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ADVERTISEMENT.

Readers of the following pages who are acquainted with the works of the late Dr. Lee, on Prophecy, will recognise his views, and sometimes his language. Where the author differs from him, on questions connected with this subject, this will be pointed out, and the reasons given. It may as well be stated also here, that the Professor appears to have been more indebted to Calvin than he seemed to be aware of; while the valuable labours of Grotius and Hammond—indeed, it may be added, of Bossuet and Calmet—immensely helped towards the same conclusion.

Upon any of the more modern hypotheses, "The more sure word of Prophecy," 2 Pet. i. 19, becomes the most uncertain of all; as is abundantly evident by a mere glance at the several works on what is called "Unfulfilled Prophecy," with which the press teems, usque ad nauseam.
The Testimony of Jesus
is
THE SPIRIT OF PROPHECY.
&c., &c.

The numerous and contradictory interpretations of prophecy which have been put forth since the days of Mr. Joseph Mede, cannot tend to make "the more sure word of prophecy" much respected, generally studied, or attended to.

I. I have no hesitation in saying, that any scheme of prophetic interpretation which exceeds, in its details, the limit assigned to prophecy, by the inspired writers, viz., THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CHRISTIANITY,¹ palpably contradicts the whole revelation of God's will.

II. Here let it be observed, that DOCTRINAL statements concerning the future, must not be confounded with pure prophecies of events and their times. Such statements, I mean, as, "The

¹ This is no petitio principii, as the following pages will abundantly show.
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wicked shall be turned into hell," Ps. ix. 17; "We shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ," Rom. xiv. 10; "The hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear His voice, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," John v. 28, 29; and numberless similar passages. That such statements are identical in character with pure prophecy, such as that, for instance, contained in the visions of Daniel, I suppose no one—even in these days—will assert.

Having said thus much, I proceed to prove that—

III. All pure prophecy was fulfilled in the advent of Christ, and the establishment of Christianity. If this be true, we may fling to the winds the reveries of our modern prophets respecting Turkey and Russia, the restoration of the Jews, and a personal reign of Christ on earth—either præ or post millennial; while the millennium itself, in any shape or form, otherwise than has been manifested, must be consigned "to the moles and to the bats," as a Jewish figment, and a Christian Utopia.² Let us see, then. The one great

² The system of the Millenarians owes its origin to the Jews. They expected to reign a thousand years with the Messiah on earth, as appears from the 4th book of Esdras,
promise made in prophecy was, THAT CHRIST SHOULD COME, AND THAT HIS KINGDOM SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED. The most precise of the Prophets is Daniel. In him we find visions, containing much of the history of this world; but all

and from the works of some of their most famous Rabbins, as Maimonides and Manasse-Ben-Israel. But he that gave the greatest credit to that opinion was Papias, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist, and companion of St. Polycarp. He pretended to have received the Millenarian Doctrine from the Apostles and their disciples. Upon this assertion it was adopted by St. Irenæus, St. Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Victorinus, Lactantius, and several others; while it was, on the other hand, impugned by others of the first ages of the Church. And certainly what Eusebius remarks of the character of Papias ought to be sufficient to discredit his authority. He was a man of a very moderate understanding, who, for want of understanding what he heard from the Apostles, took literally what was said in a mystical sense. St. Dionysius, of Alexandria, in the 3rd century, expressly refuted one Nepos, who had composed a book in defence of the Millenarian opinion. And Caius, a priest of the Church of Rome, in the 2nd century, calls it a fable invented by Corinthus. Origen also rejects it in several places of his works. In fine, we may conclude with a very able man (M. Du Pin, Dissert. sur les Millénaires) who has fully discussed the question, that the Millenarian sentiment is contrary to the gospel, to the doctrine of St. Paul, and is not at all founded in the Apocalypse. Calmet in Apoc. xx.

Whitby shows that the early orthodox Church did not hold the Millennium.—Treatise on Millen. appended to his Commentary. The heterodox did, with the Jews; and the Mohammedans do to this day.

It will be shown below that the New Testament refers to nothing whatever beyond this, in its citations from the Old Testament, or elsewhere.
terminating in the establishment of Messiah's Kingdom. This is the object, and the end of them all. Nor is it of any now future kingdom of Christ that the prophet speaks. The terms of the prophecy forbid this.

The first vision occurs in the 2nd chapter, and is as follows:

"Thou, O King, sawest, and, behold, a great image. This image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee, and the form thereof was terrible. This image's head was of fine gold, his breast and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and broke them in pieces. Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors; and the wind carried them away,

Here Calvin observes,—"Hoc extra controversiam; quicunque prædicti sunt sano judicio, et candidè etiam cupiunt mentem Prophetarum exponere, intelligunt de quatuor Monarchiis, in quibus alia aliam sequuta est. * * * Verum est quod dixi, nempe interpretex qui et mediocre judicio pollent et candore, omnes ad unum hunc locum exponere de monarchia Babylonia, Persica, Macedonica, et Romana." In this he is quite right, no other such four empires having ever existed, and, from the nature of the case, never can.
and no place was found for them; and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." Verses 31—35, inclusive. Such was Nebuchadnezzar's dream. Had we no explanation of this given to us except the previous assurance that "God made known to the king what should be in the latter days," ver. 28, Holy Scripture at once decides that it had reference solely to the Apostolic period, and that immediately succeeding,—the term "latter days" being the Scriptural designation of that period. But we have an infallible commentary on the dream of the Babylonian monarch.

5 Some references here may be useful. Gen. xlix. 1. The events predicted in verse 10 decide the period. Num. xxiv. 14. The 17th ver. here decides the period; also the 24th ver. compared with Dan. xi. 30. See also Deut. iv. 30. Here the 26th ver. decides the period. Isaiah ii. 2, which indisputably refers to the period of calling the Gentiles. Micah. iv. 1, &c., where the whole context to the end of the 5th chapter, compared with St. Luke i. 72, 73, makes it abundantly evident that the period of our Lord's Advent, the preservation of the godly remnant among the Jews, and the calling of the Gentiles, is intended.

The New Testament application of the term is also unquestionable. St. Peter uses it to denote the period in which he lived—Acts ii, 17. See also 2 Peter iii. 2, 3; Jude 18; 2 Tim. iii. 1; and 1 Tim. iv. 1—which was foretold by our Lord, St. Matt. xxiv. 10, seq., and fulfilled in the Eneratites and Gnostics generally, within the same period. See also Heb. i. 2; 1 John ii. 18; and sec. XVIII, infra.

The most eloquent and able writer of Mr. Mede's school,
Daniel proceeds, in the 38th and following verses,—"Thou art this head of gold. And after of the present day—in a private correspondence with the author of these pages—objects here,—"You confine the period of the latter days unwarrantably. They may extend to our, and still subsequent times."

To this it is irrefutably answered—

1. That it has been shown below when this period should and did come to its end,—i. e., at the close of Daniel's 70th week.

2. That the kingdom (Christ's) having No End can have no latter days, or last times.—See Dr. Lee on the Covenants.

Estius, a very able Roman Catholic Commentator, endeavours to distinguish between ὑστέρος and ἐσχάτος, and says, "Novissima tempora designant ultimam mundi ætatem ab Apostolis usque ad diem judicii." In 1 Tim. iv. 1., A little farther on, however, he says, "Alii putant novissimum et posterior ab Apostolo non distinguui." And, indeed, it is there proved that this is the fact. In the scholia of Rosenmüller, on the same place, I find the following: "Ἐν ὑστέρος καιροῖς, ε. i. non est temporibus ultimis, sed secuturis, quo sensu ἐν χρόνῳ ὑστέρῳ, Plato in Phædone dixit." In the scholia on 1 John ii. 18, he says, "Varie explicatur hæo verba;" and, it must be confessed, that the "various explications" there given should guard us against departing from the scriptural use of the phrase. Heb. i. 2, is so very plain and limiting, his note is explicit. He refers to Jer. xxiii. 20, to show the sense of the term, and adds, "Judaei per tempora posteriora καιρ' ἐξοχήν intelligunt tempora Messiae." Dr. Adam Clarke, as all commentators who do not see the Scriptural limit to the latter times, says, on 1 Tim. iv. 1, "This does not necessarily imply the last ages of the world, but any times consequent to those in which the Church then lived." Yet he writes, on Hebrews i. 2, as follows: "The Gospel dispensation
thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass; which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth king-called the last days and last times, because not to be followed by any other dispensation; or the conclusion of the Jewish church and state, now at their termination." The term, "world to come," was also used by the Jews in nearly the same sense. Thus it appears to have been used by our Lord, Matt. xii. 32, and also by St. Paul, Heb. ii. 5. Henry observes on 1 Tim. iv. 1, "This should come in the latter times during the Christian dispensation, for those are called the latter days." He does not say where it is evident that any period, "during the Christian dispensation," is thus called. Mr. Mede tells us, and after him Matthew Poole's continuers, and Bishop Newton, "that the latter times must needs be the latter part of the last times." Barnes, too, has it, "Under the last dispensation, during which the affairs of the world would close." But such distinctions have been made to suit a theory. The latter or last days, in prophecy, nowhere refer to a period subsequent to the establishment of Christianity. Dr. Todd tells us, Discourses, p. 279, that they "denote the times which are immediately to precede the coming of our Lord." Lord Mandeville, as quoted by Dr. O'Sullivan in his work on the Apostacy, says, in his Horæ Hebraicae, ix. 13, that "the term 'last days' may signify with equal propriety, 'the last days of a dispensation;' or, 'the dispensation of the last days.'" As if Christianity, a dispensation which is to have No End, could have any last days. Dr. Gill says, "The latter days of the Apostolic age, which John, the last of the Apostles, lived to see," and then runs off to latter days not referred to in prophecy.

The truth is, it is a rule laid down by the Jewish Doctors that, wherever this phrase, in the latter times, occurs, it refers to the times of Messiah; and, wherever we meet with it in the New Testament, it clearly refers to the last
dom shall be strong as iron, forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes part of potters' clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided, but there shall be in it the

times of the Jewish State, synchronizing with the erection of an universal Christian Church in its place, as we learn from other scriptures. Whitby's note B. on 1 Tim. iv. 1, will amply repay a careful perusal.

How? I answer by intestine divisions, which we know it was. To bolster up the prevailing prophetic theories, a division of the Roman empire into ten kingdoms has been invented. The prophet says nothing whatever about this division—if indeed it ever took place. See pp. 16, 17, infra. Calvin on the place observes,—"Hœc est causa cur propheta dicit monarchiam illum partim fuisse compositam ex ferro, partim autem ex terra fictili. Nam scimus ipsos intestinis discordiis semper laborasse. Et propheta hæc in parte non alia interpretatione indiget, quia dicit hanc mixtum ferri et lutii, quæ male coherent, esse signum dissiddii, quòd scilicet nunquam inter se consenserint." Dr. Lee observes, —"Daniel's words are, —as the toes were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom (i. e., when divided) shall be partly strong and partly weak, (i. e., shall consist of two irreconcilable parts, or rather sorts of characters.) He adds, which should confirm this, they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. Daniel does not say 'the Kingdom,' but the 'Kingdom,' under this division, 'shall be partly strong and partly weak.' Nor does he say that the toes shall not cleave one to another, but that the iron and clay of which both feet and toes were composed, shall not. It is true that he virtually makes these toes to
strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest
the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes
of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so
the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly
broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed
with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with
the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one
with another, even as iron is not mixed with clay.

And in the days of these kings shall the God
of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never
be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be
left to other people, but it shall break in
pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it
shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest
that the stone was cut out of the mountain, without
hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the
brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great

represent ten kings; but then it is not necessary, nor
indeed intimated by the terms used—but quite the contrary
—that the division mentioned should be extended to them
severally."—Intro. to Inquiry, ¶ lxvii. Barnes has the fol-
lowing:—The kingdom shall be divided. That is, divided
as the iron and clay were, in the image. It does not neces-
sarily mean that there would be an open rupture—an actual
separation into two parts; but that there would be such
a diversity in the internal constitution that, while there
would be the element of great power, there would also be
an element of weakness." It is very true that the com-
mentators have misunderstood this; but they have mis-
understood many other matters quite as much.
God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter,⁷ and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure."

Here one thing is undeniably certain, viz., *That four successive universal empires were represented by the image.* The first was that then in being, that is, the Babylonian, as the prophet interprets: "Thou art this head of gold." If there be any truth in the representation, to this succeeded another, which history tells us was the Medo-Persian. To this a third succeeded, which we know was the Grecian. And this was succeeded by the Roman Empire. Of all this there can be no doubt: it is plain matter of fact, as recorded in history. But we read that this *whole image⁸* was to disappear as the chaff of the summer threshing-floors, and that a *fifth empire* was *immediately* to

⁷ *i.e.*, as before, "in the latter days."

⁸ Dr. Todd, although much opposed to the indisputable meaning of Daniel's visions, well observes on this:—"If the legs and feet of the image be still standing,"—*i.e.* as Mr. Faber and his school will have it,—"the stone has not yet smitten them; for nothing can be plainer than that the stone was not seen to become a mountain until after the ruins of the image had been swept away, like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors." This remark compared with ss. X. XI. below, sufficiently disposes of the whole of Mr. Faber's remarkable production—*The Revival of the French Emperorship Anticipated from the Necessity of Prophecy.*
succeed, represented by the "stone that became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." What this can refer to—being the immediate successor to the heathen Roman Empire, in which the former empires were absorbed—unless to the establishment of Christianity, I cannot conceive. It is undeniable, too, that nothing subsequent to this is contained in the prophecy. It ends with the erection of the fifth kingdom, as the immediate successor to the preceding four, although of a different character, being "set up by the God of heaven." To refer this, then, as Bishop Newton and others, who follow Mede, to an imaginary, now future, reign of Christ on earth, is absurd, being directly at variance with the periods of the prophet.

