of a hopeful career of victory begun. But alas! it was not resolutely pursued. The contents of Heaven’s Armoury did not satisfy her; she wished for more speedy and manifest results than could be obtained by means of her celestial ammunition. Hence to the “sword of the LORD” (the [Greek]) she added the earthly weapon also (the [Greek]);¹ and with this she attempted to subdue the world: with the world’s own appliances she sought to obtain that “Victory over the world” which could only be achieved by “the Faith.” For a while she succeeded. But the success is only partial: it is not a real triumph: “the deadly wound shall yet be healed;” and “all the world shall wonder” and rejoice.

We conceive, then, that in the “deadly wound,” or “stroke with the sword,” we see depicted the *visible defeat* sustained by the world-power in its sixth or Roman Head (the varied expression hinting at the admixture of earthly elements in the warfare). We see foreshadowed, not only the temporal destruction of the old empire by the northern barbarians (for this seems included), but a still greater victory also, viz., the subjugation to CHRIST and His Church of the ancient heathen kingdom—this subjugation having been previously rendered possible by the secret victory obtained by CHRIST. But we see, lastly, a mournful but plain hint that this present visible subjection of the world-power to the Church shall [269] not be final, but shall be ultimately succeeded by a terrible reverse.

We cannot see our way to the acceptance of Auberlen’s and Dean Alford’s view, that the “*Christian Empire*” is the “seventh head of the Beast.”

It appears to ourselves that the sixth kingdom (the “*one*” which “*is*”) is supposed to continue during the whole period of the non-existence of the Beast; and that when the Beast rises from death, it is in its *seventh*, ten-horned Anti-Christian phase. For the Angel tells us that the seventh king (corresponding to the seventh head) “*is not yet* ([Greek])

¹ We noticed the Apocalyptic distinction between these two words above, p. 200. It is only in conformity with the *lex talionis* enunciated by our LORD to S. Peter, (S. Matt. xxvi. 52,) and repeated (Rev. xiii. 10) that they who have unauthorised recourse to the earthly weapons of warfare, must themselves fall therewith. The very expression, “the stroke with a sword,” seems itself to contain a hint that in so far as the wound was inflicted with a *sword* it would not be permanent in its effect.

come,” and that “when he cometh he must continue a *short space*.” And similarly of the “ten kings” (corresponding to the “ten horns”) he says that they have *not yet* ([Greek]) received a kingdom, but that “they shall receive power as kings *one hour*” with the Beast—where the “one hour” of the ten horns’ dominion seems to correspond with the “short space” of the seventh head’s continuance.¹

Hence, the seventh kingdom appears to be the divided Anti-Christian kingdom of the ten kings, with whom the Harlot consummates her impurities, and by whom she is destroyed. From amongst these arises, on the overthrow of the Harlot, the fully developed despotism of the “Man of Sin.” It is first an eleventh or “little horn” growing out of the seventh head; it uproots three of the “ten,” becoming an *eighth*, and at last develops itself into an absolute recapitulation of the entire Beast, and in a form so much more awful than that of any of the old heathen empires, as blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST is a sin of infinitely deeper malignity than any sin possible in the ancient world.

It remains for us to ask, Who, or what, is the Image of the Beast?

What can he be, save the individual *head* of the Anti-Christian kingdom, the visible personification of the entire Beast; not of this phase or that phase (as Dr Wordsworth would have it), not of this or that particular head, but of the *whole* Monster, in its full plenitude of power, and GOD-defying CHRIST-denying impiety? He is that one human being, “the last foe of the flock,” who will emphatically “gain the whole world and lose his own soul”—of whose future coming the whole Church, in all ages and countries, has given united testimony; to whom Satan shall give, what he once offered to CHRIST, “all the kingdoms of the world and their glory,” claiming in return the worship of himself. He shall be the manifested Prince and God of the world, of whom all former world-kings and Anti-Christians have been feeble types—the very embodiment of worldliness in its inmost essence, the exact image and *beau* [270] *ideal* of the world’s own conception of greatness and nobility; in whom the world shall see and worship itself. He shall “come in his own name,” and “him the world will receive.”² He shall be surrounded by all the pomp and solemn circumstance of religion, but of a religion of which himself is the centre and sole object;—himself the human organ of the Fiend, the very incarnation (so to speak) of Satan. His high Priest, the false Prophet, in whom we see summed up, in one ideal (possibly one actual) head, all the swarms of false prophets foretold by our LORD, “showing great signs and wonders, so as to deceive if possible the very elect”—shall prepare his way before him, shall work for him, shall call him into being.

The *time* when this “Beast from the earth,” or false Prophet, comes into full and matured existence, is clearly marked: it is on the “healing of the deadly wound” of the first Beast (xiii. 12);³ when Christianity is fast disappearing from the earth before the irresistible course of reviving heathenism, and when this diabolical “resurrection from the dead” may

¹ Dean Alford seems to think that the [Greek] contains a hint of the possible continuance of this head for a considerable period; the stress being, not on the [Greek], but on the [Greek]. We cannot agree with him. It certainly appears to us that the [Greek] is emphatic.

² We have said that S. John represents the FATHER and the World as the two great secret Objects of worship. Each has a visible representative or Image. There is the [Greek] of the Father (2 Cor. iv. 4; Col. i. 15); and the [Greek] of the World: The CHRIST and the Anti-Christ.

³ The “false Prophet” appears to discharge towards the Anti-Christian world the same functions which the Harlot of old discharged towards the Christian world. He is the official successor of the Harlot; though possibly for a time they may be practically one and the same

be confidently appealed to, as a crucial test of the truth and rational certainty of Anti-Christianity, of the failure and folly of Christianity.

The false Prophet (the impersonation of the world's *wisdom*, as the Beast is of its *power*,—he) and his wretched crew, the “predicadores Anti-Christi,” these emissaries from the bottomless pit, shall have been the great means of indoctrinating men with the poisonous [Greek] of the latter days—for which the teaching of the Harlot has previously prepared them—and thus of gradually reawakening the world to a restored heathen, or rather a new Anti-Christian life. Mighty and terrible will be their success. For they are aided not only by all the powers of Hell, but even by Heaven itself; GOD in dire judgment sending upon men ‘a strong delusion,’ so that *all*—the *entire* inhabitants of the once Christian earth, save only the ‘little flock’ of the elect—will receive and embrace them. The time for half-Christianity is past. It must be either CHRIST or Anti-Christ; death with CHRIST, or worldly joy with His enemies.

At an early stage of the movement, the Harlot or false Church which has pandered to the advancing tide of opinion, has served as the religious ally of the world; it may be, as the State Establishment of the ten confederate kings—some specious visible reunion of Christendom, on an Anti-Christian basis, having possibly been effected. Her intolerance, cruelty, and self-assertion increase with [271] her corruption; until the [Greek] predicted by S. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3, reaches such a head, that the Majesty of Heaven is outraged past endurance. GOD's people are warned in unambiguous accents to renounce her communion; the SPIRIT of Life deserts her, and she becomes the loathsome carcase, spoken of by our LORD, whom the eagles of vengeance scent out to devour. Alas, she little knows that her hour has come! Meanwhile, onward sweeps the resistless tide of infidel opinion. And now, *no* form of Christianity, however corrupt, will satisfy the quickened demands of the intellects of the men of the day. The very name of Christianity has become odious and intolerable. The growing Apostasy of the ten kings of Christendom receives a diabolic stimulus from some new Power suddenly arising, by means of which fresh elements of Anti-Christianity are infused into the fevered mind of the world; and in a frenzied paroxysm of hate, every vestige of Christianity and the Christian name is obliterated; the Harlot is torn to pieces and burnt with fire, and false Babylon becomes a habitation of devils. While the Head of this new Power which fast fills all the earth, and which speedily subdues or absorbs all other kingdoms, is solemnly proposed to the world, and deliberately accepted, enthroned, crowned as its sole King and God. Here is the end of the world and its *wisdom!*

What shall be the secret cipher, the ‘number,’ or ‘mark,’ whereby the last dread Enemy shall be recognised by the ‘wise,’ (a mystic key to which, intelligible at the time, S. John has bequeathed to the then faithful remnant,) it seems presumption seriously to inquire. Of Dr Wordsworth's solution of the enigma we will not speak further than to say, that it pains us to see a learned Christian man committing himself to such, transparent folly.¹

¹ One trifling point of detail we may just notice in passing.

Dr. Wordsworth, as is known, contrives by some ingenious process (we doubt not satisfactory to himself) to discover in the arrangement of the Keys on the Papal coin the “following letters, X Ξ Σ T.” Now, counting these, he tells us, we get X=600, Ξ= 60, Σ T (=σ τ = ζ) = 6. Now admitting, for the sake of argument, (which we do not) that these capital letters have any numerical value whatever,—with the exception of X, which represents 1000—we affirm that the combination of letters χ ξ σ τ so far from being equivalent to 666, really amounts to 1190, and nothing else.

Dr. Wordsworth's assertion that the =σ τ = ζ = 6 is a complete mistake. The ζ (=σ τ) and the episemon ζ (= 6) have no connection whatever, in respect to their numerical equivalence. The latter was the regular
 {cont.}

But what is to succeed this terrible triumph of Anti-Christianity?

Our LORD and His Saints suddenly appear from the opened [272] Heavens, in the midst of the world's short-lived jubilee, to destroy His impious foes, and "with the Breath of His lips to slay the wicked;" to hurl the old Dragon into the Abyss, to seal and chain him, and to consign the Anti-Christian confederation, secular and sacred, to the everlasting torments of the Burning Lake.

But what is to ensue? Is the Church never to have *her* visible time of triumph upon this earth? Is the earth to be then destroyed, as we are now usually taught, and all the Old Testament Prophecies which tell of the Church's future glories to fail of accomplishment? Is Christianity to exhibit itself last in the world as a failure? Are CHRIST and His Saints never visibly to assert their rights as the real Lords and Kings of the earth?

The 20th chapter of this book emphatically negatives such an idea. It affirms distinctly that the three and a half years, which shall see the long inworking "Mystery of Iniquity" at its head, and the triumph of Satan and Antichrist, shall be succeeded by "a thousand years" of *manifested* victory.

Dr Wordsworth adopts the common, but most unsatisfying interpretation, which spiritualises away the Prophecy, and dislocates the inspired sequence of events; placing the thousand years of triumph *before* the three years and a half of distress and defeat, and regarding the thousand years as now continuing.

Dean Alford adopts, in the main, what we are more and more convinced is the alone admissible interpretation of the chapter.

"I cannot (he writes) consent to distort the words of this passage from their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the Millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole Church for three hundred years, understood them in the plain literal sense. . . As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion."—P. 726.

As we recently devoted an entire paper to the subject of "the thousand years reign"¹ we must refer such of our readers as take an interest in that very interesting and important question, to the remarks we then offered.

We regret the length of the present Paper. But we have omitted much which we wished to say, and possibly what may be needful to guard us against misconception.