But are there no other prophecies referring to a more distant period of the world? I can find none. The one aim and end of prophetic Scripture is, testimony to Jesus—"Testimony to Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." Rev. xix. 10.⁹

IV. In the 7th chap. of Dan. we read, (3—7,) that "four great beasts came up from the sea,

⁹ Μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.—The testimony of, or concerning, Jesus. The genitive case here being used passively, as indeed even Mr. Mede acknowledges and proves. In fact the whole context will not admit of any other interpretation. For similar instances of the use of the genitive, see 2 Tim. i. 8; Rev. i. 9, xii. 17; and Acts x. 43, for the Scriptural establishment of the principle.
diverse one from another." These necessarily correspond with the four universal monarchies represented by the image in the last vision, because these also were succeeded by a fifth universal empire, which was to last for ever, even as our blessed Saviour expressed it, when commencing the erection of it, "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it." Matt. xvi. 18. Hence it was to be—"the kingdom under the whole heaven, given to the saints of the Most High." See verses 14, 18, 22, 27. Did Christianity, I ask, ever take the place of heathenism throughout the world? If it did not, the prophecy was falsified; if it did, "this is the end of the matter," as the 28th verse tells us, and we have nothing else to look for under its everlasting rule.

But it may be objected that before this consummation, the 24th verse speaks of a division of the Roman Empire into ten kingdoms.—See note 6, above. But I find nothing of the sort predicted. Christianity was established, and had succeeded the heathen Roman empire long before the alleged division took place. I say alleged, for it remains to be proved that it ever took place. If we put the different lists of ten kingdoms, supplied by commentators, together, ten times ten may as easily be made out. So says Mr. Burgh, in his Lectures on the Revelation, and truly;
while Mr. Tyso, in his *Elucidation of the Prophecies*, gives a table of twenty-nine distinct lists, showing that sixty-five different kingdoms and persons have been suggested. See Mr. Myer's valuable Dissertations appended to the Calvin edition of the Commentaries on Daniel, *Diss. ii*. Dr. Lee satisfactorily interprets the ten horns as being "a series of kings, each series constituting an universal empire for the time being, and the little horn as the latter rule of the Roman power."—*Inquiry*, pp. 153—168.

V. The 8th chapter also deserves our most serious attention. There we read of "a ram and a he-goat," visionally, as we are informed, pointing out to us "the kings of Medea and Persia, and the king of Grecia." We then read of "four kingdoms standing out of this nation," which must historically refer to the times immediately subsequent to Alexander the Great.¹⁰ Then we have, as before, the

¹⁰ For a masterly exposure of Dr. Todd's extraordinary quibbling on this quadripartite division of Alexander's empire, see the Preface and Introduction to Dr. Lee's *Inquiry*, §§ lxxxi—vii.

Mr. Davison well observes, in his *Warburton Discourses*, p. 486,—"The opinion which would make the reign of Alexander's successors a kingdom distinct from his, and thereby the fourth, can be reckoned nothing better than a mere mistake, inconsistent with the principles of the vision." (i. e., in Dan. chap. ii.) "and with the plainest
Roman power succeeding, (verses 23, 24,) which should "destroy the mighty and the holy people," that is, persecute Christians to death, as we know it did. But, as in the former visions, it "should be broken without hand," ver. 25, to give place to the coming kingdom of the Son of Man, which shall have no end.

VI. In each of these chapters, viz., the 7th and 8th, we read of a "little horn," or power, which many have been inconsiderate enough to make symbolical, the one of the Pope, the other of the Turkish and Mohammedan power. Any one, however, carefully examining the contexts will readily perceive that the little horn in each chapter is identical, and can refer to no other power than the Roman, under Vespasian and Titus, for "by it the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place

ideas of the history of kingdoms. The dynasty, the name, the foundation, and title, were all Grecian, derived from the first conqueror to the whole clan and body of his successors. The language of Appian, in the Proem to his History, when he speaks of the partition of this empire, is obviously the only correct and natural language that can be used on the subject:—"ης γε, καὶ διαλυθείσης εἰς πολλάς σατραπείαις, ἐπιπλείστον ἔξελαμε τὰ μέρη. The kingdoms of the succession were members of the same empire, not a new fabric." It is to be lamented that so able a writer should, after this, immediately involve himself in Medish difficulties.
of God's sanctuary was cast down," (viii. 11,) which we know was effected in the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple. (Sec. XIV., pp. 56–58 infra.)

VII. The 9th chapter of our prophet will lead us, inevitably, to the same conclusion. In the 24th verse, we read: "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."\(^{11}\)

To enter here, at any length, into a discussion of the chronological difficulties experienced by interpreters of this place, is beside my purpose or my desire. Suffice it to say, that the seventy weeks refer to no chronological period whatever. This is sufficiently manifest from the fact, that the time of the destruction of Jerusalem was not

---

\(^{11}\) The original has no definite article here, but "vision and prophecy," i.e., generally, and as the circumstances of this case evidently require. The term up is superfluous.—See Dr. Lee in loc.

\(^{12}\) The term, "Holy of Holies," here used is never applied in the Hebrew Scriptures to any person whatsoever, but only to the most sacred place of the Tabernacle or Temple. What we have before us, therefore, must of necessity, apply to the Consecration of the Church of the New Covenant.—Ib.
known — or revealed, as it may mean — to any one. Matt. xxiv. 36. It might, easily, have been calculated, if Daniel's weeks were intended to be reckoned after the common fashion. How, then, is the prophecy to be understood? I answer:

The seventy weeks I take to represent a certain indefinite period (seventy, seven, &c., being occasionally so used) to be determined by the events here foretold, and which the language of inspiration should also certify. The usual mode of reckoning this period, taking these weeks to be weeks of years, and the whole amounting to 490 years, —which is very ancient,—must, after a moment's consideration, appear utterly inapplicable to this place. For, first, from the issuing of the edict of Cyrus to return and rebuild Jerusalem, could not be much less than 550 years before any of these events took place. But suppose it could be made to quadrat e either with the birth or the death of Christ, how is it to be made to take in the fall of the Temple and the other circumstances still to take place, before the end should come? Besides, the cutting off of the Messiah is to happen in the 69th week, after which another week is to come, and to complete the seventy: and it is in this last week that the covenant is to be made with the many; in other words, the apostles and their immediate successors are to receive the kingdom, (Luke xii. 32), and the desolations determined are to be poured out. What ingenuity, I ask, can make such 490 years cover this whole period? The view which makes 69 weeks take in the whole 490 years, which it also ascribes to the whole 70, must be too inconsistent to bear a moment's consideration; as must its attendant one, which carries this last week onwards to other far remote and distant times and events.—See Prelim. Dissert. to the Theophanta of Eusebius. The last observation may be illustrated by the following from Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on the
The number 70 was evidently suggested by the second verse—as the twelve tribes suggested the number 12 in Rev. vii. 5, seq.—and it will presently appear that all is plain and intelligible, when viewed as a prophecy whose items were to be explained by their fulfilment, and not by any arithmetical calculation whatever. But, first, it must be observed, that one great event of the weeks was to be, the sealing of vision and prophecy,—or prophet. (There is no definite article in the original; it means prophecy generally.) Is there anything in this prophecy extending to a period beyond the “bringing in of everlasting righteousness,” by the advent of our blessed Lord, and the “anointing the Most Holy,” or the consecration and establishment of His Church or Kingdom? Within this period, then, according to Daniel, all prophecy was to be closed, precisely as in the seventh chapter, the erection of Christianity was “the end of the matter,” verse 28. Dr. Lee writes thus concerning this period: “And after—that is, within, as in Luke chap. ii. 21, &c.—sixty-nine weeks, that is, of the seventy, the Messiah was to be cut

Prophecies of Daniel:—“If divers of the ancients,” he says, “applied the half week to the times of Antichrist, why may not we apply the seventy weeks to the time when Antichrist shall be destroyed by the brightness of Christ’s coming?” I answer, because the coming of Christ, spoken of by the Prophets, has already taken place.
off, that is, within the sixty-ninth week. But we know when this event took place, and therefore we also know when this 69th week should be in existence. We are next told, that then should the people of the prince who should come, destroy both the city and the sanctuary. We now know, therefore, that some time after the cutting off of the Messiah, Jerusalem should fall. But we know when this took place, and, therefore, that it happened within Daniel's seventieth week, as we also do that this event cannot take place again. We have now done with the sixty-ninth week.

"The prophet next tells us that, during one week, that is, of necessity, the seventieth, the events of the sixty-ninth being disposed of, the covenant—that is, the new covenant—should be confirmed with the many, that is, in bringing in of everlasting righteousness, &c. This contains, therefore, the great event, generally to be completed within the last week; and here, among other things, the sealing of vision and prophecy, that is, its full and complete fulfilment, should take place.

"Again, in the midst of this last week, he should cause sacrifice and oblation to cease, which must have been effected in the fall of the temple. But we know when the temple fell, and, therefore, we also know when the midst of the week had arrived.
"We are further told that to the end, i.e. of this 70th week, "desolations were determined," &c., i.e. from the fall of Jerusalem to the end of this last week, or whole period. We also read elsewhere, chap. viii. 12, that when the little horn should have taken away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of God's sanctuary, he should make war and prevail against the saints of the Most High: and that he should continue to do this for a time, times, and half a time, chap. xii. 7. We read also, chap. ix. 27, that, at the time of the end or consummation, that which had been determined should be poured upon the desolator, i.e. of Jerusalem, or which is the same thing, upon the power symbolized by the little horn, for he also was to cast down the place of God's sanctuary.

"We know now, therefore, sufficiently well, that from the fall of Jerusalem to the end of Daniel's 70th week, the Saints of God should be persecuted, and that, at this end, their Persecutor, the heathen Roman power which desolated Jerusalem, should fall. We know in like manner from other Scriptures that, when this power; so symbolized should fall, then

14 Which must, of necessity, signify the time that should elapse from the fall of Jerusalem to the end of Daniel's 70th week; for, according to the prediction announcing this, the temple and the city were to fall in the midst of this week.—Lee's Inquiry, p. 100.
should the empire under the whole heaven be given to the Son of Man; in other words, that then should the Christian Church, or New Covenant, be fully and finally established, and all the promises made to the fathers fulfilled.”

VIII. The 11th chapter contains much bearing upon the same subject; the times or period of this are sufficiently decided by the “at that time” of the first verse of the 12th chapter,—as we shall presently see,—where also we find in the 7th verse, that “when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people,” i.e., to spread Christianity far and wide, “all these things shall be finished.” Even as our blessed Lord expresses it, St. Matt. xxiv. 14, “This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come,” that is, as the fact proves, not the end of the physical world, but of the Jewish polity, and of heathen rule in its universal prevalence, and of all prophecy, by the establishment of that blessed kingdom of heaven upon earth, which, in the language of prophecy, has no end. Hence it is that our Saviour, standing at the commencement of this period, declares—“these be the days of vengeance.

that *all things* which are written may be *fulfilled.*”
St. Luke xxi. 22.\(^{16}\)

IX. The same truth pervades the whole New Testament. “Search the Scriptures: they are they which testify of me,” says Christ, John v. 39. St. Luke informs us, that “Jesus, beginning at Moses and *all* the prophets, expounded unto them in *all* the Scriptures the things concerning **himself**, Luke xxiv. 27. And if we look at the 44th verse, compared with xxi. 22, we find the Saviour declaring that *then*, i.e., within that period, “*All things* must be fulfilled which were written in the

\(^{16}\) Οτι ἡμέραι εκδικήσεως αὕται εἰσὶ, τον πληρωθήναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα. But has Dan.xii.2, been fulfilled? Whatever be the meaning of the words, that the fact has taken place is sufficiently manifest from comparing Matt. xxiv. 15, 34. Such language is common in Scripture, e.g. Rom. vi. 3—6; Luke ii. 34; where ἀνάστασις is the word used. Besides, Daniel’s people were to be delivered at this period, ver. 1. This must mean the disciples,—See Matt. xxiv. 16, —for the Jews were *not* delivered, but punished. The disciples were delivered. Luke xxi. 18, 20, 21; Acts ii. 21; Mark xiii. 20. The passage, then, may be paraphrased thus:—“Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake,” i.e., in a first resurrection with Christ, Rom. vi. 3—6; Rev. xx. 5; and “some to shame and everlasting contempt;” i.e., awakened to hear, through the preaching of the Gospel, the judgments denounced against *unbelief*, and to feel this in a general overthrow.—See Dr. Lee on the place. Mr. Desprez—from Professor Stewart—understands the “first resurrection” spoken of in the New Testament in a *literal* sense; and refers it to a *past* resurrection of the early Christians. See postscript.
law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me." Our Saviour evidently delivered a discourse of considerable length on this occasion, and having "opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures," verse 45, instead of giving them any chiliastic information, "said unto them, thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His name, among all nations," verses 46, 47. Then in the 49th verse, power to accomplish this was promised to them. But there is not the slightest hint of anything subsequent. St. Peter also, having quoted Moses, adds,—"yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days," Acts iii. 24. What other subsequent days, besides the Apostles', and those immediately succeeding, did they speak of, and where? Again, St. Peter says, "of which salvation the prophets have enquired, and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow: unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us
they did minister the things which are now reported unto you." 1 Pet. i. 10–12. This brings us to the advent of Christ, and the establishment of Christianity, in fulfilment of prophecy; but of anything subsequent to this, the prophets say nothing, if we are to believe their inspired commentary in the New Testament. This, surely, we ought to do, in preference to the reveries of Mr. Mede and his successors, however ingenious these may be.

St. Paul, too, in his Epistles to the Galatians and the Hebrews, shows that Christ was the substance of the whole Jewish dispensation; and, in his defence before Agrippa, he declares that "he said none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come." Acts xxvi. 22. How many "other things," besides what Paul said, do our modern prophets say? But they are more fond of the principle of "developement" than the holy Apostle, who anathematised any addition to the Gospel. (Gal. i. 8.) And again, when he appointed a day for giving public instruction in his lodging, we find him expounding to the many who came to hear him, "the law of Moses, and the prophets, concerning Jesus, and the Kingdom of God,"—Acts xxviii. 23,—that kingdom which was "at hand" when our blessed Lord began his ministry. Matt. iv. 17.
Moreover, during his whole two years' residence in Rome, the matter of his preaching was the same, viz., "the kingdom of God, and the things which concerned the Lord Jesus." Acts xxviii. 30, 31. Accordingly, he tells the Church at Rome, (chap. xvi. 25, 26,) that "the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began, was then made manifest, and by the scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." In connection with this passage the language of St. John, in the 10th chap. of the Revelation, is particularly remarkable. The angel having declared that "time," which clearly means, as the sequel shows, prophetic time, "should be no longer," says, verse 7, "But in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished, as he hath declared to his servants the prophets." Now what was the finishing of the mystery of God as foretold by the prophets? The 15th verse of ch. xi. tells us. "And the seventh angel sounded," as stated in x. 7, "and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms

17 Or, which comes to the same thing, that there would be no delay to the execution of God's purposes. Thus the Apostle uses the verb ἔρχομαι, Heb. x. 37. He that comes will not delay.—See Dr. Hammond on both places; he will amply repay the readers' trouble.
of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign for ever and ever." But did this ever take place? Unquestionably it did, within the very period fixed for it by prophecy. Let us see.