It has been our misfortune to disagree with many of the conclusions to which Dr Wordsworth has arrived, in his interpretation of this mysterious book; and we have felt bound to state our disagreement unreservedly. Any feeling of disrespect towards this esteemed writer we entirely disclaim. But it grieves us, in the present instance, to see a really valuable work, like the Greek Testament now [273] under review, disfigured by blemishes so serious; to find a learned, devout, and Catholic-minded writer lending all his energies to the hopeless task of upsetting a tradition of the Holy universal Church, handed down from Apostolic times, and drawn from Holy Scripture itself; and substituting in its

symbol in S. John's time for the number 6, borrowed, as Bishop Beveridge maintains (*Arithm. Chronol.*, lib. i. c. 7,) from the sixth letter of the Samaritan alphabet inversely written. The former, though similar in appearance, bears no possible relation to it, and is merely a modern stenographical contraction introduced in the 12th or 13th century. So that to take no higher ground, this absurd explanation of the "mark of the Beast" is, on this account alone, seen to be utterly baseless and visionary.

¹ Ecclesiastic, March, 1860. φ 'Curzon's Scriptural Key to the Revelation of S. John', p. 340 *supra*.

place a modern perversion of GOD's Inspired Word, not more false and unsubstantial in itself, than it is mischievous in its results, and derogatory to the Divine Author of Scripture.

The present Volume is a sad anti-climax to Dr Wordsworth's work, as a whole. His Commentary on the Gospels was sound and devotional, and, excepting where the writer touched on the Church of Rome, left little to be desired.

The Volume on the Acts of the Apostles was not quite equal to its predecessor. In the next Dr Wordsworth seemed frequently to miss the sense of S. Paul; and in reviewing it, we were obliged to say that a Commentary on S. Paul was still a desideratum in the English Church. The last Volume contains the Commentary on the Apocalypse!

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian VOL 23 (Joseph Masters: London, 1861)
 [502]INSPIRATION AND INTERPRETATION: BURGON AND WORDSWORTH

The Interpretation of the Bible: Five Lectures, delivered in Westminster Abbey.
 By CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. London: Rivingtons.
 1861.

Inspiration and Interpretation: Seven Sermons preached before the University of Oxford: with preliminary remarks: being an answer to a volume entitled "Essays and Reviews." By the Rev. JOHN WILLIAM BURGON, M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, and Select Preacher. Oxford and London: J. H. & Jas. Parker. 1861.

THE Church of England is passing through a new phase of her chequered history. Again has the tempter been at work, plying his insidious artifices to seduce her from her allegiance to GOD: again, through the overruling care of the great Head of the Church, shall his malignant designs be frustrated, and his mischievous devices redound to the Church's spiritual welfare.

Having discovered that his subtle endeavours to tempt her into abandoning her faith in the two great Sacraments have come to nought, and have only proved the means, under GOD, of enabling her to attain to a clearer apprehension, and firmer practical grasp of these cardinal mysteries, he has been attempting bolder measures, setting himself to work craftily to undermine her faith in the Creeds, in Holy Scripture itself—nay, in the entire complex of Divine Revelation.

He has been resorting to his old well-tried weapon, first successfully plied by him in Paradise—"Yea, *hath God said?*"—seeking [503] to instil the baneful poison of doubt and uncertainty into the minds of thinking Christians. "Yea, *hath GOD said?*" Hath He really spoken, or not? Is it really *true* that He has made known His will to man, save through man's individual conscience? Are not these which are uncritically assumed to be Divine utterances, not rather the simple utterances of fallible men? Is not that Book, popularly though inaccurately designated as the 'written Word of GOD,' merely the "written voice of the congregation?" Is not its language, at least through the greater portion of the volume, but the language of frail humanity—of humanity, too, in its early childhood? How then can this—an interesting, doubtless, and valuable, though miscellaneous and unsystematic, compilation of early records—be regarded as any conceivable *authority* to the advanced intellects of the nineteenth century, to those who have arrived at 'mature age,' whose 'eyes are opened,' and who 'by reason of use, have their senses exercised to discern good and evil?' Is not the notion of an 'external revelation' a mere 'fiction,' one of the exploded dreams of an over credulous and unscientific age?

These, and the like, are the views which, popular amongst the "wise and prudent" of Germany, are now pressed upon the acceptance of the clergy and laity of the Church of England; pressed upon them, moreover, not by the Church's "adversaries" or "open enemies," but by "her own familiar friends," by names of note and influence within her borders, by men in every way entitled to a respectful and affectionate hearing.

Thanks be to GOD! the Church of England has not yet fallen so far from GOD as to consent to adopt such principles. From one end of her to the other, has the teaching of the miserable book wherein the views above referred to have obtained an embodiment and a wide circulation, been indignantly repudiated. And not only this: but an earnest desire also has been elicited, and called into active practical exercise, throughout her whole communion, to strengthen the bulwarks against which the attack has been directed, and

thus render herself, under GOD, better prepared for similar attempts hereafter. The enemy has once again overreached himself. Even now we see, that through GOD's loving Providence, this assault on our Faith is beginning to subserve a great purpose, and to contribute towards a fuller restoration of Catholic Truth amongst us.

Among the multitudinous array of books, pamphlets, sermons, &c. called into being by the appearance of the "Essays and Reviews," the two works named at the head of the present paper deserve a passing notice.

Dr Wordsworth's little volume consists of a short course of sermons on the Interpretation of Holy Scripture: being the sequel to a former course recently delivered on the subject of Inspiration.

The sermons are carefully and earnestly written; and the important theme of Scripture Interpretation handled in a grave, learned, and reverent, though not perhaps very deep or complete manner.

The first sermon contains a brief but interesting historical survey of the evil results which have ensued in Germany from erroneous principles of interpretation:—the author glancing in order at the most noticeable of that series of mutually-contradictory heresies to which these successive schemes of misinterpretation have given rise; tracing out how "the rigid dogmatism of Lutheranism and Calvinism gave way to the enthusiastic fervour of Pietism;" how "Pietism fell beneath the attacks of Rationalism;" how "Rationalism was driven from the field by Pantheism:"—and "Pantheism," as he adds, "is only another name for Atheism." (P. 30.)

The second sermon treats of the qualifications, intellectual, moral, and spiritual, for the interpretation of the Bible. A valuable passage on the same important subject occurs in a later sermon: pp. 94, 5.

The third—"JESUS CHRIST interpreting the Bible in His own Person and by the ministry of His Apostles and Evangelists"—is perhaps the most seasonable and useful of the series for the present time; as indicating in a lucid manner the true answers to the mischievous theories of interpretation suggested by writers of the Rowland Williams and Jowett school.

In the fourth sermon—"the Bible interpreting itself"—are to be found some thoughtful remarks on the probationary character of Scripture. We must find space for a short quotation.

"It is a characteristic of the Divine Mind in Holy Scripture to speak strongly on special points of Christian Doctrine in particular places of Holy Writ, and to leave it to the reader of Scripture to supply the correlative truths from other portions of Holy Writ, which are necessary to *complete* the statement of the doctrine as a *whole*. Sometimes Holy Scripture startles us by seeming paradoxes, and staggers us by hard sayings, and perplexes us by riddles and enigmas. And why does the Divine Author of Scripture deal thus with us? In order to try us. He does it in order to allow us, if we will, to carp and cavil, and to rely on our own reason with overweening pride and presumption, by which we shall be self-condemned; He does it in order to teach us that all parts of Scripture are dependent on one another, like joints in a well-organized body, or like parts of a beautiful building; He does it in order that we may not confine our attention to *any one part* of Scripture to the neglect of others, but may carefully consider the whole; and in order to exercise our patience and diligence in *searching the Scriptures*, and to test and prove us, whether we possess those moral dispositions of meekness, candour, and love of truth, which are requisite for admission into the Kingdom of GOD."—Pp. 98, 9.

Many apposite illustrations are added, showing how that to partial views of Scripture well nigh all heresies are attributable. He teaches, moreover, how [505] “the various portions of Scripture are ever touching one another without any evidence of effort on their part and thus give strength and support to each other, and present the Holy Scriptures to our view as one harmonious whole.”

“These *points of contact*,” he adds, “have sometimes been called, *undesigned coincidences*. But surely this is hardly a correct description of them. *Nothing* in the Holy Scripture is done *without design*. The Author of them is GOD; and whatever He does, He designs; and whatever He designs, He does The silent adjustment of one part of Scripture to another is not the less designed, because *we do not* at first *perceive* the *design*: but rather the *non-appearance of design* was itself *designed* by GOD, in order that we might *search* for, and *discover*, the coincidences, and that they might serve for our moral probation, and show what manner of spirit and temper we are of.”—P. 112.

The subject of the fifth and last Sermon, which we think hardly equal to its theme, is, “JESUS CHRIST interpreting the Bible, in matters of faith, by the Presence and Power of the HOLY SPIRIT in the Universal Church.” On the whole we consider this a very timely and valuable little volume, and one which might be advantageously put into the hands of our educated laity.

Mr. Burgon’s book is on a much more extended scale. It is a goodly octavo, handsomely printed, containing from five to six hundred pages. The former half of the volume consists of a Preface and Introduction, devoted to a sharp criticism of the Essays and Reviews; the latter half, of seven Sermons on the subject of the Inspiration and Interpretation of Scripture—together with a short Appendix.

We need hardly say that this volume contains very much admirable matter, that the Author insists ably and earnestly on the supreme authority and Divinity of Holy Writ, that he vindicates its plenary inspiration and orthodox interpretation from the old godless and oft-refuted cavils recently revived against them, that he stoutly defends what is good and true, and that his answers to the Seven Essayists, though occasionally betraying undue haste, and an inadequate apprehension of the arguments which he is undertaking to subvert, as well as an entire want of sympathy with the perplexities with which his adversaries may be really beset, are generally searching and complete.

We much regret, however, that his work is so sadly disfigured by its style; and that the whole volume loses in effect, and in its power of convincing the understanding, or beneficially influencing the heart, by the singular absence of good taste which characterises great portions of it. There is an unpleasing tone of banter and bluster about it; an air of self-consciousness and unseemly self-sufficiency; a manner, at times, condescending and patronizing, at times rude, arrogant, and contemptuous: there are indications, too, even of sentiments of personal rancour and animosity against one [506] of the Seven Essayists—all which have the effect of marring the usefulness of the book, and weakening the confidence of the reader in a guide who appears wanting in that chastened humility, that sensitive charity, that transparent self-forgetting purity of motive, which befit one whose sacred and self-imposed task should lead him to court with all earnestness the aid and Presence of that Illuminating Spirit “who spake by the Prophets,” and whose very being, and name, and essence is Love.

Even in a literary point of view, we consider Mr. Burgon’s style a great mistake. Dispensing with grace, courtesy, dignity, it loses in force and effect.

Who, for instance, can read such a passage as that on pp. ccxiv.—xvi., without feeling that it is overdone, and in the worst possible taste; without finding, too, that the indignation so coarsely invoked against the Professor of Greek, misses its intended object, and really expends itself upon the writer who can manifest such a want of Christian delicacy?

Or take another and briefer specimen in the same style.

“Indeed to follow that most confused of thinkers [Mr. Jowett], and crooked of disputants, through all his perverse pages; to expose his habitual paltry evasive dodging—his shifty equivocations—his misapplications of Scripture—his unworthy insinuations,—his plaintive puerilities of thought and sentiment; would require a thick volume.”—P. ccvi.

Or again:

“I shall be thought a very profane person, I dare say, by the friends of Mr. Jowett, if I avow that the passage with which he concludes his Essay, instead of sounding in my ears like the plaintive death-song of departing genius, sounds to me like nothing so much as the piteous whine of a school-boy who knows that he *deserves* chastisement, and perceives that he is about to experience his deserts. [We presume at the hands of Mr. Burgon.] Views, except negative ones, Mr. Jowett is altogether guiltless of. Can anybody in his senses suppose that a man ‘has by a Divine help been enabled to plant his foot somewhere beyond the waves of time,’¹ who doubts everything, and *believes nothing*? Can any one of sane mind dream that posterity will come to the rescue of a man who, when he is asked for his story, rejoins, (with a well-known needy mechanic,) that he has ‘none to tell, sir?’ *What* then is posterity to vindicate? *What* has the Regius Professor of Greek written so many weak pages to prove? Just nothing!” &c. &c.—Pp. ccx. xi.

Now this kind of writing, of which there is far too much in Mr. Burgon’s pages, is very foolish, very mischievous, and very weak. Moreover, after admonishing his readers as to the effects he *intends* to produce by his book—how that “he cannot for a moment allow [507] some of the sophistries” of Mr. Jowett “to *escape without castigation*,” (p. clxxxix.);—how that, in answering the Essayists, he purposes “*mercilessly to uncover their baseness, and uncompromisingly to denounce it*,” (p. xxiv.);—how he intends “to *hold them up to ridicule to the very utmost of his power*,” to “*make them objects of unqualified reprobation to all*,” (p. 249), &c. &c., he should really have had the wisdom to adopt a style of writing more calculated to aid him in effecting these desirable results.

But Mr. Burgon’s vehemence occasionally leads him to an entire misrepresentation of his opponent’s meaning. Thus—to take a single early instance, from his review of Dr Williams’ Essay. Dr Williams is referring to Bunsen’s “Prophetical disquisitions,” and says that “no fair reader will rise from them without feeling that he has been under the guidance of a master’s hand.”² Mr. Burgon hastily assumes that by these “Prophetical disquisitions” of Bunsen, Dr Williams signifies the Prophetical Scriptures: and, thereupon, thus proceeds to develop the Essayist’s meaning:

“The ‘Prophetical disquisitions’ therefore are subject to error of every description; and possess no higher attributes than belong to any ordinary human work by a master’s hand.”—P. xxxviii.

This is very careless work, and singularly unpardonable in one who deals so freely with the character of his opponents.

¹ See the close of Mr. Jowett’s Essay.

² Essays and Reviews, p. 77.

Nor—(quitting the Preface and Introduction)—can we agree with Mr. Burgon in considering the following, a becoming *sermon* style. The preacher thus represents one of the Essayists accosting the four Blessed Evangelists.

“You are four highly respectable characters, no doubt; and you *mean* well. But it cannot be expected that persons of your condition of life should have described so many intricate transactions so minutely without making blunders. I do not say it unkindly. I often make blunders myself,—*I*, who have a ‘clearness of understanding,’ a ‘power of discrimination between different kinds of truth’ unknown to the Apostolic age!” &c. &c.—P. 60.

Nor again, for a preacher who has the faintest desire to influence his hearers for good, is it wise to scoff and rate at them as though they were infidels. He is encountering, in his fourth sermon, the objection, that it cannot be said, of such a passage, as (e.g.) the “catalogue of the Dukes of Edom,” that it is inspired by GOD. Well, then, he fairly rejoins, if not inspired, let it be ejected from the Volume of Inspiration. But (he argues) the process of excision cannot stop here: by parity of reasoning, it must be extended to more, far more, than half the Bible. After which he continues to address his hearers in the following unpleasant strains:—

“If *your own* handling of Holy Scripture,—*your own* method, by [508] *yourself* applied—be not a *reductio ad absurdum*, I know of nothing in the world which is. Look only at that handful of mutilated pages in the hands of one who is supposed to be the impersonation of ‘common sense;’ turn the tattered and mangled leaves over and over, which *you* are pleased to call the Volume of Inspiration; and get all the comfort and help out of it you can! But be not surprised to hear that you are exposing yourself to the ridicule of the sane part of mankind,” &c.—P. 99.

And then mark the self-conscious and inflated tone of what follows:—

“Let *me* now be permitted to lay before you a somewhat different view of the office of Inspiration. Since the illumination of science, falsely so called, and the process of common sense, would seem to have resulted in the extinction of the deposit, I ask your patience while I try to show that common sense, *informed by a somewhat loftier Theological Instinct*, may give such an account of the matter as will enable us to preserve every word of the deposit entire.

“*You call my attention* to the catalogue of the Dukes of Edom, and tell me that it required no supernatural aid to enable Moses to write it. How, may I ask, do you ascertain that fact? No specimens of the documentary evidence of the land of Seir in the days of Moses are known now to exist. *You therefore know absolutely nothing whatever about the matter of which you speak so confidently.*”—P. 100.

And so on, for pages in the same uncomfortable strain.

Now, we sincerely regret these errors in judgment: for, as we have said, they materially detract from the value and usefulness of a volume of unquestionably sterling merit. Mr. Burgon surely ought to know that young men will not be sneered and bullied into orthodoxy from the pulpit. But throughout the whole of his volume the author manifests, what we can only call, a strange deficiency in *tact*—an absence of any nice perception of what is really becoming, or *effective*, either in writing or speaking. Mr. Burgon’s volume may confirm believers: it will convert no sceptics; it will reclaim no doubters.

Nevertheless, with all its blemishes and foolish waste of power, the work is really a valuable one; and, as an antidote to the pernicious teaching of the Essayists, (to those who can bring themselves to study it) on the whole, most satisfactory and complete.

We must not omit to quote Mr. Burgon's estimate of the respective merits (or demerits) of the individual Essays—a judgment in which, for the most part, we concur.

“The most foolish composition of the seven is Dr Temple's; the most mischievous is Professor Jowett's; . . . the most unphilosophical Essay, (where *all* are unphilosophical,) is Professor Powell's; the most insolent, Dr Williams'; the most immoral, Mr. Wilson's; the most shallow, Mr. Goodwin's; the most irrelevant, Mr. Pattison's.”—P. xxvii.

[509]

Great and permanent, however, will have been the benefit arising from this sevenfold league against orthodoxy, if it awaken the minds of Churchmen to a more accurate examination of the several points 'freely handled' by the *septem*; and especially, if it draw them to a more careful consideration of those cardinal questions which form the subject matter of the volumes now under review,—namely, the Inspiration and Interpretation of Holy Scripture.

No subjects can be of more vital interest: for if the systems of interpretation and the theories of Inspiration advanced by men of the Williams and Jowett school be true, then our faith is vain, our hopes visionary; our Christianity vanishes like a dream.

For, as has been again and again shown, and cannot be too seriously urged, there is absolutely *no logical resting place whatever* between such theology and the most avowed and GOD-defying infidelity.

If the Bible be divested of its paramount claim upon our faith and obedience: if its [Greek] be denied—or, which amounts to the same thing, be only nominally and partially admitted, so that it is left to each self-opinionated questioner to determine for himself, or herself, how much is Divine and how much merely human, how much is 'spirit' (according to the cant of the day) and how much bare 'letter,' and, as such, capable of being discarded, how much is *actually* true, and how much only true *ideally*—then is all dark and uncertain before us; our path through this world, our journey to an unknown future, are shrouded in gloom: we are, indeed, as S. Paul says, 'most miserable.'

How far, in the case of the writers above referred to, the traditional faith wherewith they have been early indoctrinated, and the salutary atmosphere of dogmatic truth with which their position in the English Church has caused them to be encircled, may still for a while have kept them sounder at heart than their explicit avowals of misbelief show them to be in theory, we cannot say: we can only hope, with fear.

But if the way of unbelief is a downhill road; if an uncertain faith is too soon a certain scepticism, and an unwillingness to believe, an *inability*¹ to believe; if, moreover, the burning woe denounced against those who offend CHRIST's little ones, begins even in this life to shed its withering blight, in judicial blindness, upon those who recklessly mislead;—then may we indeed tremble for men who, having once "known the way of the LORD," are turning, and seeking to turn others, "from the Holy Commandment delivered unto them;" and in the Name of CHRIST are subverting the doctrine of CHRIST.

It is very sorrowful to watch the gradual declension of sceptical minds from the path of orthodoxy. Who, for instance, that has [510] perused the able and (on the whole) unexceptionable and valuable Sermon of Dr Williams on the Athanasian Creed, in his

¹ "Therefore they *could not* believe, because . . . He bath hardened their heart." S. John xii. 39, 40.

“Rational Godliness” (Serm. xvii.)¹ can read without a shudder the cold infidel sneer in which that venerable Symbol is now (apparently) referred to, in his recent Essay (p. 87)?

Compare again—as more closely bearing on our immediate subject—his earlier teaching with his later on the Interpretation of Scripture Prophecy.

In his earlier writings on that interesting theme, he appeared to manifest a sincere desire to explain (though with an undue freedom of speculation) the phenomena of Prophecy—and especially its double sense. In his late productions, especially his last, his sole object appears to be to deny with reckless impiety, the very existence of any Prophetic element—in fact, of any supernatural element—in the Bible.

Thus, in 1850, we find Dr Williams writing in this guarded and sober strain.

“We do not indeed assert, that the Hebrew Prophets knew precisely what manner of salvation they foretold;² for they often shadow it forth under such temporal deliverances, as to make the literal, or Jewish interpretation of their predictions, not altogether unreasonable . . . Still, amidst this imperfect knowledge, we find them . . . foretelling with the strongest confidence the ultimate triumph of pure Religion, the springing of a Righteous Branch out of the stem of Jesse, and the Reign of a King who should execute Justice and Mercy

“Although some circumstances in the description of GOD’s Firstborn and Elect, by whom this change is to be accomplished, may primarily apply to collective Israel, *many others will admit of no such application. Israel surely was not the Child whom a Virgin was to bear; Israel did not make his Grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his Death; Israel scarcely reconciled that strangely blended variety of Suffering and Triumph which was predicted of the Messiah.*”—(Rational Godliness, p. 56.)

In 1855, Dr Williams appends a note to the passage we have italicized, to the effect that he no longer feels confident of the assertion therein contained: adding “I *now* believe that *all* the prophecies have primarily an application nearly contemporaneous.”

Nor can we offer the least possible objection even to this latter statement. We firmly believe, with Dr Williams, that a nearly [511] contemporaneous *primary* application . is the *rule* in the ancient Prophecies.