X. Previous to the commencement of our Lord's ministry, John the Baptist had declared that "the kingdom of heaven was at hand." Matt. iii. 2. Christ himself began His preaching with the same assurance, chapter iv. 17, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." But this kingdom was not to be by human might or power only, for "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but spiritual," says the Apostle, 2 Cor. x. 4; just as our Lord had said before him, "If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight; but now is my kingdom not from hence." John xviii. 36. How, then, was His kingdom to be established? "And he said unto them, go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature, . . . and they went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following." Mark xvi. 15—20. This was in accordance with the promise, Matt. xxviii. 20, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

St. Luke gives us some important particulars of our Saviour's address to his Apostles, to whom he
had given the command to evangelize the world. In Acts i. 8, we read, "Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you, and ye shall be witnesses unto me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." Thus we see that the command was given, power to execute it was bestowed, even the Almighty Power of the Holy Ghost. And was all this in vain? Oh, the fearfulness of such a thought! It looks like blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Let us flee it. Let not the fear of the downfall of our modern prophets, with this their foundation, induce us to imagine that Christ hath said, and hath not made it good.  

18 Mr. Grinfield, in his work on Heathen Redemption, says,—"Two thousand years have nearly passed away since the command (Matt. xxviii.19) was given, and at this moment the number of Christians, as compared to those who are unbaptized, is little more than one to five." But this has nothing to do with prophetic announcements. Dr. Todd, however, tells us that "Christianity has not yet reached all the dark habitations of the Heathen."—Discourses on the Prophecies. It is inexplicable how so learned a writer as Dr. Todd evidently is, should have hazarded such an assertion. How differently writes the great and learned Bishop Pearson:—"That all nations were to come in to the Messias, and so the distinction between Jew and Gentile to cease at His coming, is the most universal description in all the prophecies. Psalms ii. 8, lxxii. 11; Isa. ii. 2, xi. 10; Mal. i. 11. That all nations did thus come in to the doctrine preached by Jesus cannot be denied. Many were the nations, innumerable the people, which received the
has been made good, abundantly. The universal testimony of the Bible, and of all history, shows, that the whole inhabited earth heard the glad tidings of salvation; that the fishermen of Galilee fulfilled their mission, and committed to faithful men the duty of carrying on the glorious work, who entrusted this to others also, until “the earth was filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea,” according to prophecy, Hab. ii. 14,—until “kings became the nursing fathers, and queens the nursing mothers of the Church,” Isa. xlix. 23,—until “the stone cut out without hands smote the image of heathen universal rule, and became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth;” so that “from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same Christ’s name was great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense was offered unto his name, and a gospel in the Apostles’ days; and in not many years after, notwithstanding millions were cut off in their bloody persecutions, yet did their numbers equalize half the Roman Empire.—Plin. Ep. ad Traj., Tertul. ad Scapul. c. 3, Apolog. c. 36. And little above two ages after the death of the last apostle, the emperors of the world gave in their names to Christ, and submitted their sceptres to His laws, that the Gentiles might come to His light, and Kings to the brightness of His rising, Isaiah lx. 3; that “Kings might become the nursing fathers, and Queens the nursing mothers of the Church.” Isaiah xlix. 23; Expos. of the Creed, art. ii.
pure offering," Mal. i. 11. Or as Justin Martyr tells us, "Prayers were offered up in the name of Jesus, not only throughout the limits of the Roman Empire, but far beyond, in regions where the arms of Rome had never reached." — Dial. cum Tryph. While the well-known letter of Pliny to the Emperor Trajan, irrefutably demonstrates, that, at the commencement of the second century, Heathenism was tottering to its fall in the provinces of Asia. The vast importance of this subject, however, demands a little more particularity. To an ignorance of, or an unwillingness to acknowledge, the fulfilment of our Saviour's command,—accompanied, be it remembered, with an Almighty Power for its execution,—we must attribute most of the dreams of our modern (so-called) interpreters of prophecy.

What, then, saith the scripture? for we will begin with this divine testimony. St. Paul assures us that "the faith of the Roman Church was approvingly spoken of throughout the whole world." Rom. i. 8. And if it be contended, that the "world" means the Roman Empire, it will not be disputed here, although well it might—as we shall presently see that it was by no means confined to this, long before the final establishment of Christianity, in the reign of Constantine, when it became a temporal successor also to the last of the four great powers.
Again, St. Paul tell us, in the 10th chapter, verse 18, that the Apostles' "sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." This is a particularly remarkable testimony, for the Apostle is specially treating of the truths of salvation communicated through missionary labours. Pass we on to chap. xvi. In verse 19, we read that the "obedience of the Roman Christians was gone abroad unto all men," and, in verses 25 and 26, that "the mystery of godliness was then made manifest, and made known to all nations." Again, in Colos. i. 23, we read—that "the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven." Surely this is as comprehensive, as our Lord's command, or as the prophecy, Hab. ii. 14. And lest it might be supposed—as Cardinal Bellarmine, and his school of our prophetic Protestants will have it—that it was only then virtually declared, the Apostle assures us, in the 6th verse, that the gospel had not only "come into all the world" but that "it had brought forth fruit." We find the same Apostle telling the Thessalonians—who were admirably adapted for missionaries, from their mercantile convenience—that "in every place their faith to God-ward was spread abroad," (i. 8.) Nor did this evangelization

19 See above, sec. page IX. 28.

20 Bellarm. de Rom. Pont. lib. iii. c. 4.
of the whole inhabited earth cease to go on to perfection, until the seventh Angel proclaimed, as in the Revelation, "The kingdoms of this world, are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ." Rev. xi. 15.\footnote{It may be objected here that all the world was not then known. I answer: all the world was not then inhabited. I am not inclined to advocate St. Anthony's preaching to the fishes; but the Gospel was preached, and was received, as universally as it was predicted that it should be.}

I suppose this must be deemed sufficient from the Bible. Let us now turn to other history.

XI. Here I cannot deny myself the pleasure of inserting an eloquent passage, from one of our modern prophets, I mean Mr. Elliott, in his "Horæ Apocalyptica."

"Scarce a city was there, scarce a town, in the vast Roman Empire, but a little church was gathered out of it, with its leaven spreading through the villages adjacent, and that would yet more spread. Thus as the aged Apostle looked round from the rocky summit of Patmos, and followed in his eye, in the distant horizon, the indented coast of Asia, and then of Thrace and Greece, with its bays, and gulfs, and islands, and far-stretching capes, and promontories, it would rest ever and anon on the sites of Christians Churches:—first those of procon-
sular Asia, where Timothy had fallen asleep, and Antipas recently suffered martyrdom, and Polycarp yet remained a faithful witness for Christ, churches under St. John's own immediate superintendence,—then the Macedonian and Greek churches of Philippi, and Thessalonica, and Berea, and Athens, and Corinth:—while yet farther, beyond where the eye might penetrate, he knew that, alike in the distant west on the one side, and the south and east on the other, Christian churches existed there, too, instinct with spiritual life, in holy fellowship; from whence the daily incense arose of prayer, and praise, and adoration, to the same Saviour God, and to the Lamb. There was the church fondly gathered round the ruins\(^22\) of Jerusalem, over which the aged Simeon still survived to preside; there was the church at Antioch, with its faithful bishop Ignatius. There were the churches of Alexandria, and Egypt, founded by St. Mark—of Cyprus, where Barnabas had laboured, and of Crete, set in order by Titus. Yet once more, there was the noble church of Rome—where Paul and Peter sealed their testimony

\(^22\) It is much more than Mr. Elliott, or any one else can prove, that the book of the Revelation was written after the destruction of Jerusalem. If the testimony of Arethas be admitted, who is much misrepresented, however, by Lücke, it was written before St. John's Gospel. This, I think, could be easily proved, did my subject require it.
with their blood. There the leaven had penetrated, not only into Cæsar's household, but into the hearts of some of the nearest kindred of Cæsar. Whilst the aged Clement, whose name was in the book of life, was faithfully presiding as its bishop, over the church in that vast city, undeterred by the terrors of the persecution, another Clement, the cousin of the Emperor, had just witnessed for Christ, even unto blood! and his wife Domitilla, with similar constancy of spirit, endured to be transported to the desolate island of Pandateria, for the Christian faith."

This, it will be acknowledged, was a good beginning. But, as time rolled on, the whole inhabited earth acknowledged Christ. His kingdom succeeded heathenism. Thus God changed the whole face of the world. For a while men went on as usual, and dreamed not what was coming; and when they were roused from their fast sleep, the work was done; it was too late for aught else but impotent anger and a hopeless struggle. The kingdom was taken away from them, and given to another people. The ark of God moved upon the face of the waters. It was borne aloft by the Power, greater than human, which had overspread the earth, and it triumphed,

"not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts."—Zech. iv. 6.

24 Newman's *Sermons bearing on Subjects of the Day*, p. 146. This mighty man has since gone—not to "another part of the Lord's vineyard," as Dr. Pusey strangely speaks, but to the heathenish Church of Rome. But his Medish notions concerning the kingdom of Christ could not fail to conduct him to Popery. His theory of development is another form of Medism. He has been overwhelmingly refuted by the late Professor Butler, in his inimitable *Letters on the Development of Christian Doctrine*. Wilberforce's *Five Empires* contains much valuable matter; but I fear that his notions of the character of the fifth will conduct him also to Newman's "holy home."

Since the above was written Mr. Wilberforce has published *An Enquiry into the Principles of Church Authority*. This is clearly the forerunner (as Mr. Newman's *Theory of Development* was in his case) to his joining the Roman schism. It is truly melancholy that such writers should decorate, with their superior style, the ten thousand times refuted pleas in defence of Tridentine figments. Mr. Wilberforce's theory, wherein he differs from the ancient Church, seems to be:—"A primacy is assigned to St. Peter in the Gospels: St. Peter's primacy is recognised in the Acts and the Epistles: The Bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor: and St. Peter's primacy involves the supremacy of the Pope." I cannot help remarking here, that it is a pity that Mr. Wilberforce did not allow Dr. Barrow's treatise to accompany him in his readings of Bellarmine, while I recommend to him the following, with which he seems to be a little acquainted:—"The power of the Roman Pontiff, in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, stood on a different basis from his power in the middle ages. The difference, perhaps, may be summed up by saying, that in the former he was Vicarius Petri, in the
I will now transcribe a few additional historical testimonies. Justin Martyr says—"There exists not a people, whether Greek or Barbarian, or any other race of men, by whatsoever appellation or manners they may be distinguished, however ignorant of arts or agriculture, whether they dwell under tents, or wander about in covered waggons, among whom prayers are not offered up, in the name of a crucified Jesus, to the Father and Creator of all things." This passage from Justin is thought deserving of some particular remarks by Mr. Gibbon, in his History of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire,—indeed, Gibbon was a perfect Medite in some of his conclusions. He calls this statement latter, Vicarius Christi; in the former he had a more or less defined primacy, in the latter he laid claim to a complete supremacy: he was exalted as a monarch above his councillors. A primate is one idea, a monarch another. It seems to be the great tour de force of Roman writers to prove the second by the first."—Allies, p. 231. Professor Hussey's Rise of the Papal Power will benefit Mr. Wilberforce, if he will read it; and if he will take the trouble to study Mr. Faber's 3rd chapter of the first book, and 3rd chapter of the second book of The Difficulties of Romanism, he cannot avoid coming to the crushing conclusion, that neither Scripture nor Primitive Antiquity gives the least countenance to the childish fable, that our Lord appointed Peter the Monarch of His Church, or that the Bishop of Rome is the rightful heir to the alleged Universal Dominant Supremacy of the Holy Apostle.
of Justin—attested, as it is, by all history—"the splendid exaggeration of a devout but careless writer, the measure of whose belief was regulated by that of his wishes." But I should like to know who told Mr. Gibbon this? And I ask, is it likely that Justin, in a controversy with a Jew, in those days, would have asserted thus positively, as a fact, what, if not so, might have been so easily contradicted? But where do we find any contradiction to the statement? It is true that Gibbon adds, that "the Barbarians who afterwards subverted the Roman monarchy were involved in the darkness of Paganism, and that certain countries were not converted until the reign of Constantine,"—as if any one ever believed that all countries which once received the gospel continued to do so, or that Christianity necessarily brought a millennium with it. Or, again, that there is no distinction between the establishment of Christ's kingdom de jure and de facto; or, that the propagation of Christianity was otherwise than gradual, according to the prophecy—"A little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation." Isaiah lx. 22. Or, as Daniel expresses it, "The stone became a mountain, and filled

25 The Apostolic Churches of Asia were threatened with immediate destruction, Rev. ii. 5: "I will come unto thee quickly and remove thy candlestick out of his place, except thou repent."
the whole earth." Moreover, Mr. Gibbon himself,—with all that infidel sneering of which he was so consummate a master,—acknowledges, as a plain matter of fact, that "Christianity had, at this period, extended beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire." Besides, let it be observed, that Justin does not say that there were no people who were

Even he acknowledges that "a twentieth part of the subjects of the empire had enlisted themselves under the banner of the Cross before the conversion of Constantine." vol. ii, p. 371. Tacitus, Ann., lib. xv, informs us that, even in the reign of Nero, the Christians were grown so numerous at Rome as to excite the jealousy of the Government; and in other parts they were in proportion. Even previously to the destruction of Jerusalem, the Gospel was not only preached in the lesser Asia and Greece and Italy, the greatest theatres of action then in the world, but was likewise propagated as far North as Scythia, as far South as Ethiopia, as far East as Parthia and India, and as far West as Spain and Britain.—See Bishop Newton's Dissertations on the Prophecies, and Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on Matt. xxiv. 14. What shall we then say of such writers as Mr. Newman, who tells us, in his Phases of Faith, that "Christians, previous to the age of Constantine, were a small fraction"? He is sufficiently refuted, sec. XI. above. He also says that "Christianity was adopted as a state religion because of the great political power accruing from the organization of the churches," &c. But how was it that such organization as the primitive churches could be so obviously suited to political and military purposes? And, since they were a small fraction of the empire, it is still less obvious how a great political power could suddenly "accerue from their church organization." — See that able work, A Defence of the "Eclipse of Faith." See also note 18, p. 30,
not "converted" in his days; but that there was "no people among whom prayers were not offered up through Christ."