And all students of Prophecy would admit the same. Thus Dr Lee writes:

“In considering the predictions of Scripture . . . we may observe that a certain method has been almost uniformly pursued, which constitutes as it were, the *Law* according to which the different portions of GOD’s Revelation have been communicated:—namely, that each prediction, with scarcely an exception, proceeds from and attaches itself to some definite fact in the historical present. In other words, when the future is to be foreshadowed, certain events of the time, historical or incidental, are selected as occasions on which may be founded the several disclosures of the Divine Will. The Almighty—who can question it?—could in all cases have unveiled His purpose without observing any such method; but He has not only thought fit to disclose His Will *gradually*, as the Scripture narrative clearly implies;—He has also, as a general

¹ In referring to this most unsettled and unsettling work, our relative commendation must not be understood to extend beyond the portions specially noticed. We recorded our opinion of the book as a whole some years ago; but little thought then, that the strong convictions we expressed as to its dangerous tendency, and the downward career of its author, would meet with such speedy and melancholy confirmation. Vide *Ecclesiastic*, Vol. XVIII., April, June (pp. 145, 245). φ ‘Williams’ Rational Godliness.’ pp. 198ff. *supra*.

² On the subject of the imperfect and indistinct knowledge of the import of their own predictions, on the part of the Prophets themselves, see an interesting note in Dr. Wordsworth’s little book, p. 81.

rule, availed Himself, (if we may use the phrase) of certain occasions which were presented, from time to time, and which formed a species of natural channel for the conveyance of His Revelations. . . . By this fact of the connection of single Predictions with the historical present, may be explained, I conceive, that characteristic of Prophecy which consists in its ‘double sense;’ according to which the *particular* is brought forward as a pledge of what lies far beyond, without representing the former as the true or highest end.”—*Inspiration of Holy Scripture*, pp. 152—7, 2nd Ed.

And in conformity with this, Dr Williams truly wrote in his earlier work, respecting the double sense of Messianic Prophecy:

“The proper position of the Christian divine is, not that the Jewish interpretation of their own prophecies is untrue, but that it is *inadequate*. *As far as it goes*, it is right: but if this be *all*, then has their faith failed them. There is only One King of their race, Who is even now ruling over many nations There has been only One Child born of a Virgin, Who has delivered mankind as to be emphatically and properly GOD with us. There is only One, and He too a Priest, both smitten through the iniquity of the people; and yet, through whose stripes His very smiters are healed. Nor, once more, is there any other save One, of Whom indeed Israel, as GOD’s Firstborn, was no mean type; Who had been taken in some emphatical sense out of His Mother’s womb; Who had also been called out of Egypt; but Who was reduced in agony, too awful to be traced, to exclaim from the Tree, My GOD, My GOD, why hast Thou forsaken Me?”—*Rational Godliness*, Pp. 169—70.

But now Dr Williams has advanced beyond all this. He now appears to deem the “Jewish interpretation of their own prophecies” not only ‘*true*,’ but ‘*adequate*.’ He now appears to deny any real ulterior reference of the Prophecies to the MESSIAH altogether. True, he writes, there still exists “*one* passage perhaps in Zechariah, [512] and one in Isaiah *capable of being made* directly Messianic.” “But even these cases,” he adds, “tend to melt, if they are not already melted, in the crucible of searching inquiry.”¹

This, then, is the result to which Dr Williams wishes to conduct us all, and to which he has brought himself; to deny the very existence of any prophetic (in the sense of predictive) statement in Holy Scripture. It is ‘*predication*,’ not ‘*prediction*.’ Prophecy is in fact simply religious history, and its phenomena are dependent (for this appears to be the *rationale* of his theory) upon the fact of the ever-recurrent unity of the Divine dealings with man. GOD’s Providence loves to repeat itself. Hence the events of one period are foreshadows, and as it were ‘*fore speakers*’ of the events of other and after periods. The Prophets were religious and thoughtful men, who acutely observing the signs of their own times, and reverently tracing out the order of the Divine Government therein exhibited, accustomed themselves to ‘*read the ideal in the actual*,’ or more correctly, to infer the abstract and real from the concrete and phenomenal; and thus learnt certain of the “*abiding thoughts of GOD*,” and of the fixed principles of His providential administration. These men, like our modern poets or historians, were oftentimes led to record, by the light of the sacred knowledge thus acquired, the facts of their own day—facts which, as outward utterances in the world of sense, of realities deep in the Divine mind, were destined ever and anon, under fresh conditions, to repeat themselves.

When the Providential Cycles came round again, and the same dramas were re-enacted under changed circumstances,—in other words, when the Divine ‘*thoughts*’ which had exhibited and embodied themselves in the events of the Prophets’ own times had shaped for themselves parallel expressions in the characters and movements of later periods,—

¹ Essays and Reviews, pp. 69, 70.

these poet-historians who had left in their mystic records mirrors of the future, would naturally come to be regarded as actual *foreseers* of what was to ensue, and as possessors of some peculiar and specific and supernatural faculty denied to the rest of mankind.

Now that this theory has a plausible look, and contains also important elements of Truth, few will deny; its only fault is that when any attempt is made to *apply* it, it shows itself to be absolutely and hopelessly fallacious and insufficient.

So long, however, as it presents itself, claiming to be founded, by an honest process of induction, upon the *facts* of Scripture Prophecy, and to be offered in sincerity as a possible means of accounting for those facts, so long we gladly give it a respectful hearing. But when it reveals itself in its true light, as framed independently and in *defiance* of the notorious facts of the case, and urged with the simple end of supporting the foregone conclu[513]sion that there is no *supernatural* element in the Bible, and as a mere expedient for accounting for the otherwise unaccountable phenomena of Prophecy, by divesting them of their apparently supernatural character, why then we treat it for what it is worth, and deal with it accordingly.

When we are urged to believe that the Prophecies of the ancient Seers had no predictive element about them, and were uttered by the exercise of their natural powers, and that there are only two of them at most "*perhaps capable of being made* directly Messianic;" we simply recall the explicit statements of our Blessed LORD and of His holy Apostles on the subject, and the confirmatory verdict of Holy Church testifying 'throughout the world' that it was the 'HOLY GHOST' Who 'spake by the Prophets;' we simply bethink us of the reiterated assurances of Holy Scripture itself,¹ that it was "the Spirit of CHRIST" which testified *in* and *through* the Prophets, (1 S. Pet. i. 11,) that it was "GOD Who made heaven and earth and all things therein," Who "spake by the mouth of His servant David," (Acts iv. 24, 25,) that "the HOLY GHOST spake beforehand through the mouth of David," (ib. i. 16,) that "GOD spake of the mighty salvation" to be brought about in the house of David "by the mouth of His holy Prophets since the world began," (S. Luke i. 68, 70,) that "holy men of GOD spake as they were moved by the HOLY GHOST" (2 S. Pet. i. 21,) that Moses "wrote of CHRIST," (S. John v. 46,) that the distinguishing characteristic of all Prophetic Scripture is to "testify of CHRIST," (S. John v. 39; Rev. xix. 10; S. Luke xxiv. 44,) that "the HOLY GHOST spake through Esaias the Prophet," (Acts xxviii. 25,) that "GOD by the mouth of all His Prophets foretold the sufferings of CHRIST," (Acts iii. 18;) that so little was the peculiar prophetic impulse under which the ancient Seers spoke, the result of any activity of mere natural powers, that the import of their own utterances was often veiled even from themselves, insomuch that they "searched diligently" to penetrate the meaning of that "Word of GOD" with which they felt themselves charged, (1 S. Pet. i. 11); and that even after the fulfilment of many of their predictions, it still needed that the Divine LOGOS should "open the understanding" of His people to enable them to discern all that was written "in Moses and the Prophets, and in all the Scriptures concerning *Himself*," (S. Luke xxiv. 25—32, 44—46.) We bethink ourselves, we repeat, of these and a hundred kindred declarations of Holy Writ, and we throw the infidel suggestions to the winds.

The question of the interpretation of Scripture Prophecy in fact, simply resolves itself into this:—To which are we to give credence, the solemn asseverations of our Blessed LORD Himself and His Holy Apostles and Evangelists, or the cold Sadduceean specula[514]tions of a few modern doubters of the Williams and the Jowett stamp—men who are little by

¹ Vid. Burgon, pp. 56, 57.

little parting with those moral and spiritual qualifications through which alone they can by any possibility understand the Sacred Oracles?

For, most providentially, on this important subject of Sacred Interpretation, the Bible itself is peculiarly explicit and communicative.

Are we assured, for instance, by the writers above-mentioned, that Holy Scripture is “to be interpreted like any other Book;” that its words have only one meaning, viz., that which first “struck on the ears or flashed before the eyes of those” who originally heard or read them: we can only remember that the Bible declares itself to be essentially unlike any other Book, to admit of modes of interpretation of which no other book is, or can be, susceptible, and to possess a manifoldness and profundity of significance to which no other writing in the world has ever presumed to lay claim.¹

Are we encouraged to treat Scripture lightly, with a half-contemptuous, half-patronizing indifference; to regard it not as our “master” but as our “servant;”²—we can only remember the profound and lowly reverence with which GOD Incarnate, our Creator, Redeemer, and Judge, ever referred to those Sacred Records; and His solemn assurances, that the “Scripture *cannot* be broken,” that “Scripture *must* be fulfilled,” that “sooner shall Heaven and earth pass than one tittle of the Law fail.” We bethink us that the three first recorded utterances of the MESSIAH, after His official inauguration, are appeals to Holy Scripture [Greek] (S. Matt. iv. 4, 7, 10)—and that this mysterious threefold appeal is made, not before man, but to the Arch-enemy himself: the whole scene proving, that the power and dignity of Scripture are abundantly recognised even by Devils; Satan himself not presuming to call in question, before his August Opponent, the paramount and conclusive *authority* of the Written Word, but merely seeking to parry off its deadly thrusts by qualifying counter-quotations.

And does not the first official discourse of our LORD evince the same reverential bearing towards the Old Testament Scripture? What means the emphatic protest, “I am not come to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to *fulfil* them.” The New Law promulgated on the Mount of Beatitudes is represented throughout, as the development and completion of the Old Law. The Lawgiver is the [515] same: but the old “Letter” is by Himself unfolded and expanded, to meet the enlarged receptivity of its new subjects. “It was said to them of old time; but I say to you.”

And throughout the whole of our LORD’s ministerial Life, is the same respectful regard, the same constant and conclusive appeal, to the Sacred Scriptures exhibited. And not only in His life: for even when the dews of Death were beginning to fall on Him, did He not, even then, manifest the same holy jealousy for their honour? Was it not at that awful time that He vouchsafed to unfold the true meaning of the mysterious 22nd Psalm? And when His Sacred “tongue clave to the roof of His mouth,” is it not recorded that the racking *thirst* which consumed His parched frame was, in order “that the Scriptures of the Prophets might be fulfilled?”

¹ See this inquiry, as to the mode in which Scripture itself interprets Scripture, ably conducted by Mr. Burgon, pp. 144—163.

² “Even if Holy Scripture were, as is popularly fancied, the foundation, and not, as I believe, the expression and memorial of religious truth in man, it would be absurd to render it honours essentially different from those which it claims for itself, or to make it a master, where it claims only to be a servant.”—Vide “A letter from Dr. Williams to the Editor of the ‘Christian Examiner.’”

The melancholy effrontery with which Dr Williams affects to ignore the Prophetic reference to our LORD in the 53rd chap. of Isaiah, is deserving of earnest reprobation; and affords a fair and sad evidence (if any were wanting) of the spirit in which his “Essay” has been conceived and written.

Did that touching scene in the “way going down from Jerusalem to Gaza,” never flash across him, as he penned those miserable lines:—the devout eunuch bending in reverent contemplation over that very chapter? “The place of the Scripture which he read was this: *He was led as a sheep to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before its shearers, so He opened not His mouth.* And the Eunuch answered Philip and said, I pray thee, of whom speaketh the Prophet this, of himself, or of some other man? Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached to him *Jesus.*”

Did it never pass through his mind—we say not that Apostles and Evangelists only, again and again, apply this Prophecy to their LORD, but—that the Redeemer Himself set His own Divine seal to the truth of their interpretation; pointing to this sacred chapter, as the time of its accomplishment drew on; affirming that its mysterious announcement, “He was numbered with the transgressors,” *must needs* be accomplished in Himself (S. Luke xxii. 37);— a statement which S. Mark further explains in these words: “With Him they crucify two thieves: and the Scripture was *fulfilled*, ‘He was numbered with the transgressors?’”

Was it, we ask, in careless forgetfulness, or wanton contempt, of these inspired comments on this memorable Prophecy, that Dr Williams coldly asserts that “*if* any single person should be selected” as the subject of the Prophecy, Bunsen’s arguments “*prove* that Jeremiah should be the one!”¹ In other words, the four Holy Evangelists, S. Philip, S. Paul, S. Peter, the Holy. Universal Church, and our Blessed LORD Himself have all miscon[516]ceived and misinterpreted this celebrated prediction, and must meekly submit to be set right by the searching criticism of Chevalier Bunsen and Dr Rowland Williams!

The fact of Jeremiah, as in some peculiar way the Prophet “acquainted with grief,” having realised in his personal experience, many foretastes of the afflictions which were yet to be accomplished in the Divine “Man of Sorrows,” is not for a moment questioned. On which of GOD’s faithful servants has not the awful Shadow of the Cross fallen? But this is no justification of Dr Williams’ heartless attempt. His ill-concealed endeavour is, not to show how Jeremiah was a striking *type* of his Redeemer; but to *dissociate* the Prophecy from the suffering Son of Man; to represent that as an erroneous and uncritical interpretation which regards *Him* as the great Subject of it—the one *true* fulfilment, of which all others, before or since, were but feeble shadows,—and to apply the inspired predictions to *another*, independently of, and in place of Him.

But the whole animus of this, and all other of Dr Williams’ sceptical suggestions is so obvious, as to render his Essay utterly unworthy the serious thought of any devout Christian.

In drawing, as our space warns us to do, these cursory remarks to a close, we are bound to repeat that on almost all points bearing upon the present controversies respecting the inspiration and interpretation of Holy Scripture, we have found Mr. Burgon’s volume very complete and satisfactory. Had his manner been as unexceptionable as his matter,² his

¹ Essays and Reviews,” p. 73.

² We must remonstrate, however, against a flippant and needlessly objectionable remark of his on the subject of the Apocrypha, p. 76.

book, though unsystematic and fragmentary, would on these points have left little to be desired.

In meditating upon the mysteries of the Bible, its apparent simplicity and want of method and design, together with other of the many difficulties which beset it, arising out of the ever varying conditions (the “sundry times and divers manners”) of the complex and multiform human medium through which GOD has been pleased to speak to man; we should ever remember that the very same *class* of difficulties clustered round the Form of the Divine Redeemer Himself when tabernacling on earth.

As Mr. Burgon truly reminds us, (p. cl.) The Written WORD stands out amongst books, as the Incarnate WORD stood out amongst men. The one mystery explains the other.

Thus the very moral qualifications which were necessary to prepare men to recognize under the veil of flesh the true Divinity of the One, are still needed to enable them to perceive the Divinity of the other. The mysterious majesty and glory of each are concealed from the “wise and prudent,” and revealed to “babes.” Intellectual subtlety, critical and scientific sagacity are just as worthless to aid or engender faith in the one as in the other. So [517] little, in fact, are they courted by either, that they are rather defied and set at nought. A lowly, teachable, inquiring, loving, confiding spirit—this is all that is needed; to this the wisdom and knowledge of GOD will ever unlock their treasures. Mysteries are revealed to the meek, and *only* to the meek. “The hungry are filled with good things, the rich sent empty away.” He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.”

The Written and the Incarnate WORD are alike “despised and rejected of men.” The world is equally offended at GOD manifesting Himself to man in the lowly Carpenter of Nazareth, and GOD speaking to man, and teaching him, in the homely, human, historical details of the Bible. But the world shall be constrained to own its folly one day.

“As He whom the Evangelist saw riding in the Heavenly pomp on high, was the same who rode into Jerusalem;—in humiliation here, in glory there—here veiled, there in brightness unveiled;”—so may we “regard that Sacred Volume which the poor cottager knows as the Word of GOD, as placed under the same dispensation, as veiled here, reserved for *Revelation* hereafter” “In this world (to conclude with the words of the thoughtful writer¹ already quoted)

“We are using sounds which mean more than we know. In our Churches we are in the highest sense singing the songs of Sion, of the future and Heavenly Sion. If Saints in Heaven shall sing (as we are told they shall) the Song of Moses, then the Song of Moses is already a Song of Heaven: only, *there* we shall know its meaning, or more of it than now we do. And the use which I make of the reflection is, to suggest the frame of mind in which we should approach the consideration of the Sacred Page, such a frame of mind as that no future revelations of the import of that page shall have power to reproach us as having dishonoured it by our interpretations here, and having betrayed an inadequate feeling of what Inspiration was.”

¹ Rev. C.P. Eden, quoted by Mr. Burgon.

The Ecclesiastic and Theologian Vol. 24 (Joseph Masters: London, 1862)

[107] **BISHOP COLENZO'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.**

S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: newly translated from a missionary point of view. By the Right Rev. J. W. Colenso, D.D., Bishop of Natal. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co.

This book has caused us no little surprise and regret. We would fain speak of its Right Reverend author with the respectful regard which his high office, his devoted missionary labours, his great and varied endowments, his large-hearted Christian sympathies would appear to warrant. But when a Bishop, in defiance of the solemn obligations under which he is laid, to guard with jealousy, and transmit in all its integrity the sacred Deposit of the Faith entrusted to him, and to drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to GOD'S Word and the dogmatic teaching of that Church whose commission he bears—sets himself forward as a champion of heresy, as a propagator of novel opinions in palpable variance with the Faith of entire Christendom;—then, the very antecedents which should have won for him and his words respect, become the most powerful reasons why his unsound and dangerous sentiments should be exposed and condemned.

Error is not the less error, or to be less earnestly rejected, because gently insinuated into the Church by one in the garb of an "Angel of light." The great heresiarchs of ancient as well as of modern times have been not unfrequently men of high intellect, of winning address, and exemplary life. The instruments of the Enemy of souls are ever selected with consummate skill.

Now, we are far from unconscious of the excellencies of much of the volume before us. We have read portions of it with unqualified satisfaction. We have found ourselves interested, instructed, encouraged. And yet it is not the less our deliberate conviction that the work, as a whole, is so incurably infected with error as to call for the most decided and earnest reprobation.

The Bishop is ever and anon employing language of the most unexceptionable orthodoxy, and yet the while, attaching to it a meaning so absolutely heretical, that there is often the greatest difficulty in disentangling the truth from the error of his statements, and discovering how far he is teaching in conformity, and how far in direct antagonism with the analogy of the Faith.

He tells us in his Preface that he has devoted "many years of close study" to the Epistle which he now undertakes to expound. We find from an incidental notice in a letter of one of his fellow-voyagers in the *Jane Morice* from Birkenhead to Port Natal, that [108] during his original passage to the scene of his present missionary labours, the same Epistle was specially occupying the Bishop's mind:—

"We had always prayers on board, morning and evening. They consisted of a selection from the Daily Service. The Psalms were always chanted; and the Bishop gave us an exposition of some part of Scripture. For the last month he was going regularly through S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and had advanced as far as to the eighth chapter."—*Colon. Ch. Chron.* Vol. ix. p. 214.

Many are the indications throughout the volume of an original and thoughtful mind, as well as of a tender and loving heart, and, where the Bishop's doctrinal aberrations do not lead him quite astray as to the meaning of the Apostle, of a clear insight into the argument of the Epistle, and an accurate and scholarlike mastery of the text. The commentary, however, possesses but little of the critical character. It seeks rather to develop the general scope and object of the Epistle, together with the practical lessons thence deducible; the

leading aim of the writer apparently being to elicit therefrom material for furnishing answers to certain of the momentous questions respecting GOD's dealings with the heathen world, which his missionary experiences have from time to time forced upon him.

As a specimen of the earnest practical character of much of this melancholy book, we may cite the following, on the text, "I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me."—

"To the true Christian these words of S. Paul are abundantly intelligible. He finds it to be the law—i.e. the rule under which his life in this world must be passed—that, when he would do good, evil will be present to him, suggested to him, or tempting him. The more devout, and earnest, and heavenly-minded a man has grown by GOD's grace, the more conscious he will be of this . . . that sin is there, close at hand in his fleshly nature. But this is the difference between his present state and his former state. *Then*, when he was stirred to the very depths within him by GOD's living Word coming home to his heart—when he thus became convinced of sin, of the of the perfect holiness of GOD's Blessed Law, and his inability to keep it—he fell into hopelessness and despair, he fell back under the power of Sin and Death. *Now* he understands the whole. He knows that there is this Sin, 'which is in him,' that evil *will* be present to him, whenever he would be doing good. . . . The knowledge he has of this fact will help to keep him humble and dependent, 'watching unto prayer:' but it will not *now* drive him to despair; for his spirit is till alive unto GOD, quickened with CHRIST's Life. He knows this, even when fallen for a season, and lying oppressed under the accursed slavery of Sin. He knows this, so long as he feels within [109] him one single pulse, as it were, of spiritual life, one movement of the heart towards GOD and the remembrance of His Holiness, one thought of repentance, one desire to return and throw himself at the feet of his Heavenly FATHER, and say, 'FATHER, I have sinned, I am no more worthy to be called Thy child.' And knowing that his spirit is thus still alive with CHRIST's Life, he knows also that he can have it quickened with the abundance of that Life. He is able now to shake off the whole of Sin. He confesses his fault to that Gracious FATHER who has known it all along, and receives again that 'righteousness,' that 'forgiveness of his unrighteousness,' that 'covering of his sin,' which that FATHER's Love has freely provided for him in His Own dear SON. And then, with the sense of that renewal of the gift of righteousness, there comes a flow of fresh life into his whole spiritual being. Being 'justified by faith,' by simple trust in GOD's Fatherly forgiving Mercy and restoring Love, he has peace again with GOD. He is able now to look up again to Heaven, with tearful eyes, indeed, and with a broken heart, but yet with joy beaming through his tears, and a living hope possessing his bosom. And so he springs forward again to his work by his Master's side, singing cheerfully the song of faith, and saying, 'Sin shall not lord it over me: for I am not under the law, but under Grace.'—Pp. 173—5.