In a note, Mr. Gibbon refers to Irenæus and Tertullian, without giving their words. This defect shall be supplied here,—for they are overwhelmingly conclusive. Irenæus says—"The church was spread far and wide throughout the empire, even to the very ends of the earth." How much farther would Mr. Gibbon and his Medite friends have it extend? Tertullian says, Adv. Gent., "We have filled everything that was yours, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum."

And again, Adv. Jud., "In quem enim alium universæ gentes crediderunt, nisi in Christum qui jam venit. Cui enim et aliae gentes crediderunt, Parthi, Medi," and so on, from Acts ch. ii. He then proceeds: "In quibus omnibus locis Christi nomen qui jam venit, regnat, utpote ante quem omnium civitatum portae sunt apertae et cui nullae sunt clausae. Quid de Rom. dicam, qui de legionum suarum presidiis imperium suum muniunt, nec above. It may be well to add here, that our English infidelity has no claim whatever to originality. In both character and form it is purely a German importation, which, to their intellectual disgrace, has been embraced by such writers as Newman, after it had been scouted from the country which gave it birth.
trans istas gentes porrigere vires regni sui possent. Christi autem regnum et nomen ubique porrigitur, ubique creditur, ab omnibus gentibus supra enumeratis colitur, ubique regnat, ubique adoratur, omnibus ubique tribuitur aequalitur, omnibus rex, omnibus judex, omnibus Deus et Dominus est. Nec dubites credere quod asseveres cum videamus fieri.” It did not suit Mr. Gibbon’s purpose to give this quotation, except by a reference to the work of Tertullian. But what is his general reply to such testimonies? Why, indeed, that “the fathers interpreted facts by prophecy.”

Very well. Then the facts were as extensive as the prophecies. This is what I wish to establish. And even Mr. Mede, who was as slow to believe in the fulfilment of some prophecies as Mr. Gibbon himself, or any of our futurist expositors, acknowledges, in his sermon on Isa. ii. 2, 3, 4, that “such a fulfilment as took place in the days of Constantine, of the prophecies concerning Christianity, when the Christian society became for a while both visible and glorious, would satisfy the terms of the prediction.” We are nowhere told, however, that this state of things should continue; while the Asiatic Churches—which clearly represented all particular churches—are pointedly

27 Rousseau has it, “The prophecy is not occasioned by the event, but the event by the prophecy.” _Hurd’s Introd._ page 124.
warned of the contrary, Rev. ii. iii. In truth, a hatred of Revelation, as in Gibbon, and an indulgence in the puerilities of millennial speculations in others, have prevented otherwise clear-headed men from seeing, that all the requirements of prophecy were fully answered when Christ's kingdom was erected on the ruins of the fourth great universal heathen empire, as the prophets predicted. 28

But the writers quoted above did not live to see the ruin of heathenism, and the complete establishment of Christianity in its place; Eusebius, 29

28 Dr. Todd's arguments against—as it appears to me—the undeniable fact, that the fourth beast describes the heathen Roman Empire are very ably exposed in Mr. Birks'—First Elements of Sacred Prophecy. It was to be expected, of course, that Jewish Commentators would oppose any interpretation establishing the truth of Christianity; hence we find them refusing to acknowledge that the fourth empire means the Roman. This is quite natural; but I do not envy any Christian interpreters, either Præterists or Futurists, who, in opposition to plain matter of fact, as shown above, help to hold the Jews in their delusion.

29 The alleged Arianism, or tendency that way, of Eusebius, cannot at all affect his testimony as a historian. I cannot help, however, expressing my belief here, that there are not the slightest grounds for the charge. I believe Eusebius of Caesarea to be as free from this heresy, as Eusebius of Nicomedia was full of it. It is true that Le Clerc, and after him, and from him, Archdeacon Jortin, laboured hard to establish the contrary. After all that has been written on the matter, I cannot avoid the conclusion of
to whom we are indebted for most of the early ecclesiastical information which we possess, did.

Spanheim, to say the least,—"De cujus non quidem eruditione, sed fide Catholica et constantiâ, iniquius jam olim fuit judicium Hieronymi, et Photii, iniquissimum passim Baronii, æquius illud Usuardi, et Gallicææ Ecclesiae, qui Sanctis adscriptserunt."—Com. Intro. ad Hist. Eccles., N. T., sec. iv, cap. ix. Mosheim, too, who was in every way capable of forming a correct opinion on such questions, says, "Some have represented this learned prelate as a thorough Arian, but without foundation, if by Arian be meant one who embraces the doctrines of Arius, presbyter of Alexandria."—Hist., vol. I., cent. IV., chap. ii, sec. ix. It is true that he had just said, "He is said to have inclined towards" such errors. Of course, this is matter of fact, but what "is said" of him is not true.

After a most searching investigation of this subject, in the Preliminary Dissertation to the Theophanta, Professor Lee says: "We are, I think, bound to conclude that Eusebius was no Arian; and the same reasoning must prove that he was no Semi-Arian; that he did in no degree partake of the error of Origen,* ascribed to him so positively, and so groundlessly, by Photius. To this may be added the testimony of Valesius, a writer of no mean acquirements and judgment, strengthened, as it is, by that of the Western Church generally, and particularly that of Gaul, which canonized Eusebius— with the single exception of Jerome — and confirmed by that of Popes Gelasius and Pelagius. To those, he adds that of Gelasius, Bishop of Casarea, and of Theophilus, of Alexandria; of Socrates, — with whom he should have joined Theodoret, — and of Gelasius, Bishop of Cyzicum. And last of all, though by

* That is, concerning the resurrection. That Origen believed the catholic doctrine of the Trinity, is abundantly proved in Faber's Apostolicity of Trinitarianism. For a masterly exposure of Dr. Priestley's unfair citations from this ancient writer, see Apost. Trin. App. ii, No. 3.
Let us see his testimony on this subject. In his *Life of Constantine*, he compares him with Cyrus and Alexander the Great, showing that he was a better man, and a greater conqueror. His Ecclesiastical History is full on this subject of the evangelization of the world. His *Præparatio Evangelica*, and the *Demonstratio Evangelica*, may be also consulted with immense advantage. I will transcribe a few passages from his work on the *Theophania*, which is not so well known.

In book ii, sec. 76, he says, "Now in our times, every anxiety about the beings just mentioned," viz., the false deities, "has suddenly lost its power, and the things belonging to this ancient disease have been cut off; every city, region, and locality, among the heathen, now remaining in the profoundest peace . . . and are delighting them-

no means least, our own Cave gives the same testimony; whose very valuable *Life* of our author can never be read without great interest and advantage.

It is strange that such a writer as Le Clerc should thus falsely accuse Eusebius. It is more strange that such a writer as Jortin should copy him wholly in his unfounded accusations; but it is not so much to be wondered at that such writers as Joseph Milner—with all his other excellencies—and Dr. Cumming, should persist in repeating the horrid slander, for, in very truth, both Milner and Cumming seem to have taken everything upon trust. The latter, 'tis true, seems to assert the contrary—Preface to Barrow’s *Pope’s Supremacy*;—but a short acquaintance with his publications at once shows this.
selves under one government, in the deepest established order and agreement.” Bk. iii. 3, 2. “The Divine superiority of our Saviour swept away the authority of the many daemons, and many gods; so that the one kingdom of God was preached to all men, Greeks and Barbarians, and to those who resided in the extremities of the earth. The Roman power, too, soon subjugated all others, and quickly brought together such a multitude of nations as soon to take possession of all, even to the extremities of the earth; the teaching of our Saviour having, by the Divine power, already prepared all parties, and established all in a state of equanimity. For at once was the error of evil daemons put out of sight; and at the same time did the enmity and contention of the nations, which had always existed, lose its power. . . . The empire of the Romans was established among men; and at once was the state of the whole race of man changed to that of peace. . . . They became born, as it were, of one common Father; of one mother, too, righteousness and truth. . . . Any desiring to proceed whithersoever he pleased for merchandise, could do this with the greatest facility. . . . The words of ancient prophecy concerning our Saviour were fulfilled, ‘He shall have dominion from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the extremities of the earth.’ And again, ‘In His days shall righteousness spring
forth, and abundance of peace.' And again, 'they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into reaping hooks, and nation shall not lift up the sword against nation, nor shall they learn war.' Again, sec. viii, "Those who were thought to be gods waged war with Him," i. e. Christ, "but He showed His pre-eminence, . . . and day after day there was exultation, and His doctrine took effect throughout the whole world." Again, sec. xx, "Some of the contenders with God did, but a little while ago, rebelliously, forcibly, and with a mighty hand, so raze to the foundation and overthrow His houses of prayer, that the Churches disappeared; . . . but He, while unseen, secretly avenged Himself of them. . . . In a moment did all they who had been thus daring suffer punishment, so that they gave in to Him on whom they had made war, turned their backs in flight, and confessed His Godhead. . . . He, therefore, quickly established throughout the whole earth the signal mark of victory, and adorned it, as from the first, with temples which were pure, and distinguished [set apart] as for the prayers of the whole creation; so that He consecrated holy and dedicated places, in every village, city, place, and even in the deserts of the barbarians, to the one God and King of all." Once more: he quotes Matt. viii. 11, and Luke xiii. 28, 29, and says, "Of these things an open confirmation is afforded
BY THE FACT of all nations having been converted to the God who is over all." Hence, to this day, in all churches of the saints—however unworthy—we profess to "believe in one holy Catholic and apostolic Church." Hence, with St. Ambrose, we sing, "All the earth doth worship Thee, the Father everlasting. Heaven and earth are full of the majesty of Thy glory. The holy Church throughout all the world doth acknowledge Thee." Was not this the adoring acknowledgement, as a fact, of the fulfilment of the prophecy that the earth should be full of the knowledge of the glory of the Lord? and if individuals and nations have since fallen away and proved unfaithful, prophecy nowhere provided for the contrary; while this was but a sequel, in this world's sinful history, to the sad fallings away of former days.—See Rom. i. 28, seq.

XII. We may now see the testimony of the New Testament on our general question. The one great promise made to the fathers, was: THE COMING OF CHRIST, AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF HIS KINGDOM. All the ministrations of the prophets were, in some way, subservient to the fulfilment of this. It is true, that they have expressed themselves differently, but this great event is the burden of all their teaching. This is sufficiently manifest from the New Testament commentaries on the Old. Thus the Virgin
Mary sang, "He hath holpen His servant Israel, in remembrance of His mercy, as he spake to our fathers, Abraham and his seed for ever," Luke i. 54, 55. And Zacharias sang, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people, as He spake by the mouth of His holy prophets, which have been since the world began, to perform the mercy promised, and to remember His holy covenant, to give light to them that sit in darkness," Luke i. 69, seq. And Simeon sang, "Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation, which Thou hast prepared before the face of all people, a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of Thy people Israel," ch. ii. 30–32. To what other promises does the New Testament refer? To none other. All were fulfilled in the advent of Christ, and the establishment of His kingdom. Our blessed Saviour Himself, too, identifies His own, and the immediately succeeding times, with those spoken of by the prophets generally, and by Daniel in particular. Thus, in Luke xxi. 22, He says, "These be the days of vengeance, that all things which are written may be fulfilled," when they should "See the Son of man coming in a cloud, with power and great glory," i. e., to destroy Jerusalem, ruin the heathen Roman empire, and establish His Church, as the Saviour adds, in the 31st verse, "When ye see these things come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at
hand." Then, as if to prevent the possibility of mistake, he declares, "Verily, I say unto you, THIS GENERATION SHALL NOT PASS AWAY TILL ALL BE FULFILLED," that is, be in rapid progress.\textsuperscript{50}

Let us now look at the 24th chap. of St. Matthew. In verse 14 we read, "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come. That is, the same end which, in verse 6, "was not yet," i. e., of Judaism, and of all prophecy; for the end of the physical world did not then come.\textsuperscript{51} Our

\textsuperscript{50} The Greek πᾶντα τὰῦτα γίνεται may be thus rendered —all these things (shall) have been becoming. For γίνομαι means, as everybody knows, to become, rather than to be. The whole verse, literally, will be:—"Verily, I say to you, by no means (shall) have this generation passed, until all these things (shall) have been becoming," i. e., rapidly proceeding onwards in their course.

\textsuperscript{51} "It is of importance to ascertain the meaning of this expression, by which many commentators have understood the end of the world. That τὰῦτα in verse 3 refer to the predictions in verse 2, and the other judgments which our Saviour had recently denounced against the Jews, and that παρεσία (presence) means his coming to execute, or rather his execution of, those judgments, is admitted by all; and it appears equally clear to me that by συντελεία τοῦ άιώνος we are to understand the result of those judgments, in the entire dissolution of the Jewish economy, both religious and civil. For first, the language of the question does not appear applicable to events so far distant from each other as the fall of Jerusalem and the end of the world, but to events that are perfectly synchronous. The disciples ask not for the signs of two independent transactions, but for the sign of two parts
Lord next refers to the prophet Daniel, speaking of "the abomination of desolation standing in the holy place." In the same context Daniel tells us, that "at that time," or period, should be a time of trouble such as never was since there was a nation," chap. xii. 1, and Christ emphatically adds, "no, nor ever shall be," i.e., afterwards. Here the testimony of Josephus is important. "It appears to me," he says, "that the misfortunes of all men from the beginning of the world, if they be compared to these of the Jews, are not so considerable as they were." And Gibbon, in speaking of the

of the same transaction. Secondly, St. Mark has pointed out the real meaning of the expression by substituting for it the sign when all these things are about to be accomplished, xiii. 4, employing the verb συντέλεσθαι in place of the noun συντελεία. Thirdly, our Lord, in his answer, declares that all the predictions in that answer shall be fulfilled before the existing generation had passed away. Of course the συντελεία must have happened" (see note 30,) "in the lapse of a few years. Hence I have rendered it, literally, the expiration of the age, meaning, by these words, the conclusion of the Mosaic dispensation." See New Version of the Gospels, by a Catholic—Dr. Lingard, I believe.