Now to speak of a Bishop who can write in such a strain as this (and this is no mere isolated extract) as one who is setting himself to subvert the doctrine of CHRIST, and to publish "another Gospel" in the place of that which our LORD and His Apostles preached, is to make a very painful and serious charge. It will be our ungrateful duty to endeavour to substantiate it.

The cardinal error which appears to us to pervade the Bishop's entire theology, is his defective appreciation and representation of the revealed character of Almighty GOD. The GOD he depicts, is a GOD all amiable, and loving, and kind; but not the GOD of Holy Scripture. There is no adequate recognition of the awful holiness and justice of GOD, or of the consequent heinousness and malignity of sin, necessitating the Death of Incarnate GOD. The doctrine of the Atonement and Propitiatory Sacrifice of CHRIST is ignored. The doctrine of Justification explained away to mean nothing. The doctrine of the Sacraments utterly and most perversely misrepresented. And the doctrine of the eternal duration of future punishments absolutely and elaborately denied. Let us briefly examine the Bishop's teaching on these several heads. We will begin with the subject of Justification.

Now by Justification, we presume, is meant GOD's solemn acquittal and acceptance of man: a Gift, which having its root in the love of the FATHER, and being purchased by the meritorious Propitiation of the SON, is conveyed by the effectuating agency of the HOLY GHOST, through instrumental means of His own appointment; imparted (namely) as to its initial grant in the Holy Sacrament of Baptism; renewed after falls from grace, on true repent[110]ance, through the "Ministry of Reconciliation;" received on man's part by faith; maintained and preserved by holiness of life, in other words, by "faith working in love."¹

Thus, the grant of Justification, according to Scripture and the teaching of the Church, belongs, not to *all*, but to those only whom GOD effectually *calls*: "Whom He *called*, them He also *justified*." And *faith*, on man's part is the essential requisite to the reception of GOD's gift of Justification.

But in defiance of the plain teaching of Holy Scripture, the Bishop insists again and again that the grant of "Righteousness," or "Justification" has been given to *all* men absolutely, independently of any instrument of conveyance on GOD's part independently of any instrument of reception on man's part; i.e., whether the recipients be baptized or not, whether they be possessed of faith or not.

To show that we are not misrepresenting him, we will quote his own words. S. Paul, he says, tells us that,

"Under the new covenant of the grace of GOD in the Gospel, *all human beings* were declared to be accepted before GOD . . . they were *all* pronounced to be righteous." (P. 71.) Again; "As he has said that all sin, and all come short of GOD's glory, so now he must mean that *all* are made righteous, justified freely by the grace of GOD. The gift of Righteousness . . . was intended for all mankind, and *was* actually, in fact, *bestowed* upon them, though they knew it not." (P. 85) . Again; "The *whole human race* are partakers of the gift of Life in the Gospel." (P. 87.) Again; speaking of the justification of Abraham and the fathers, he says, "Justified indeed they were by the grace of GOD, as *all others of the human race*, even *before they were born*." P. 96.) Again; "Thus the good tidings of great joy for all mankind, is this Divine announcement, that the *whole human race* are looked upon and dealt with as *righteous creatures* in CHRIST their Head. The curse of their sinful nature *has been taken away* altogether—has been taken away from the first, though the fact is only now fully declared in the Gospel—by GOD's Fatherly Love As by their natural birth from Adam, they fell at once as fallen sinful creatures under a 'condemnation of death,' so by the free grace of GOD in CHRIST JESUS, they shall receive *every one* of them a 'justification of life.'" (P. 129.) "The curse has been utterly taken away, and *all* we of the *human race*, being recognized as one with our Head, are counted to be righteous as He is righteous, are made the righteousness of GOD in Him. We shall die, indeed, still, but we shall not die under a curse. We shall die as righteous creatures, creatures freed from the curse, however needing to be chastised." (P. 134.) "What our Head did, that we share in, *we* [not the regenerate race, the members of His mystical Body, the New Creation, but] the *whole brotherhood of man*, the *whole race*." (P. 135.)

[111]

But we need not multiply examples, for this heresy as to the universal justification and regeneration of the whole race meets us at every turn. What then, we ask, according to the above system of theology, is the province of faith? What is the object of Holy Baptism? Have our LORD's words, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized*, shall be saved," any meaning, or not ?

¹ We must not, of course, be understood for a moment to call in question the supplementary truths involved in the inspired statements, that "The Gentiles who have not the Law, are a law unto themselves;" and that, "In every nation, he that feareth GOD and worketh righteousness is accepted with Him."

First, let us seek to discover the place and office of *faith* in the Bishop's scheme. Is it, in any sense, what Holy Scripture represents it, an instrumental cause of our justification, a necessary requisite to its reception? By no means. We are not "justified by faith," or by anything else, for we are equally justified whether we have faith, or whether we have it not. Faith is merely that faculty in ourselves which makes us *conscious* of the grant of justification, which we, in common with the whole family of man possess, quite irrespectively of our faith. Faith simply reveals to us the existence of a privilege which belongs to us as human beings.

Hence when S. Paul tells us that GOD's gift of Righteousness is "unto and upon all that *believe*," the Bishop expounds the passage by the assurance that "the fact that those who *believe* receive the gift of Righteousness, cannot be understood to exclude from it all those who do *not believe*;" (p. 86,) and finally interprets the Apostle's words to declare that "the justification here spoken of extends to *all*, to those who have never heard the Name of CHRIST, and who cannot have exercised a living faith in CHRIST, as well as to Christians," (p. 85.)

Those then who believe in CHRIST, and those who disbelieve in Him, are equally justified; the only difference being, that the former are conscious of their justification, the latter know it not. And hence, he insists that the fact of the allowed justification of those who have faith—that is, (so he explains it) "who have the blessedness of *knowing* that they are justified, and so have peace with GOD"—this fact "does not exclude the case of the mass of humankind who are not yet privileged to know this, but of whom the Apostle distinctly speaks as sharers in the gift of Righteousness" (p. 93). In like manner, he tells us that when S. Paul specially speaks of GOD justifying any—as Abraham, or others—(words which certainly appear, at first sight, to *imply* that He does not justify all)—the Apostle merely "means that He justifies them in their own *consciences*, brings home to them consciously the gift of Righteousness."

And just as *faith* is, in no sense, an instrumental means on man's part for receiving any gift from GOD, but merely a faculty which makes us conscious of a gift of which we have been always partakers; so is *Baptism*, in no sense, an instrumental means on GOD's part for communicating justification, or in fact any gift whatever, but simply a naked sign and outward expression of certain gifts otherwise received.

[112]

The Bishop shall speak for himself.

Thus he informs us, at p. 9, that when our LORD said to Nicodemus, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of GOD,"

"Nicodemus in point of fact *was* already thus born again, thus born from above; he had already received the second spiritual birth, though he did not know it."

In like manner he tells us that "circumcision, *like Baptism*, was a *sign*, appointed by GOD to declare and ratify the grace *already given*," (p. 101.) Again, ch. vi. ver. 3, "Know ye not that we who were baptized into CHRIST JESUS were baptized into His Death"—"that is," (adds the Bishop,) "were *declared* by our Baptism to have a share in His Death;" "were declared" (as he elsewhere adds) "to have a share in the Death unto sin, as our portion in our LORD'S own Life and Death, *which was given us from the first moment of our existence*, and of which our Baptism therefore is *not* the *efficient agent*, but the *declaration*, the sign and the seal," (p. 148.)

And again, on the passage, "If any man have not the Spirit of CHRIST, he is none of His," he tells us that

“the words are not intended to imply that some men have the Spirit of CHRIST, and some not, any more than the words addressed to Nicodemus, ‘Except a man be born again,’ &c., implied that some men were thus born again and others not, or that *he* needed at some future time to be born again, and was not so born already.”—P. 186.

And once again:

“Christians are said to be ‘adopted,’ declared, avouched to be the children of GOD, receiving each for himself personally in Baptism a formal *outward sign* of ratification of that adoption which they *shared already, independently of the sign, with the whole race.*”—P. 220.

And thus we have the Church’s doctrine of Holy Baptism flatly and categorically denied. We are instructed that the Church teaches falsely, when she tells us that, “being by nature children of wrath,” are *by Baptism* made children of grace:” seeing that, so far from our being therein *made* members of CHRIST, children of GOD, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, we were all this from the very moment of our birth. Hence, the only admissible interpretation of our LORD’s words, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” is, *Every one* shall be saved, whether he believeth and is baptized, or not. Hence too, we find S. Paul’s words, “By one Spirit we are *baptized* into one Body,” presumptuously contradicted; inasmuch as we are taught that we belong to this ‘one Body’ *before* we are ‘baptized into it.’ We are members of the mystical Body of CHRIST by nature; our union with Him dates from the first moment of our existence. “We have already died [113] to sin, and risen again unto righteousness in our very birth-hour, by that mysterious union with CHRIST our Head, which we *all* enjoy *as members of the great human family,*” (p. 136). “What He our Head did, that, we the members of His Body share in—we, the *whole brotherhood of man, we, the whole race* whose nature He took upon Him.”

We have thus then seen that, according to the system of theology wherewith the infant Church in Natal is being perverted from the Faith of CHRIST, GOD’s gift of Righteousness is utterly independent, not only of faith, but also of baptism; and that the grants of justification and regeneration belong alike to every child of Adam.

But as we have glanced at the Bishop’s teaching on one of the great Sacraments, let us examine, for a moment, his teaching on the other also.

“The Body and Blood of CHRIST,” he tells us, “are represented to us by the Elements.” “These things are set forth to us in that Holy Sacrament as the source of all Life—as the great Provision of our FATHER’S Love—of which every man everywhere is partaker, though he may not know what the WORD made Flesh has done for the children of men. But in the Holy Supper, these things are brought vividly before us by the outward and visible sign of them: and we are called more closely and deeply to consider them, and to feed upon them in our hearts by faith.”—P. 137.

And the heresy of a merely shadowy, pictorial Eucharist is repeated and expanded in a sermon on the Holy Eucharist, on the text, S. John vi. 51, printed at the close of the present volume, preached, we grieve to say, before the Bishop’s candidates for Ordination: the general teaching of which we shall best exhibit by an extract or two.

“The Holy Eucharist,” he tells us,

“is a *sign* and pledge to us of that eating and drinking of CHRIST’s Body and Blood . . . which is carried on within us by every act of true faith which we exercise upon the Life and Death of our risen LORD, as *really, and truly, and in the very same kind of way,* as when we meet together at His command, and eat the Bread and drink the Wine in remembrance of Him. Beware then, brethren, of attaching a superstitious meaning to the Holy Sacrament, and fancying that our LORD is present to us more really, when we eat and drink at His Holy Table, than He is when we are privileged to have communion with Him *at any other time, and in any other manner*—as

if, by partaking of the consecrated Bread and Wine, we are made, in some mysterious way, more truly partakers of CHRIST's Body and Blood, than we are by *any other act off living faith.*"—P. 301.

And again:

"As I do not feel, so would I not speak lightly of the dignity of that Holy Feast, [!] to which our LORD invites us. . . . Yet still, as I have said before, so say I now again, the bread which we then break, the [114] cup which we then bless . . . are *visible signs* to us of that communication with Him which is daily supporting our spirit's life . . . The food which is then supplied us . . . is the *same* as that which we may trust to receive at *all times*, according to our need when diligently treading the path of Christian duty. . . . Yes, brethren, our LORD is always present with us—as *really* and *truly* present—and in the *very same kind of way*, in the midst of our every-day duties, as when on some High Festival we gather together round His Board and keep the Feast at his command."—P. 301, 2.

"Let this be the use we make of the Holy Eucharist"—to approach It—"not in the hope of realising in some ineffable, extraordinary way, the Presence of our LORD, as *we do not at other times*. But let us come to it, as the appointed means for *keeping us in mind* of that far more awful but withal cheering mystery of the Real Presence of our LORD with us *at all times.*" P. 305.

And *this* is the miserable heresy with which the poor candidates for Orders are poisoned at the very moment of their entering upon their sacred ministerial functions. The solemn teaching of our LORD and His Apostles, and of the whole Catholic Church of Christ in all climes and all ages, defiantly set at nought, to make room for a theory of yesterday, the solitary recommendation of which is that it approves itself to the individual mind of the Bishop of Natal. We commend this case to the serious attention of all supporters of the Propagation Society, and to all who have the interests of our Colonial Church at heart. But we must proceed.

After what has been written above, it will cause our readers no surprise that this false teacher absolutely denies the doctrine of our LORD's Atonement and Propitiatory Death. It concerns him not, again, that he has the "Holy Church throughout all the world" against him, and that his teaching is in palpable antagonism with the formularies of that branch of the Church through which he has received his commission, and in whose name he presumes to put forth his private fancies. If the Church holds not with him, so much the worse for the Church.

"Once for all," he writes,

"let it be stated distinctly, that there is not a single passage in the whole of the New Testament which supports the dogma of modern theology that our LORD died for our sins, in the sense of dying *instead* of us, dying *in our place*, or dying so as to bear the *punishment* or *penalty* of our sins."—P. 115.

Now in reply to this twofold misrepresentation which denies (1) that our LORD died instead of us; and (2) that He died to bear the punishment due for our sins; we have simply to ask

(1) What is the meaning of our LORD's own words '[Greek]' (S. Matt. xx. 28;¹ S. Mark x. 45²)? Here we have the very preposition [Greek], on the non-use of which the Bishop

¹ φ 'Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

² φ 'For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'

appears to rest the [115] whole of his argument, emphatically employed by our LORD Himself, as expressive of the vicarious character of His precious Death. And with regard to the Bishop's further assertion that the preposition [Greek], which is ordinarily employed in reference to the bearing of our LORD's death upon ourselves, is "*never* in any single instance" used in the sense of "in our stead," or to convey the idea of substitution, we have but to ask how he translates the clause in the Epistle to Philemon, [Greek] (v.13)¹ where [Greek] must inevitably have this meaning? And any careful examination of the passages in the New Testament where it occurs, will convince a candid and unprejudiced inquirer how very frequently this its secondary sense must necessarily be included in and united with its more strict and primary meaning of "on behalf of," or "for the advantage of."²

And (2) with respect to the additional misrepresentation of the Bishop that there is no single passage of the New Testament which supports the modern (?) dogma that our LORD died "so as to bear the punishment or penalty of our sins;" we should like to hear his exposition of such passages as the following: "CHRIST was once *offered* to *bear the sins* of many" (Heb. ix. 28); "He His Own Self bare our sins in His Own Body on the tree" (1 S. Pet. ii. 24); "CHRIST suffered for sins ([Greek]—the expression peculiarly appropriated to the "sin-offerings" and offerings of expiation) the just for the unjust" (1 S. Pet. iii. 18); "CHRIST hath appeared to put away sins by the sacrifice of Himself" (Heb. ix. 26): for "the LORD hath *laid on Him the iniquities* of us all." As in like manner, we read that "CHRIST *gave Himself* for our sins;" that "He tasted death for every man;" that "we were redeemed with the precious Blood of CHRIST as of a Lamb without blemish;" that He "our Passover was *sacrificed* for us;" that He is the "LAMB of GOD that taketh away the sins of the world;" that He is the "Propitiation for our sins," &c. But we need not proceed: for if language of this character is not intended to convey to us the idea that our LORD's sufferings were the consequence of our *sins*, and that the punishment which He, as the Great Sin-bearer endured was that which *our* iniquities had merited; that in the words of Isaiah, "His wounds" were the consequence of "our sins," "His bruises" of "our iniquities," and that "the chastisement" which was "laid upon Him," "whereby our peace was effected," was that which was due to ourselves—then it is vain to look for meaning from language of the most plain and unambiguous kind.

For what purpose then, we ask, *did* our Blessed Lord die? What [116] awful necessity was there that the Blood of GOD Incarnate should be spilt? He died, answers the Bishop, because He was a *Man*. That is all. "He paid that debt, which, if He really came to be a true member of the race, a true brother man, He was bound, as any one of us, to pay." Death, it is true, has, in the case of ourselves, some connection with sin. But in His case, death has no connection with "sin," or with any idea of "a curse," in regard either to Himself or others. Because His sinful brethren must die, therefore it pleased Him, though without sin, to pass through their experience.

"If He came to be made like unto His brethren, it was needful that He should die. And death, though to us the consequence of sin, has *no necessary connection with sin*. . . To Him death was, *what it is to us* now, the painful passage for a human being out of this life to another, *without any shadow of the curse to darken it*."—P. 133.

¹ φ 'Whom I would have retained with me, that in thy stead he might have ministered unto me in the bonds of the gospel'

² See a notable example in 2 Cor. v. 14; where S. Paul reminds us that "One died for all" ([Greek], not only, "on behalf of," but "*instead of* all"), and that "therefore *all died*" ([Greek]). His Death was a vicarious and representative one: it was the Death of *all* in One. The forfeit life of humanity was paid in Him. Cf. also 1 Tim. ii. 6, where S. Paul combines [Greek] and [Greek].

We have only indignantly to ask, Does Holy Scripture, or does it not, emphatically state that our adorable LORD “was made *sin* ([Greek]) for us;” not merely “a sin offering,” but SIN in the abstract—the great Representative of *Sin*? (2 Cor. v. 21.) And does it not further tell us that, as such, He became “a curse ([Greek]) for us;” that is, not merely accursed, but Himself a very CURSE? (Gal. iii.13.) Insomuch that He, the all Holy, all Blessed One, “bearing our sins in His own Body,” laden with the “iniquities of us all,” suffering as the great antitypical Sin-offering “without the camp,” became for us the very impersonation of the *Curse* and *Sin*; and mankind, summed up in Him, sinful and accursed, paid through Him the penalty, and endured the curse which was its due, and thus was liberated from the curse: the curse being overcome by a Curse, sin by Sin, and death by Death.

And yet we are to be taught by one of our “Fathers in GOD” that our LORD’s Death had no more significance than that of any other child of Adam—had no connection with “sin” or with “the curse” but was merely “the painful passage for a human being out of this life to another!” May GOD have mercy on a Church whose Chief Pastor so miserably perverts the doctrine of CHRIST!

We have said that the Bishop’s Commentary often exhibits an accurate mastery of the original text. But this, only in cases where the Apostle’s statements do not conflict with his private theories. In such instances the Bishop manifests a capability of obscuring and perverting the meaning of S. Paul, truly marvellous.

A notable example occurs in the celebrated passage, Rom. iii. 21—26; in which the Apostle, after speaking of “the Righteousness of GOD”—a righteousness which, though appertaining to GOD only, is yet, through the Propitiatory Redemption of CHRIST, imputed and imparted to all believers—proceeds to show how that this propitiation has vindicated and manifested GOD’s *justice*, both [117] in His pratermission of past sins, and in His remission of present sins. GOD’S [Greek], or passing by of sins in former times, and his plenary forgiveness of them now, are both seen, in the light of the Cross, to be compatible with the most strict righteousness. In the former case justice was not dormant; it was only suspended. The Mystery is now cleared up. Mercy and Truth have met: Righteousness and Peace have embraced. Forgiveness is proclaimed; but, forgiveness *through Propitiation*. Justice is tremendously vindicated, and yet the sinner is released.

Thus there has been an [Greek] of GOD’S Righteousness. And this [Greek] which the Apostle declares to have been *necessary*, “on account of GOD having in His forbearance passed by the sins of former times” ([Greek])—and necessary also to explain the fact of GOD being able to “justify,” without compromise of His “justice”—was none other than “GOD setting forth His SON to be a Propitiation by (the shedding of) His Blood.”

To go through the Bishop’s obscure and elaborate exposition of this passage, which extends over twelve pages (pp. 82—95,) is beside our purpose—first, because our space does not admit of it; and secondly, because we are quite unable to see the drift of it. We only notice the warning he gives to his readers. He admonishes them that the words “that GOD might be just, and yet the justifier,” &c.,

“are often explained to mean that GOD does not lightly treat sin: but, if He reconciles to Himself our fallen race, it is only by sending His dear SON to suffer in our stead. Thus, it is said, He vindicates His ways, and is able to be just, and yet the justifier of him that believes in JESUS.”—P. 94.

But this interpretation he entirely rejects. “This,” he says, “is *not at all* the Apostle’s meaning.” The expression “GOD is just” here merely signifies that He is “righteous” or “faithful in respect of His promises made of old to the Jewish race.” And the particular respect wherein this justice or faithfulness needed vindication was, that whereas the

promise was only made to “Abraham and his seed,” it really included every child of man. True, the Apostle *says* that the promise appertains to “those who *believe*; but he *means* that it belongs to all men *absolutely*, whether they believe or not. We repeat, however, that we are unable to follow the thread of this obscure exposition. We therefore simply add the Bishop’s rendering of the verses and pass on.

“But now, apart from law, the righteousness of GOD has been manifested, being witnessed of by the Law and the Prophets: I mean the righteousness of GOD through faith in JESUS CHRIST, unto all and upon all them that believe. For there is no distinction. For all sin, [118] and come short of the glory of GOD, being made righteous freely through His grace, through the redemption which is in CHRIST JESUS; Whom GOD hath set forth, a propitiation through faith in His Blood, unto the showing forth of His righteousness, with a view to the remission of bygone sins during the forbearance of GOD,—for the showing forth of His righteousness in the present season, to the effect of His being righteous, and making righteous him who is of the faith of JESUS.”