32 Preface to his Wars of the Jews. Mr. Whiston adds, in a note—"That these calamities of the Jews, who were our Saviour's murderers, were to be the greatest that ever had been since the beginning of the world, our Saviour had directly foretold, Matt. xxiv. 21; Mark xiii. 19; Luke xxi. 23, 24; and that they proved to be such, accordingly, Josephus is here a most authentic witness." Mr. Trollope, in his Analecta Theologica, says, "This is a proverbial expression,
period before us, says, that "a moiety of human nature suffered," while it appears evident, from the document on which he founded the unquestionable statement, that, within a few years, two thirds of mankind actually fell. Was there ever anything like this, I ask? No: "nor ever shall be," says our Lord; and "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled," or be in progress, verse 34, for there were to be "the beginnings of sorrows," verse 8, before "the end" came, verse 14. But frequently employed by the sacred writers to express some very uncommon calamity, as in Exod. v. 9, x. 14; Joel ii. 2; Dan. xii. 1; 1 Macc. ix. 27. It is not, therefore, necessary to take the words in their strictest sense: at the same time, in this instance, they were almost literally fulfilled. (See Horne.) The triple negatives ôô ôô are powerfully emphatic. Compare Luke x. 19, Heb. xiii. 5, Rev. xviii. 14. (Whitby, Kuinoel.)" It is evident that Mr. Trollope and his authors might have advanced much more. Two of their references, namely, Joel ii. and Dan. xii., clearly point to the judgments referred to above. The reference to Exod. v. 9, I do not see the point of. 1 Macc. ix. 27, does not appear to contain the triple negatives; nor can I see that the author should be classed among the "sacred writers," —albeit the Homilies also do this. Exod. x. 14, may be literally true. See Dr. Gill, on the place.


34 In verses 6, 7, of this chapter we read,—"Ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars; nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places." When did these events happen? They began within three or four years after our Saviour's death, and recurred at
the end DID come. Christianity ascended the Imperial Throne, was established from the rising to

intervals, till the arrival of Cestius Gallus at Jerusalem, in 66, four years before the destruction of the city. Within that interval we read of wars and rumours of wars, of insurrections and affrays between the natives of Judea and Samaria, and between the Jewish and Gentile populations in most of the great cities of the East; in Alexandria, Sileucia, Ctesiphon, in Mesopotamia, in Scythopolis, Ascalon, Tyre, Ptolemäis, Alexandria again, and in Damascus. Nor were they bloodless affrays; for if the numbers in Josephus are correct, the Jews who perished in them, men, women, and children, amounted to 150,000. "Famines"—are accidentally mentioned in Acts xi. 28, and by Josephus. Ant. iii. 15. "Pestilence" we know to be generally the companion of famine, and one in Italy is noticed by Tacitus, anno 65, Ann. xvi. 13. "Earthquakes" in Italy and Asia happened in the years 51, 58, 60, 62, 63. Tac. xii. 58, xiv. 27, xv. 22; Seneca, tom. v. 301, 307.

In verse 9 we read,—"At that time they will put you to death." James was put to death, and Peter was committed to prison for the same purpose. Acts xii. 2, 3. See also Acts iv., v., vii., xxi.; 2 Thes. i. 3; James ii. 5; 2 Peter iv. 12; Justin Martyr 234; Tac. xv. 44; Suet. in Claud. xxv., in Ner. xvi.

In verse 11 we read of "false prophets." Here consult 2 Peter ii. 1, iii. 3; 1 John ii. 18, iv. 1; 2 John 7; Jude 4. "The abomination of desolation" of the 15th verse, and Dan. ix. 26, are explained below. The Roman armies are so called from the idols on their standards, and on account of the destruction which they wrought. The 17th and 18th verses are explained in Luke xxi. 21.

The expressions in the 29th verse will be best explained by Isaiah's prediction of the destruction of Babylon, xiii. 10, and of Tyre, xxiv. 28, and of the desolation of Idumea, xxxiv. 4; and Ezekiel's of the fall of Egypt, xxxii. 7, 8.
the setting sun, had the utmost parts of the earth for its possession. "The little one became a thousand, and the small one a strong nation," Isa. lx. 22; the grain of mustard seed became a tree, and the fowls of the air lodged in its branches. Matt. xiii. 31, 32.

The conclusion, then, seems irresistible, viz., that Testimony to Jesus is the spirit of all prophecy—that He and His kingdom were the end of it all—and, consequently, that to nothing beyond the erection of this kingdom, or the establishment of Christianity, does any prophet make the slightest reference, i. e., in their predictions of events, with their times and circumstances.

XIII. Here an objection may be raised, namely, That, although Daniel limits his prophecies with the establishment of Christianity, and although our Saviour recognizes this limit, the predictions of

Certainly, we cannot suppose that our Lord would use language less bold and less figurative in describing the ruin of God's old people and their polity, than the prophets used concerning the destruction of Pagan cities and tribes. And with such descriptions the Apostles were of course well acquainted. See some very valuable remarks in Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary on this chapter. And the less learned reader may consult Barnes with advantage. In his note on the 30th verse, however, he makes mistakes which are sufficiently corrected in these pages; the general principle being established, the mistakes of commentators in matters of detail will be easily rectified.
the other prophets need not be so limited. The answer is ready. 1. If Daniel's prophecies be thus limited, all others are, for no other prophecies are supposed to refer to a period beyond his. 2. It has been shown above, sec. VII, that Daniel limits all prophecy within the period of his 70 weeks, or the establishment of Christianity; and, moreover, that the teaching of the whole New Testament, from our blessed Lord's strictly limiting discourse in the 24th of St. Matthew, to its close, or "the finishing of the mystery of God," Rev. xi. 10, conspires to establish the same. It will be well, however, to enter here a little into detail,—not that any difficulty in detail can, in the slightest degree, affect our general conclusion,—and examine, briefly, certain portions of Holy Scripture, supposed to contain prophecies which have not yet been fulfilled.

XIV. "The subject I propose to examine," says Dr. Cumming, in his Signs of the Times, "is Turkey and Mahometanism, or the Moslem, and

As regards this great subject of Prophecy, I may say, as the accomplished author of the Restoration of Belief expresses it respecting Christianity generally:—"A better course is, first to assure ourselves of the Substance of our Belief: we may then, with comfort and advantage, meet the exceptive argument in its particulars," p. 112, part 1. This I have endeavoured to do, however briefly, in this little publication.
his end.... The two great prophecies to which I would direct attention, are contained in the book of Daniel, and in the book of the Revelation." We are then referred to Dan. viii. 20—25, and Rev. ix. 1—19.

Now as regards the first, viz., the prophecy concerning "the little horn," it has been shown above, sec. VI, that this is identical with "the little horn" of the 7th chapter, and cannot, by possibility, be applicable to any power except the Roman, which took away the daily sacrifice, and desolated Jerusalem. On the little horn of the 7th chap. Calvin remarks, "Hic incipiunt variare interpretes: quia alii hoc ad Papam detorquent, alii vero ad Turcam. Sed neutra opinio videtur mihi probabilis. Falluntur autem utrique, quoniam existimant hic describi totum cursum regni Christi, cum tamen Deus prophetae suo tantum indicare voluerit quid futurum esset usque ad primum Christi adventum. Ego igitur non dubito hic per cornu parvum, intelligi Julium Caesarem, et reliquos, nempe Augustum qui ei successit: deinde Tyberium, Caligulam, et Claudium, Neronem, et alios. How he could afterwards refer "the little horn of the 8th chapter"—i.e., Dr. Cumming's Turk—to Antiochus Epiphanes, I cannot conceive. But even Dr. Lee, when he wrote his Dissertations, in 1830, or his preliminary dissertation to his translation of the Theophania of
Eusebius in 1843, did not understand the prophecy of the "little horn." Commentators have, in general, been too much consulted, and the sacred text itself not sufficiently studied. However, in verse 9 we are told, that out of one of the kingdoms of Alexander's successors "came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land." That is, so grew as to become a great horn, such as Alexander's rule had been, and was vested, like it, with Universal Empire. This growth, too, took its course in the directions of the east, the pleasant land, and the south. Come we therefore to the latter times of those dynasties, and what power do we find occupying this Western division of the rule of Grecia's first king? History tells us that it was the Roman: for the Romans took possession of Macedon, and added it to the empire, about 160 years before our æra. This power would be now, therefore, so situated as to have Egypt to the south, and Judea, Babylon, and its dependencies generally, to the East. But as Asia Minor was more exactly to the east of Greece, this seems here to be meant by "the East," together with its dependencies to the

36 The matter, however, is fully discussed in his later publications, viz.,—An Inquiry into the Nature, Progress, and End of Prophecy; and The Events and Times of the Visions of Daniel and St. John.
northward. By "the pleasant land" will then be meant Canaan, Syria, Babylonia, and its more eastern and northern kingdoms: all of which fell to the share of Seleucus. By the south must be meant Egypt, with its dependencies, Lybia, &c. As to the periods when these several places became provinces of the empire, Macedon has been mentioned; Pontus and the East were so attached in the times of Pompey; Egypt in those of Augustus. Thus Rome—not the Turk—"waxed great;" and thus also "three of the horns," in the successors of Alexander, were actually "plucked up, from the very root," before it.\(^57\)

We may now turn to Dr. Cumming's other reference, viz., Rev. ix. 1—19. Here the Doctor, as usual, sufficiently dogmatizes.\(^58\) It had been

\(^57\) See Dr. Lee on the place.

\(^58\) He is not more positive, however, than was Dr. Walmsley, who interprets the same portion of Scripture—let it be observed, upon the same system of interpretation—as pointing out the churches of the Reformation. He writes:—"The whole explication given here of the allegory of the locusts appears so consonant to the history of the Reformation that the propriety of it will not be denied." • • • The author is not the first who has thus applied that prophecy. La Chatardie did so. Bellarmine did the same; and others had preceded him, as he testifies. • • • The application is so obvious that the learned Protestant divine, Dr. Walton, used it for describing the multitude of new sectaries that swarmed out of the English Church.—Gen. Hist. Chr. Ch., pp. 257, 258, ed. MDCCLXXI. And on
more prudent had he spoken as the learned continuers of Poole’s English Synopsis, — albeit very

Rev. ix. 1, he says,—”Here is a description of the rise and progress of the Reformation. . . . Luther, a priest, is styled a star, but, renouncing his faith and vows, may truly be said to have fallen from heaven. . . . That fatal defection from the ancient faith afterwards overspread a large portion of Western Christendom.”—Gen. Hist. pp. 194–5. The heading to this chap., (Rev. ix.) in the Rosenmülleri Scholia, is—“Ab hoc capite usque ad cap. xi. 19, describuntur et prænunciuntur fata Urbis Hierosolymorum et populi Judaici, et primo quidem, vs. 1–12 hujus cap. exponitur, unde originem duxerit calamitas prænunciata, nempe e tumultibus hominum rebellium. Cf. notata ad viii. 13.” On verses 7–10, he observes—”Uno quasi spiritu legenda sunt hac quatuor commata. Nam inest symbolica descriptio hostilis agminis terrorem incutientis. Solenne est Orientalibus, inprinis Arabibus, exercitus hostiles comparare locustis, teste Niebuhrino in descriptione Arabise. Cf. Joel ii. 4, . . . Ὄς πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων. Non erant locustae, sed homines. Sequentia pertinent ad amplificandam imaginem. Sic vs. 8, dicitur: καὶ εἴχον—λέοντων ἡσαυ. Hæc lucem accipient ex loco Hieronymi, annotantis in locum Ezech. xlix. 20, hæc: comam demittere—propriae luxuriosorum est, barbarorumque, et militantium. Dentes eorum sicuti leonum, i. e., homines voracissimi.”

Dr. Hammond paraphrases the 19th verse thus: “And the rear of this army was as terrible as the front, came after wasting and destroying, as the front had done, (verse 18). And so the whole army was like that kind of serpent which hath an head in the tail, and wounds as dangerously with that as with the other.” Dr. Cumming’s remark, “Their ‘power,’ their ἵδουσια, that is, their jurisdiction, ‘is in their tails,’” and his story that “in one of the great battles of the Turks, the commander lost the standard of his army, and immediately cut off his horse’s tail, hoisted it on a pole,
blind interpreters of prophecy,—"It is Mr. Bright-
man's opinion," they say, "that the judgment of the
Turk shall determine, 1696; but of that the Scrip-
ture hath not informed us, and guessing is a vanity,
where we have no sure foundation, and so many
have appeared to be mistaken, in such particular
determinations, that he lightly exposeth his reputation
that will adventure further upon such rocks." This
was a candid warning from writers whose vision was
nearly as much affected as Dr. Cumming's by the
hermeneutic glasses of Mr. Joseph Mede. But
Dr. Cumming did "adventure further." With what
success let us see. "The star fallen from heaven,"
he says, means "Mahomet, because, at the death
of his parents, he was left a destitute orphan,"
p. 83. (See note 38, above.) Most admirable conclu-
sion! Most evident demonstration! "The locusts
clearly mean the Saracens," pp. 82—89. Surely
the doctor has forgotten the 1st and 2nd chapters
of Joel. We are next told that "the second woe

and made that the rallying standard of the Turks; and that,
to this day, a pasha of two, or a pasha of three horse-tails,
is the description of Turkish dignitaries and rulers" are so
utterly beneath the notice of any one of common sense,
that perhaps an apology ought to be offered to the reader
for printing them here. Surely Dr. Cumming ought to have
known that among the Jews, false prophets were designated
as "tails," Isa. ix. 15, seq. And there can be no doubt that
such were intended here.
is plainly the Turkish woe." How does Dr. Cumming establish this? He says,—"In one of the great battles of the Turks the standard was lost, and the commander cut off his horse's tail, hoisted it upon a pole, and made that the rallying standard of the Turks," p. 96. Am I quoting Dr. Cumming, or some wretched satirist of Holy Scripture? Be this as it may—this 9th chapter of Revelation never can be made to apply to Turkey, or to Turkish times. 50 The events predicted here preceded

50 It is strange that such a writer as the late G. S. Faber did not perceive this. In the last work of this late, much lamented, able Divine, and surpassingly powerful controversialist, it is taken for granted all through. "The predicted Downfall of the Turkish power, the preparation for the return of the ten tribes," is therefore nothing more respectable than a complete pettito principii from beginning to end. "There is," he says, "I think, scarcely a reasonable doubt that the prophetic period of 1260 years commenced in the year 604, and consequently that it will expire in the now rapidly approaching year, 1864." And again, "I consider the downfall of the Ottoman power to be clearly predicted in Scripture. Hence, whenever the destined time shall arrive, all the complications of modern political diplomacy will be found totally unable to prevent the ruin of that once formidable empire."—The Predicted Downfall, &c., Pref. p. v., and the Revival of the French Emperorship anticipated from the necessity of Prophecy, by G. S. Faber. This very able writer who here fixes the date of our approaching calamities in 1864, on the 14th March, 1809, wrote,—"We cannot now be very far removed from what Daniel calls the time of the end."—Gen. and Con. View of the Prophecies, vol. 1, Pref. p. i. This was much safer
the establishment of Christianity brought before us in the 10th and 11th chapters, and, therefore, whatever they refer to,\textsuperscript{40} cannot exceed the limit assigned to Prophetic Scripture, i. e., the advent of Christ, and the establishment of Christianity. So confident, notwithstanding, is Dr. Cumming and,—I regret to be obliged to couple with his name, the great name of—George Stanley Faber, that we are to expect, it seems, the destruction of the Ottoman Empire, and sundry other more important matters, in the year 1864.—See note 39, above.

XV. Here, instead of following these authors through their dates, as regards the past and the future, I will show that the foundation upon which their whole reasoning is founded is visionary and delusive.

There were certain prophecies, then, whose fulfilment was to take place within a period designated as "a time, times, and half a time,"—as "forty and

than the Almanac precision of his last publication. Dr. Adam Clarke also guesses a good deal on Dan. xii. 11. He says, "If we reckon 1290 years from A.D. 612, it will bring us down to 1902, when we might presume, from this calculation, that the religion of the false prophet will cease to prevail in the world."

\textsuperscript{40} Dr. Hammond and Dr. Lee may be consulted, with advantage, on this chapter—Rev. ix. I differ with both, however, in matters which it is not necessary to state here.
two months,"—as "1260 days,"—and so on. Dan. vii. 25; Rev. xi. 3, xii. 6, xiii. 5. Now, not perceiving that these are indefinite periods, to be decided by the fulfilment, as in the case of the 70 weeks of Daniel,—see sec. VII, above,—we are told by Dr. Cumming, that, "by referring to various parts of Scripture, we may easily see, that we have here a day for a year,"\(^{41}\) ubi supra, page 97. Looking back, however, to pp. 5, 6, we find the "various parts of Scripture" reduced to two, and Dr. Cumming thus speaking: "These prophetic days represent each of them a year. We have distinct authority for this." The Doctor then refers to Num. xiv. 34, and Ezek. iv. 6. But, let it be

\(^{41}\) Some very sensible remarks in refutation of the year-day theory may be seen in pp. 790, 801, of Professor Stewart's *Commentary on the Apocalypse*. He, however, must always be read cum grano salis. On this subject he says, "We seek in vain to establish by the Old Testament a precedent for making a day the representative of a year. Ezek. iv. and Num. xiv. are the only cases where this is done; and there the reasons for so doing are perfectly apparent; and there, too, we are expressly admonished how the reckoning is to be made. Does not this amount to a declaration, that, unless we had been so informed, we should, of course, reckon time as it is elsewhere reckoned? And inasmuch as in other cases no notice of such a kind is given, what can we do, consistently, except to reckon in the manner which is usual throughout the Scriptures?" Mr. Maitland's Essay annihilates the theory, if I remember rightly: I have not now got it by me to consult.
observed, that in *neither* of these passages was a prophecy delivered in *days* which was fulfilled in *years*. In the first, it was predicted that the children of Israel should wander in the wilderness *forty years*, a year for each day that the spies searched the land. *This prophecy, then, was delivered in years, and not in days, as it was fulfilled in years also.* Dr. Cumming's adopted interpretation would have confined the Israelites to the wilderness for 14,400 years!! In the second reference, we find, verse 5, the prediction delivered in *years* — the very reverse of Dr. Cumming's hypothesis — while it is only the *symbolical action* of the prophet, that was completed in *days*. Hence the words, "I have appointed *thee* each day for a year." Thus it appears that all the guessing and prophetic-almanac making of the school of Mr. Mede is unwarranted and absurd; and that, all prophecy having terminated in the establishment of Christianity, the Word of God is trifled with and abused by such unfounded hallucinations. When will they cease to be uttered?

XVI. The restoration of the Jews to Canaan is supposed, by some, to be the subject of much prophecy. The Seventy Weeks of Daniel, however, *within which all prophecy was to be fulfilled*, as shown above, were "determined upon his people, and upon
his holy city," Jews of after-times can, therefore, have no place in them. The Mosaic covenant gave them Canaan only "during their generations," Gen. xvii. 8, seq., that is during the Theocracy. At its termination they were expelled from it, according to prophecy, Deut. xxviii. And now, under the New Covenant, there is no particular country assigned to Jew or Gentile. Indeed, if "the law was a shadow of good things to come," (Heb. x. 1,) these good things must have been different from those which

42 This second and temporary Covenant made with Abraham must be carefully distinguished from the earlier and everlasting one, Gen xii. 2, seq., as a voucher for which the second was made, Psalm cv. 8, seq. Mr. Faber, however, tells us that "his friend Mr. Townsend is perfectly right in contending, in his deeply interesting note on Gen. xvii. 8, that the land of Canaan is still the property of God's people Israel. And that on this very basis rests the surely predicted restoration of the chosen House of Jacob." Prophet. Dissert. vol. I, p. 157. It is to be regretted that such writers as Townsend and Faber, should have overlooked the important fact, that the original, so far from being equivalent to the English term for ever, is actually often applied to the statutes of the law under the Theocracy. This system, we know, was to cease, and did cease,—Deut. xviii. 15, 18; Acts iii. 22–24; vii. 37—and, therefore, in this place, must mean for the period in question, which can in no way be extended beyond the abrogation of the whole Jewish system. The word is also applied to the lifetime of a servant, in Deut. xv. 17. If, then, this be the "basis on which rests a restoration of the Jews to Palestine," the looked-for fact is as visionary as its foundation.
shadowed them. The former, it is clear, were _carnal_; the latter were _spiritual_. The tenure of Canaan was _carnal_; that of the Canaan shadowed out must, therefore, be _spiritual_. The gift of Canaan, too, was circumscribed _in time_, as just now said, to the generations of the _Jews_; _in place_, to the limits of the river of Egypt and of the Euphrates; and the gift of the first Canaan was a voucher that the second should be given, _unlimited both in time and place_. Psalm cv. 8—12. This was to be the empire of the Son of man under the whole heaven, Dan. vii., and He Himself has told us that His kingdom is a _spiritual_ one, John xviii. 36. The gift of this to the _pious seed_ of Abraham was the one great object of the _covenant_ made with him. See Psalm cv. 8th verse particularly. Moreover, the period assigned for the Coming of Christ is said to be the period of _Israel's_ restoration. Isa. xi. 10, 13; Jer. xxiii. 3, 5, xxxiii. 14—17. Whatever _restoration_, therefore, was promised to the godly _"remnant"_ among the _Jews_—for nothing but denunciations of wrath are addressed to the ungodly multitude—must have taken place within the period assigned to _prophecy_. Accordingly, we find that while "Israel after the flesh had not obtained that which he sought for," the election—the _remnant_—had. Rom. xi. 7. And on the whole house of _Israel_—as Ezekiel calls the "remnant," ch. xi. 15, (com-
pare also Acts xiii. 26, seq.)—the Holy Spirit was bestowed in the time of the Apostles. St. James addressed his Epistle to every tribe of them, i. 1; and they were told, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xii. 22, that they had then come to Mount Zion, and to the heavenly Jerusalem; and this too, be it carefully observed, when the Apostle is contrasting the character of the new with that of the old covenant. That their number was considerable is evident from the "many myriads" spoken of in Acts chap. xxi. 20, and also from the following places: Acts vi. 7; xii. 24; xix. 20. We find also the number of the "sealed of all the tribes of the children of Israel," in the erection of the Christian Church, to be 144,000—i. e., a very large indefinite number, Rev. vii. 4. 43—whereas the ungodly multi-

43 I am surprised at Mr. Burgh's statement on this passage. He says,—"Strange to say, the only point in this chapter on which we find an universal agreement among commentators, without one exception, as far as I can discover after consulting all within my reach, is that Gentiles and not Jews are here alluded to."—Lectures on the Revelation, fourth ed. p. 166. I certainly must say, "stranger" still, that in the same volume, p. 434, this clever author quotes Professor Lee, maintaining that "the 144,000 of Israel, and the multitude out of all nations, Rev. vii., are the converts from both the Jews and Heathen in the same period," i. e. during the first ages of the Church. But "all the commentators within Mr. Burgh's reach agree that Gentiles, not Jews, are here alluded to." Then he clearly has never seen the Poli Synopsis Criticorum. It is very
tude among them, who "said they were Jews, were not, but did lie, for they were of the synagogue of Satan." Rev. ii. 9; iii. 9. The truth is, Jews in unbelief are out of the covenant, and nothing but a reception of it can restore them to God. Rom. xi. 23—26, 31. To restore them to Canaan would true that the continuers of Poole's English Synopsis say, that "by the tribes mentioned here are to be understood the several Gospel Churches of the Gentiles." But was not Matthew Henry within Mr. Burgh's reach? He, too, gives the opposite opinion, although not agreeing with it. Where, then, is the unanimity of which Mr. Burgh speaks? Has he never seen Dr. Adam Clarke's Commentary? He says, that the "144,000 of the tribes were those Jews who were converted to Christianity." Professor Stewart's Commentary also assures us that the "144,000 designates a large number of Christians from among the Jews." Dr. Hammond, too, explains it of Jewish converts. So does Le Clerc. Bishop Newton says, they were the Christian Church of both Jews and Gentiles. I cannot imagine what Mr. Burgh could have been thinking of when he wrote the above. Dr. Gill includes the Jews. Professor Ewald supposes that all Christians were called Jews at this time. The Romanists Witham and Walmsley (Pastorini) refer it to the Jews exclusively. The latter, amidst a good deal of other puerility, says,—"We learn from St. Paul that all Israel will be saved. Rom. xi. 26." Gen. Hist. p. 371. Now the truth is, we learn no such thing from St. Paul. The Apostle says that, "If they abide not in unbelief they shall be grafted in again," i. e., into the Church, (not restored to Palestine) and that "so—thus, in this way—σωτήρ—they shall be saved," verse 26. Here is no prophecy, but a purely hypothetic statement. They do abide in unbelief, however, and we nowhere read that it shall be otherwise. It is our duty, nevertheless, to labour for their conversion.
be to break the New Covenant, and to give force to the old, which St. Paul tells us has for ever passed away. Heb. xii. 26, seq. Under the new covenant "all are one in Christ Jesus," "there is no difference," "there is neither Jew nor Gentile," i.e., as such, for "he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, but he is a Jew who is one inwardly." Gal. iii. 28; Rom. iii. 22; and x. 12. God, on His part, keeps His covenant with them, and so does not "utterly destroy them,"—(Lev. xxvi. 44, 45,) which accounts for their existence in the present day; but no prophecy of their future restoration to Canaan is to be found in the inspired volume; while there are many positively forbidding it; see Jer. xxiii. 39, 40; Isa. xxv. 2; Hosea i. 6, seq., compare Isa. xxxvii. 31, 32.

How, then, are we to explain the portions of Holy Scripture which seem to promise a future restoration of the Jews to Canaan?

I answer: many such have had ample and literal fulfilments. But I will briefly examine one or two upon which the greatest reliance seems to be placed, by those who, however unconsciously, encourage the Jews in their obstinate rebellion. Without encumbering these pages with a needless reference to authors on this subject, let it suffice to say that the chief stress seems, by most of them, to be laid on passages in the latter part of the book of Deute-
ronomy, and on predictions unquestionably contained in the book of Zechariah. In Deut. then, we find, in the 28th chapter, "life and death, blessing and cursing, set before them," — blessing if they were obedient—from the first to the fifteenth verse; but they did not "hearken unto the voice of the Lord," hence the curses of the 15th and following verses, to the 49th, came upon them to the letter. Then in the 49th and following verses the siege of Jerusalem is predicted. After this, Ezekiel tells us, there was to be no return of the multitude. His words are—chapter vii. verse 13—"The vision is touching the whole multitude thereof, which shall not return." 44 In the 13th chapter we also have,—

"The 26th verse is very remarkable:—"Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumour shall be upon rumour; then shall they seek a vision of the Prophet," i. e., they shall seek it in vain, "for the law shall perish from the priest, and counsel from the ancients." Is it not strange that, notwithstanding this, both Jews and Judaizers continue to look for a prophecy of their restoration? The Prophet Amos is equally explicit, chap. ii. verses 4, 6. "I will not turn away the punishment of Judah — of Israel." More literally—I will not surely bring him back, i. e., restore him. Yet the preservation of the holy remnant is secured in the 5th chapter; and if we read of a restoration in the 9th chapter, it is sufficiently explained for us by St. James, (in Acts chapter xv. and verse 15,) as well as by many considerations put forth above. But some passages are quoted, which it is said, cannot refer to the Captives at Babylon; but must to a return from all nations. The answer is: the Jews had been dispersed among
"Neither shall they enter into the land of Israel," verse 9. And, again, in chap. xx. 38, "They shall not enter into the land of Israel." Indeed, it would be impossible, *after this period*, that they should, for Isaiah tells us that they were to be "slain" as a "peculiar people," lxv. 15. The words are very remarkable—"And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." What other name but that by which Inspiration designated them? "The Disciples were called Christians first in Antioch," Acts xi. 26.