We note with pain that, in chap. ix. ver. 3, the Bishop rejects the interpretation adopted by the unanimous voice of the ancient Church, acquiesced in by well-nigh the entire bulk of orthodox and trustworthy commentators of modern times, and apparently necessitated by the arrangement of the words, and the rules of grammar, which refers the clause [Greek], to *Christ*, of whom the Apostle is speaking in the immediate context; and regards them as an isolated and independent doxology addressed to GOD the FATHER. His professed reasons for this uncatholic interpretation are most unsatisfactory, and may be found ably refuted by anticipation in Alford’s or Wordsworth’s note. We notice this with the greater regret, as in another important passage he deliberately rejects the Orthodox for the Arian interpretation. Having occasion to refer to the words “I and My FATHER are One,” he appends the following unworthy comment:—

“Our LORD was not then speaking *at all* of His substantial unity with the FATHER, but *only* of His unity of Will and Word.” [As though this mysterious declaration did not necessarily embrace *both* of these two great truths; His unity of Will and Word being but the outcoming and manifestation of His Substantial unity with the FATHER]. “The expression sounded to the Jews as if He were taking higher ground than any mere man might take. . . . And yet in truth He *did not*, and *did not intend to do so* by these words, but *only* to express that His Mind was wholly one with the Mind of His Eternal FATHER, Who had sanctified Him and sent Him into the world.”—P. 17.

Now far be it from us to lay a charge of Arianism against the Bishop, on the ground of these his heretical interpretations: such a charge would be eminently unjust. We merely adduce them as showing how untrustworthy and dangerous an expositor he is, and how entirely unfit to be the theological instructor of others.

His contempt for the teaching of the Church seems to be unbounded. Nay, and if his language be weighed, we think it will appear that he has just as little real reverence for the Holy Scriptures also—whensoever, that is, they do not express his own private opinions. True, he does not infrequently declare his mind on this important subject: but his incidental remarks are too significant to be passed by wholly without notice.

[119]

Thus, in allusion to S. Paul’s assertion that Death came into the world as a consequence of sin, he takes occasion to notice the indications of death in the lower creation anterior to the time of Adam, (a matter, by the way, wholly irrelevant: the mystery being the death of a being created in the image of GOD,) and thus patronisingly speaks of the Apostle:—

“It is possible that S. Paul entertained this notion himself, of all death having come into the world by sin. For we have no reason to expect that scientific knowledge of any kind, beyond that of the people of his age, in a Scripture writer. It is not in this way, by securing an historian,

a prophet, an Evangelist, or Apostle from all errors of detail in matters either of science or of *fact (!)*, that the power of the Divine Spirit is exhibited in Scripture.” . . . “In all such matters,” he proceeds to add, “the books of the Holy Scriptures must be tested by the ordinary rules which critical sagacity would apply to *any other (!) human* compositions. So it is quite possible S. Paul may have entertained the erroneous notion so common among the best Christians within the memory of the present generation.”—P. 122.

Again, he thus speaks of S. Paul’s argument at the beginning of Rom. vii., “The wife is bound by the law to her husband,” &c.

“The Apostle’s meaning is sufficiently plain; but there is here a *little confusion* in the statement of his argument. He has changed inadvertently the line of thought which he was pursuing in the first verse.”—P. 160.

So, with regard to the quotation, Rom. xv. 3, “The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell upon Me:”—

“S. Paul,” he tells us,

“quotes it in his usual way, merely as illustrating the self-sacrificing, sympathising spirit of our LORD’s life, without recalling distinctly to his mind to whom the pronoun ‘Thee’ pointed.”—P. 278.

“It is worth remembering,” he elsewhere adds, “that so long an Epistle as that to the Romans could not have been written at one sitting, and probably required several. This will account for S. Paul not taking up the thread of the argument, in some places, exactly as he left it.”—P. 291.

It is needless to observe that in passages of this character, all idea of an objective Inspiration—of the Inspiring Spirit being the real Author of the Sacred Books, and the inspired penmen but the human agents through whose co-operative instrumentality the Divine Word, historical, didactic, doctrinal, prophetic, was translated into human language, and communicated to the Church—is virtually denied; and the human writers regarded as the real *authors* of those Books which the Church has ever held to be the written Word of GOD.

[120]

But, in truth, neither the voice of the Church, nor the voice of the Bible are to this writer any decisive authority. The only authority which he will acknowledge is the inward light—the light of his own fallen, fallible conscience and intellect.

“By that light within us,” he writes, “the acts of the Church, the proceedings and decisions of her Fathers and councils, *the writings of Prophets and Apostles*, the *words recorded to have been uttered by our Blessed Lord Himself (!)* must be tried. . . . To the man himself there is but *one* lawgiver. He that sitteth upon the Throne has set His own Law to be the Law of Life within the heart of every man. Whatever contradicts that Law, whether it be the word of man, or *the dictum of the Church*, or the supposed *teaching of Holy Scripture*, cannot, *ought not*, to be a Law for him. . . . No seeming authority of the Church, or Scripture, *ought* to persuade a man to believe *anything* which contradicts that moral Law, that sense of righteousness and purity, and truth and love, which GOD’S own finger has written on his heart,”—Pp. 209, 210.

These last extravagantly misleading and mischievous words occur in a treatise on the Doctrine of Eternal Punishment, parenthetically introduced into the Commentary, in which the Bishop sets himself elaborately to explain away the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Universal Church on that momentous subject. (Pp. 195—219.)

We have no space to follow the Bishop in his discussion of this theme. We feel bound, however, to say that he writes with the utmost seriousness and tenderness; and that in his denunciations of the unchristian exaggerations of those who wish to condemn the entire heathen world to everlasting perdition, we heartily agree with him. Where he contents

himself again with urging, with Mr. Archer Gurney and others, the apparent necessity of some state of corrective punishment hereafter for those justified ones who yet require to be beaten with “few stripes,” and the possibility that such are aided by the prayers of the faithful on earth—here, from much of his reasoning we can find no cause to dissent. But when we find ourselves called upon to reject the teaching of the whole Catholic Church from the very first, and the plain, stern, unambiguous utterance of Holy Scripture; here, we start back, and reject the seductive tones of the deceiver.

There is nothing new in the Bishop’s objections against the doctrine of the everlasting duration of the punishment of the lost. We are told that “Eternal” does not mean “endless.” No. But who dare affirm that endless duration is not *one element* in the wide-embracing meaning of that mysterious word? Does not S. Paul in one place assume the necessary existence of that element in the word, by bringing it out into special notice? [Greek] (2 Cor. iv. 18.)

“If the *Life* be eternal (says S. Chrysostom, speaking in special [121] reference to endless *perpetuity*), the punishment is likewise eternal.” (Hom. xxv. in Ep. ad Rom.)

And S. Augustine:

“Si *utrumque* ‘æternum;’ profecto, aut *utrumque cum fine diuturnum*, aut *utrumque sine fine perpetuum* debet intelligi. Paria enim relata sunt; hinc ‘supplicium æternum,’ inde ‘vita æterna.’ Dicere autem in hoc uno eodemque sensu ‘vita æterna’ sine fine erit, ‘supplicium æternum’ finem habebit, multum absurdum est. Unde quia ‘vita æterna’ Sanctorum *sine fine* erit, ‘supplicium’ quoque ‘æternum’ quibus erit, *finem* procul dubio *non habebit.*” (De civ. Dei, xxi. 3.)

Now, we may argue as we will: we may *wish* as we will; we cannot evade the terrible force of these plain simple declarations of Holy Writ. To say that, in such words as these—“Good had it been for that man if he had not been born;” or, “their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched,” (S. Mark ix. 43-48), where our LORD asserts five times consecutively, with terrible emphasis, the unquenchable nature of the fire reserved for the lost; or, “they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever”—to say that, in these and kindred denunciations of Holy Writ, we are *meant* to discern one single ray of comfort, or to gather from them any thought of a possible termination to that dreadful woe to which they introduce us, appears to us a mere reckless sporting with sacred mysteries, a presumptuous intrusion into things not seen, a wanton trifling with the souls of those, to alarm whom these appalling disclosures were made by the Loving Spirit of GOD.

But no, teaches the Bishop of Natal, the doctrine of endless punishment *cannot* be true, *whatever* be the teaching of the Church, or of the Apostles, or of our LORD Himself, because it contradicts that higher Law and Instinct within us. As though we, poor, feeble creatures, with spiritual perceptions darkened, with our moral sense impaired, had any faculties wherewith to test the claims of an Infinite Holiness, or to measure the heinousness or deserts of wilful unrepented sin.

But herein lies the cardinal error of the Bishop’s theology—his inadequate appreciation of the guilt of *Sin*. He measures it by his own faulty notions of its malignity, and not by the awful standards of the Cross. All his false theories have their origin in this—his taking a human not a Divine estimate of sin; his false theories respecting Justification, Atonement, the means of Grace, and Eternal Judgment.

Read our LORD’s burning words of terror at the close of the 9th Chapter of S. Mark; and then note the easy way in which the Bishop speaks of death and judgment, even in the case of the *wilfully* impenitent.

“It is the Devil,” he writes,

the Slanderer, the Accuser of GOD and [122] the Brethren, who teaches us to connect the idea of a curse with death.” And he takes care to assure us that he is not speaking only of those who are in CHRIST, for whom death hath lost its sting; but that, even those

“who have been *consciously* keeping back the truth in unrighteousness *all their lives*, and have died *hardened and impenitent* . . . even to *such* as these, death itself has no curse attached to it. It is but the gate through which their LORD and Master calls them to Him, that He may pass the righteous sentence of His Love upon them—that is, that He who knows exactly what they are, in consequence of what they have done, may appoint for them that lot, that degree of *purifying chastisement* which they need.” P. 147.

We have thus furnished our readers with a few samples of the teaching with which the nascent Church in South Africa is being poisoned and corrupted in its infancy. We can only utter our most solemn and emphatic protest against such miserable perversions of the doctrine of CHRIST. If every individual Bishop is to be permitted to invent a private system of theology for himself, to accept just as much of the Catholic Faith as commends itself to his own intellect, and to reject the rest, what is to become of the Sacred Deposit which the Church is commissioned to preserve, and hand down whole and entire?

We are convinced that this is not a case to be trifled with, and that, if there is a vestige of discipline remaining in the Anglican Communion, (and if not, she has forfeited one of the claims to be a part of the Catholic Church of CHRIST,) this heretical Bishop must be called upon to give an account of his teaching, to retract his errors, or to be degraded from his office.

If a Bishop is at liberty, by a licentious exercise of private opinion, to throw to the winds the solemn teaching of that Holy Catholic Church, of which he is the divinely appointed representative, and to promulgate his own visionary fancies in its place, what are to become of the souls of the sheep committed to his charge?

Bishop Colenso is destitute of that which is the very first essential in a Christian Bishop—reverence for the authority of the Church. The consequence will be, that we must either have the Church of Natal in open mutiny—the faithful Priests (as GOD give them grace to do!) boldly repudiating the heresies of their Bishop; or see a promising branch of the LORD’s Vine pine and sicken and wither, from the deadly canker of false doctrine.