But the 30th chapter is alleged, saying, that "*when* all these things have come upon them, *if* they shall hearken they shall possess their land." But the constant "*ifs*" here make it plain that it is a statement of *doctrine*, not of prophecy, just as we find Moses afterwards informing them—from a knowledge that they would *not* hearken—"evil will befall you in the latter days"—xxx. 29. And then, other nations also. See Zech. viii. 7, vii. ult.; Nehemiah ix. 30; Dan. ix. 7. Upon what particular occasions these *early* dispersions took place, we are not informed; but we find from Joel iii. 6, that the neighbouring nations had been in the habit of selling captive Jews to the Greeks and other nations: and it is expressly promised at verse 7, that these should be brought back. To what extent this had been carried on, it is impossible to say; but that it was considerable is evident from this place. Several other such intimations, as these occur, as in Amos i. 6—9, ii. 6; Obadiah 20.
having, in the 32nd chapter, predicted the call of the Gentiles, he exclaims—"Oh that they were wise, that they understood this, that they would consider their LATTER END." But they did not consider it, and hence, although John the Baptist was sent before the great and dreadful day of the Lord, lest He should come and smite the earth (land) with a curse, yet it was smitten, for they "hearkened not." Still, God was "merciful to His land, and to his people," (Deut. xxxii. 48,) "in that day," (Joel ii. 18; Rom. xv. 10); though little faith was found in the land of Judea on the coming of our Lord to execute judgment, according to his own prediction, Luke xviii. 8, the land was blessed with a series of faithful bishops, all of whom were actually Jews by birth; but by the time their life had run out, Canaan had lost its peculiarity, being absorbed in the universal dominion of the Son of Man.\footnote{That it was universal is evident.—Sections X. and XI. above.}

We now come to the stronghold of the Medites, in proof of the future restoration of the Jews to Palestine. It is contained in Zech. xiv. Here Calvin remarks, "some have wrested the passage, and applied it to the last coming of Christ; but this is inconsistent with the subject in hand." He was right. Let us see. In verse 4 we read—and this in immediate
connection with a prophecy of the advent and crucifixion of Christ,—"Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle." This cannot refer to the general judgment—the Lord will not fight with the nations then; He will judge them. In verse 7, "that day is to be known to the Lord," i.e. to Him only. See Matt. xxiv. 36. In verse 8, "living waters are to go forth from Jerusalem," which we know took place; Luke xxiv. 47, Acts i. 8; according also to the prediction of Ezek. xlvi. 1—12 incl. (compare Rev. xxii. 1, 2, Matt. iv. 19), and in ver. 9, "the Lord was to be king over all the earth;" none of which can refer to the last judgment; but all of which most naturally and obviously does to the establishment of the kingdom of Christ, as foretold by all the prophets. The language certainly is highly figurative, still its grand object is as plain as could well be conceived. Hence the establishment of the principle laid down by Mr. Fairbairn, after a train of irresistible reasoning—"Prophecy often writes out its delineations of the future under the shape and aspect of the past;" or as Glassius expresses it, in his "immortal work," as Mosheim calls the Philologia Sacra:—"Quod prophetæ de rebus N. T. loquentes, nominibus et phrasibus utantur, à sui, nempe V.T. circumstantiā desumptis: cujus ratio est, quod res veteris legis fuerint typi et figuræ bonorum futurorum in
St. James establishes this principle in his citation of Amos ix. 11, 12, in Acts xv. 14—17, and, indeed, it must be recognised, and acted upon, unless, with Mr. Begge and others, we require "the literal and exact reproduction of the Old Testament state of things," which St. Paul tells us were removed, that immoveable things should take their place. Heb. xii. 27, 28. But, it will be asked, is it not declared that Christ should sit on the throne of His father David, St. Luke i. 33, and has this been fulfilled? Let us see how St. Peter answers this question. He says—"Let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made this same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." "Him hath God exalted

46 Vol. 1, p. 475, 15., MDCLXIII.
47 Connected View, pp. 105, 106. Let me here take notice of the uncertainty of the genealogies now kept by Jewish families. They have intermarried with their proselytes of all nations, and sometimes with others; insomuch that they cannot be sure of one Jew now in the world, who is of the pure and unmixed blood of the Jews. Nay more, whether most of them be not sprung from proselytes of the Heathens, Mahomedans, and Apostate Christians. Therefore they can never know whether any Messiah, who shall hereafter set up, be of the tribe of Judah, or family of David, according to the prophecies of the Messiah. For they have no certainty of either tribe or family now amongst them. See Pref. to Leslie's Short Method with the Jews; also Prel. Dissert. to Euseb., Theoph., part iv, pp. cliii, iv, v.
with His right hand, to be a PRINCE and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." Acts ii. 36; v. 30, 31. Does this look like David's throne wanting its king? If Christ hath been exalted to be a Prince, is He not seated upon a throne? And if seated upon a throne, what throne is it? Is it David's or some other? Was there any other ever promised Him? And if not David's, why should St. Peter be so anxious that all the house of Israel should know that Christ had risen to His dominion? Such prophecies take their hue and shape from Old Testament relations, but we must search farther and rise higher for the substance they contain.  

XVII. A few remarks may now be made on Acts i. 11, a prophecy generally supposed to be still unfulfilled. First, I observe that the mode of expression seems designedly peculiar. It says, in effect—"He who was taken away shall so come again, as ye have seen Him go." It does not say "ye shall see Him coming again in person, as ye have seen Him go in person." Indeed, they did not

48 Compare St. Luke i. 33; Psalm ii. 6; Rev. iii. 7; and see Mr. Fairbairn's Typology, Appendix. See some valuable remarks also in Salomon Glassius, as above—de styl. Prophet. and de typis.
see Him go into heaven personally, for "a cloud received Him out of their sight,"—verse 9.

Let us now see what information Holy Scripture gives us as to the character and period of the coming of our Lord spoken of in this text. We find, then, the disciples asking this question—"What shall be the sign of Thy coming and of the end of the world?"\(^{49}\) Matt. xxiv. 3. Jesus, after warning them of deceivers personally appearing, gives them all necessary information. Among other things, He says, verse 27, —"AS the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, SO also (i. e. of that sort) shall the coming of the Son of man be,—that is, if words have any meaning, not as an individual on earth, whether in the desert, the secret chamber, or elsewhere; but in power, as in the clouds of heaven, discernible far and wide, in proof of His divinity, and as foretold by the prophets; and, at the same time, striking through His enemies, and scattering, as with the lightning, those that might seem as deeply rooted as the cedars of Libanus. In this "manner" he came, and destroyed Jerusalem with its temple, verse 28. The once holy city had now become a mere dead carcass; the spirit had fled, and then it was consigned to the fate of such carcasses. And if "the

\(^{49}\) See note 31, above.
eagles" (ver. 28) were intended to mark the Roman army, so much the clearer is the prediction.50 "In like manner," according to the prophet Daniel, referred to in this chap. by our Lord, was He to "come" to destroy "the desolator" of Jerusalem, ch. vii. 18, 14, ix. 27.51 From verse 29 to 32 we read, "Immediately after the tribulation of those days," that is, clearly, of the fall of Jerusalem, "shall the sun be darkened, and then"—that is, again—"shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven," that is, not His person, but the testimony of His power," and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn," not of

50 "The Roman armies, called so, partly from their strength and fierceness, and partly from the figure of these animals, which was always wrought on their ensigns. It is remarkable that the Roman fury pursued these wretched men wheresoever they found them. They were a dead carcass doomed to be devoured, and the Roman eagles were the commissioned devourers.—A. Clarke, who refers to Josephus, Wars, book vii., chaps. 2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11. Some have thought this merely a proverbial expression. A comparison of Luke xxi. 20, seems to make it certain that our Lord did denote the Roman armies. Besides, as Grotius writes,—"Hic quoque accidit, quod in multis aliis vaticiniis, ut verba non tantùm secundùm proverbiam loquendi modum, sed etiam secundùm exactissimam verborum significationem implentur."

51 The periods of these judgments are shown by Dr. Lee to have been—the first, in the midst of the seventieth week; the second, at its end, when the whole image was broken to pieces by the power of Christianity.—See Dan. ii. 44, and sec. X, above.
the Jews only, but of the Gentiles also, who should oppose themselves to Him; and they, that is, all "shall see," that is, PERCEIVE in this way (and in no other was He to be seen) "the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven," that is, with power and great glory. It is added, in the 31st verse, "And He shall send His angels," i.e., the apostles and their successors, "with a great sound of a trumpet," that is, as shadowed out in the priests blowing the trumpets about Jericho, "and they shall gather together His elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other," that is, admit the Gentiles into the Church. And again, ver. 37, "As the days of Noah, so also shall the coming of the Son of man be." Then follows an intimation of the destruction which was to ensue; "Two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken, and the other left." It is added, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord cometh."\(^{62}\) These predictions were delivered in plain opposition to the notion that Christ should, at His coming, be found personally either here or there, and the pe-

\(^{63}\) Holy Scripture abounds with such language. Thus David tells us, that he was in distress and called upon God, and that He heard him: that the earth trembled, and the Lord bowed the heavens, and came down riding on a Cherub, and flying on the wings of the wind, 2 Sam. xxii. 8-12. Yet the 1st verse teaches us, that all this meant nothing more than that he had been delivered from Saul.
riod before us is sufficiently shown above, section VIII, and section XII. We may conclude, therefore, that Acts chap. i. 11, refers altogether to the "manner" of Christ's coming, that is, in the clouds, or with power; but does not make the slightest allusion to any personal coming whatever. Indeed the "two men" who stood by the Apostles on that occasion, seem to have done so, that they might not look after Him, as if to see Him with bodily eye. Let us now look at a few other places where this coming of our Lord is spoken of. We have, then, Matt. xxvi. 64: "hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." Some who were "standing by" should "see his coming" before they "tasted of death," chapter xvi. verse 28.53 But, I ask, was any personal manifestation implied in this? Surely not. Such phraseology is most common in Holy Scripture. Thus in Deut. xxxi. 15, we read—"The Lord appeared in a pillar of a cloud." I suppose it will not be maintained that there was any personal appearance there. Again, Ps. xviii. 8, seq., "There went a smoke out of his nostrils, and fire out of his mouth devoured. He bowed the heavens also, and came down." Again, Ps. civ. 3, "Who maketh the clouds his chariot; who walketh upon the wings

53 This is referred by some to the transfiguration; absurdly, however, as the parallels abundantly manifest.
of the wind.” And again, Nahum i. 3, seq., (containing an acknowledged revelation of Christ) “The Lord hath His way in the whirlwind and in the storm, and the clouds are the dust of His feet. The mountains quake at Him, and the hills melt, and the earth is burned at His presence.” The language here is too like our Saviour’s own to be mistaken, and He limits the full progression of the awful facts thus predicted by all the prophets, and by Daniel in particular, to the “generation” then living, (Matt. xxiv. 34,) “Verily, I say unto you,” i. e., I declare solemnly, on my oath as Jehovah,

54 Amen—“verily,” is a word with which our Lord prefaced his solemn declarations, in a style proper to the Son of God. The saints used it in supplication, or in assenting to the word of God; but no Prophet or Apostle ever said,—Amen, I say unto you. This use of Amen is left to God and Christ; for it is the language of Him who avers by Himself. See Archdeacon Townson’s Discourses on the Gospels, Dis. vi. sec.2. He adds, in a note,—“To ’Αμήν passim quidem a sanctis usurpatur quum optant, sed non quum asseverat. Nemo unquam prophetarum aut Apostolorum dixit, ‘amen dico vobis.’ Soli Deo Christoque hoc relinquitur, qui ejus est qui per seipsum asseverat.—Ludovicus De Dieu, in Poole’s Synopsis on Matt. v. 18.” Among those of the learned who dispute this doctrine of De Dieu is Nicholas Fuller,—Miscell. Theol., lib. i. chap. 2,—who maintains that Amen signifies no more than Nat or άληθως. Let us, however, observe what he himself says of it, in obviating an objection from St. Jerome’s authority:—“Cæterum hic nobis opponuntur Hieronymi verba, quibus ait. In veteri Testamento Dei juramentum esse, Vivo Ego, dicit Dominus; in novo autem—Amen, Amen, dico vobis. Sed sensus est,
"this generation shall not pass till all these things be." Once more, I observe, that our Saviour seems to guard against any expectation of a future personal manifestation of Himself when he says—St. John xiv. 19—"Yet a little while, and the world seeth Me no more; but ye see Me." If "every eye" (Rev. i. 7,—see below, sec. XIX,) should sensibly see Him, then the whole world should; but He says, they should not, any more. Moreover, the illustrations of His coming are in pointed antagonism to any personal manifestation, as partially seen above, which puts the matter beyond all doubt. He says—"Wherefore if they shall say unto you, behold, He is in the desert, go not forth; behold He is in the secret chambers, believe it not. For"—a most remarkable for—"as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even to the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be," i. e., necessarily,

recentem hanc Novi Testamenti formulam perinde valere ac antiquum illud veteris juramentum, ejusque instar esse, et parem ad veritatem confirmandam vim locumque obtinere." Whether Amen had the nature of an oath, or not, enough, surely, is granted here to show that it hath sometimes at least a significance which Nai and Ἀληθῶς cannot reach. They who attend to the prophecy of Isaiah to the Jews, lxv. 15, 16, with a plain reference to the Gospel times, and consider that our Lord styles himself "The Amen," Rev. iii. 14, will be apt to think that this Hebrew word, in the mouth of Christ, has, on more occasions than one, a significance not well to be preserved in another language.
in power, not personally; but as in the clouds of heaven.

XVIII. A few words may be expected here on the supposed reference to Popery in the New Testament, e.g. 2 Thess. ii. 3, seq., and 1 Tim. iv. 1—3 inclu. 55 A single remark on the first would be amply sufficient, 56 viz.,—that it seems certain that the power

55 It may be as well to state here, that, in 1851, I published a Sermon,—preached pursuant to the circular of the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph to his clergy—on Romish Miracles. I did not then see that all Prophecy had been fulfilled. But the Sermon contains an unanswerable ad hominem argument with the Romanist, while the Medite must either believe that all prophecy terminated with the establishment of Christianity, or acknowledge the reality—albeit by satanic power,—of the miracles of Popery. But this is impossible, as we are now under the dispensation of the Holy Spirit; not under the ministry of angels, Heb. chap. ii. 5.

56 I here earnestly recommend Dr. Lee's treatise on the Antichrist, in pp. 201—223 of his Inquiry. I cannot, however, think the very learned author right in saying, page 203, that "the Christian Church is never called the Temple of God in Holy Scripture." How then are we to apply such passages as 1st Corinthians chap. iii. 16, 17; 2nd Corinthians ch. vi. 16? Although the definite article does not occur in one of these verses, it does in another. It is an inconsistency, too, in this great man, that he actually proves that the "anointing the Most Holy," or the most sacred place of the temple, in Dan. ix. 24, must of necessity apply to the consecration of the Church of the New Covenant. Inquiry, p. 139. Moreover, the Temple in Jer. xxx., which must be included in the city, and the
symbolized by "the little horn," in the 7th and 8th chapters of Daniel, is that here described by St. Paul. But the former has long since fallen, as before shown. The latter, therefore, cannot be referred to Popery. It was all fulfilled in Nero, Domitian, &c., down to the end of the heathen Emperors; for, let it also be observed, that the day of Christ was to succeed it all, ver. 1, 3, and

SECOND Temple of Ezekiel, i.e. from the 45th chapter, clearly refer to the Christian Church. It is true that St. John tells us that there is "no Temple therein." Rev. xxi. 22 But why? Because the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the Temple of it. Ib. While true Christians are not only the Temple, 1 Tim. iii. 15, comp. 2 Tim. ii. 20, but also the priesthood, 1 Peter ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6; v. 10, comp. Isa. lxvi 21. It is the Church of Rome—which is a compound of Judaism and Heathenism—not the Christian Church—which has a Temple in it, to offer sacrifices which can never take away sins. Heb. x. 11. But Canon Wordsworth—who applies 2 Thess. ii. to Popery—writes thus in his:—"Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of the Revelations?" p. 60. "The ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in the mouth of an Apostle in speaking of Gentile Christians concerning the future, cannot mean the Jewish temple, and can only mean the Christian Church." If by the future he means future to the destruction of the temple, he is right; if not, he is as clearly wrong. "Ο ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ," is not in the style of St. Paul: simply ναὸς, any Temple but the Temple of Jerusalem, which alone was so called. This appears by the doubling of the article; nor can those words, in any Jewish writer, be ever understood otherwise." So says Le Clerc, (in loco,) whose learning everybody acknowledges, and whose criticism is sometimes of the highest character.
this has been shown to have come, and its period
demonstrated—sec. XVII, above. And here it may
well be asked, was there nothing mysterious in the
conduct of the Emperors? no deceivableness of un-
righteousness in the heathen Priesthood, who worked
for them, and with them, under the chief agent, that
old serpent, the devil? Were there no strong delu-
sions in the whole Gnostic heresy—the continued
exertions of the Jews doing their utmost to corrupt
Christianity? Was there nothing like the working
of Satan in all this, in which thousands of Chris-
tians fell, some by the sword, and some by relapse,
during a period of more than 200 years? I only
ask, was there ever anything like this recorded? A
moiety of human nature perished during the judg-
ments now poured out. Does the history of the
world present anything like it? Now the period
of these events is limited and fixed beyond the
possibility of extension. Dan. xii. 1, Matt. xxiv. 21.
Besides, Popery could not be said then to "work,"
verse 7. As regards 1 Tim. iv. 1, seq.—this cannot
possibly have been predicted of the papacy. The term
"latter days," alone decides this. See sec. III, p. 9,
above. The Gnostics fulfilled it to the letter. The doc-
trines, commandments, and practices of Popery are
not in such direct and positive antagonism to the
truth as were those of the Gnostics. Popery forbids
meat on Fridays, &c.,—indeed so does the Church of
England—the Gnostics forbid it *universally*. Popery forbids priests to marry; the Gnostics forbid *all*, and actually established a *common use of women*. The thing existed to an enormous extent, and its reporters are worthy of all credit. Besides, how could Timothy be commissioned to preach, verse 6, against Romish doctrines, of which no one heard for 500 years after his times? However far the Church of Rome has gone in forbidding the marriage of the clergy—and she has much resembled the Gnostic principle in this matter—Marriage has never been generally forbidden by that Church; in fact, she makes it a Sacrament, which is more than our Articles assert, although the Homilies assert as much. (This may lead us to suspect that the Homilies are not of such authority as is generally supposed. St. Paul, surely, does not mean sacrament in our sense, by μυστηριον, in Eph. v. 32.) St. Clemens Alexandrinus—*Strom.* i. 8, tells us that the Gnostics generally believed that "all marriage was fornication, and was introduced by the Devil." And Irenæus, lib. i. c. 22, says, that there were many heretics in the ancient Church who prohibited marriage; and instances Saturninus and Simon Magus, as the fathers of the Gnostics.

XIX. A few remarks may now be made on what is called the *Millennium.*
And first: According to the year-day theory, I suppose we must consider St. John's 1000 years, to be a period of upwards of 360,000 years—at least Dr. Cumming seems to tell us so, see sec. XV, above. Whatever period, however, it refers to, I prefer to be guided by the analogy of Scripture language, and shall, therefore, consider it as denoting an indefinite period. And, next, it will be necessary, before any conclusion be arrived at respecting this period of 1000 years, to ascertain the main object of the Holy Spirit in writing the book of the Revelation. This, I think, may be easily ascertained from the book itself, and, as it appears to me, will necessarily exclude the popular Millennium from any of its supposed prophecies. We find, then, in chap. i. 1, the following: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto Him, to show unto His servants things which must shortly come to pass."57 Again, in the 3rd verse, "Blessed is

57 'Εν τάχει. The sense of this,—viz.,—speedily, shortly,—cannot, I think, be questioned, with any plausibility. It is true that Eichhorn, and some others, attempt to evade the obvious meaning here. But they advance nothing which can at all invalidate the above conclusion, even if the third verse did not give an infallible commentary—

ο καιρὸς εγγὺς τὸ χρόνον εἶναι κοινός. However difficult, then, any portion of the Revelation may appear—and to European minds, unacquainted with Oriental composition, it must ever appear difficult—it is quite plain, that no portion of it can be referred to times very remote
he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, for the time is at hand.” Again, in the 22nd chapter, verse 6, “The Lord God of the holy Prophets sent His angel to show unto His servants the things which must shortly be done.” The nexts verse adds—“Behold, I come quickly.” The 16th verse will show us what is meant by this. The words are—“Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book, for the time is at hand.” We may now look to Dan. xii. 4, where we find—“Seal the book even to the time of the end.” Now the interval, we know, could not be less than 530 years, and in the 10th chapter, verse 14, is said to be “for many days,” and it was therefore then not at hand; but St. John tells us that in his days, “the time was at hand,” which, therefore, must imply a from its date if we are to believe the statements of the book itself, describing, professedly, its sole object. On Rev. xxi. the learned continuers of Poole’s English Synopsis remark—“We shall find some things in the New Hierusalem here described, which will agree with no state of the Church on earth, see verses 22, 23.” Here they were not aware of the principle laid down by the late Dr. Lee—and, I think, established by him—that the prophets in describing the spiritual blessings of the Church restrict them to true believers. He adds, “If this distinction had been duly attended to, the question about Jewish restoration to Palestine would, long ago, have been cast to the moles and the bats: for it would have been seen, that every promise made to that people has been fulfilled to the very letter.” Introduction, Events and Times, page xlviii.
period of less than 530 years. But 1800 years have passed, and the time then at hand has not yet arrived!! Oh! admirable interpreters! Oh! most accurate calculator! It would be an extraordinary occupation, although not more extraordinary than habitual, for our arithmetic-literal interpreters, to prove that 530 equals 1800; or that 1800 is less than 530.

It may be objected here, that "1000 years with God is as one day." 2 Pet. iii. 8. Truly; but the inspired writer is not speaking of periods with respect to God, but as having reference to "his servants, to whom he showed things which were shortly to come to pass," i. 1, and on this account they were pronounced "blessed" if they "heard and read them," verse 3. Still, St. Peter's words, just quoted, show us, what indeed we must know, that a day with God—with whom is no time—is as 1000 years, and will lead us to believe that the Millennium of St. John was that period in which the Gospel was miraculously spread—the very "devils being subject to them," and "power being given to them over all the power of the enemy." Luke x. 17—20. Hence we find—after the letting loose of Satan during the great persecutions, Rev. xx. 7,—the establishment of the Christian Church immediately succeeding, (xxi. xxii.) on whose angel-guarded gates were written the names of the 12 tribes of the children of Israel, verse 12, and in
whose foundations were the names of the 12 Apostles of the Lamb, verse 14. This is that perfect Christianity to which all prophecy looked, and beyond whose establishment none extends. And if we now find nations of the earth immersed in heathen darkness, it is only what happened before: "Men did not like to retain God in their knowledge, and God gave them over to a reprobate mind." Rom. i. 28, seq. Ours be the duty and the privilege to do again, without miracle, but with Christ's abiding Presence, what was done so well before, with miracle—to evangelize the world. And who knows but that, if we be faithful and obedient, "God, even our own God, shall bless us. God shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall" again "fear Him." Ps. lxvii. 6, 7.

XX. To examine all the portions of Scripture which are supposed to contain prophecies yet to be fulfilled would be an endless task— and, indeed,

57 If we understand a large portion of Prophetic Scripture in its (to us) prima facie meaning, we are sure to interpret wrongly; for the symbolical, metaphorical, and figurative style of the East, is, to any unacquainted with it, as wholly unintelligible, as it was abundantly evident to those to whom it was addressed. It requires patient and long-continued investigation to become at all acquainted with prophetic phraseology. The Philologia Sacra of Glassius will be of great use to the student; and to the English reader, Mr. Fairbairn's Typology is invaluable.
quite as unprofitable as an examination of the places alleged by Romanists to prove their doctrine of Purgatory. "If in Scripture," says Peter Du Moulin, "there be any word of a 'boiling pot,' or of 'the filthiness of the daughters of Zion,' or of a 'pit wherein there is no water,' they are so many proofs of Purgatory. Covetousness hath made these doctors expert in fire-works." So may we say—If in Scripture, we read of the kingdom of heaven coming upon earth, Christ's saints reigning with him, the remnant of Israel restored—they are so many Medish proofs of the non-fulfilment of prophecy, and, consequently, (although they do not intend this) of the falsehood of Christianity. If we read of the coming of Christ as at hand in the days of the Apostles, "the revolution of 1800 years," as Mr. Gibbon would rejoice to express it, backed as he is in principle, by our modern prophets, "teaches us that it is only at hand now;" 58 or, to

58 Mr. Faber and Dr. Cumming say that it is to occur sometime about the year 1864, as shown above, sec. XIV. The authenticity of the grant by Phocas, of the title of Universal Bishop to Boniface III, is not only questionable, but the assertion of Baronius, and other Pontificians, cannot be supported by a shadow of ancient evidence. With the subversion of this imaginary privilege falls the Faberian Theory relative to the 1260 days.—Butler's Letters on Development, p. 171, note G. Rev. xvii. 10–12, made much of by Mr. Faber, is thus paraphrased by Dr. Hammond:—verse 10, "And besides (the seven heads) denote the seven kings or
use his exact words, "not to press too closely the mysterious language of Prophecy and Revelation."

emperors thereof, that have had anything to do with the Christians, which are here to be numbered from the time of the beginning of these visions, till this of the writing of them: of them five are dead, all of violent deaths, poisoned or killed by themselves or others, viz., Claudius, Nero, Galba, Otho, Vitellius; one then reigned, viz., Vespasian; and a seventh was not yet come to the kingdom, viz., Titus, who, when he should come to it, should reign but two years and two months. Professor Stewart writes—"Five are fallen, i.e. Julius Cesar, Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius; Nero is the sixth; Galba succeeded, who reigned only seven months. Or, if we begin with Augustus, then Galba is the sixth, and Otho, who succeeded, reigned only three months, (ver. 11); and Domitian, described, ver. 8, as he that was, and is not; that is, one that in Vespasian's time, while he was busy in other parts, exercised all power at Rome, and was called emperor, is the eighth, that is comes to the empire after those seven, being the son of one of them, to wit, of Vespasian (in whose time also he held the government of Rome), on this, a wretched, accursed person, a cruel, bloody persecutor of the Christians, and shall be punished accordingly."

Dr. Lee writes as follows on the 12th verse: "We have seen under Daniel's first vision that the toes of the image are indirectly styled kings, ch. ii. 42, 44. These must therefore be ten. The beast here which carries the mystical Babylon has likewise ten horns, and these are explained by the angel as symbolising ten kings, each of which is to receive, as a king, power for a certain season, here termed an hour, with the beast; i.e., as his ministers or agents. Now here, as just noticed, by these ten kings appears to be signified, in round numbers, the whole series of this persecuting rule, for these reasons, viz.: 1. They had received no kingdom as yet, i.e., at the time when John was honoured
(Vol. ii. ch. xv.) If we read of a new heavens, and a new earth, (Rev. xxi.) it is at once concluded that with this vision, i.e., as already observed, before Domitian was in power; but were,—as constituting St. Paul's man of sin,—shortly to appear. 2. If they were to receive power with the beast, each for a certain season, then could not the whole of this reach beyond the period determined for his fall, i.e., the close of Daniel's seventieth week. And again, as each of these was so to have his hour with the beast, they must of necessity succeed one another in time, so that the last should fall with the beast himself. And 3. If these ten horns, or kings, were so to succeed Daniel's ten horns, for they occupy the place of the eleventh or little horn, then must they symbolise the rule, and mark the period of this eleventh, little horn; and, accordingly, they must fall with the beast as before. And, for the same reason, they must synchronize with the ten toes, or kings of Daniel's first vision, and must also perish from the stroke of the stone which destroyed them. We have, therefore, in every case here, the same power, events, and times, before us. It may nevertheless be supposed, that this number is to be literally understood, for in some parts of this angelic explanation, the literal sense is evidently intended; and, if so, then the ten persecutions, or ten persecuting Emperors, may have been meant. But, as I doubt whether such an exact number of persecutors can be shown to have acted on these occasions, I have preferred taking the analogy of the parallel scriptures.” —Inquiry, pp. 441, 442. The above extracts from these learned writers are given here to show other explanations, besides Mr. Faber's, of this passage,—explanations certainly quite as intelligible. If all prophecy, however, has been fulfilled, as shown above, Mr. Faber's must be wrong.

59 It is truly pitiable to see the efforts of such writers as Bishop Watson to reply to Gibbon's 15th chap. In the Bishop's Letters to Mr. Gibbon (Let. ii.) he actually quotes all the places in the New Testament, from which the
such was never yet witnessed, and a desire to prophecy predicts a future fulfilment. If, in fine, we read that St. John was commanded, (Rev. i. 19,) "Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter," it is forthwith concluded that the things which were future to St. John, are future to us, and it is altogether overlooked that the passage simply means—"Write the things which thou hast seen," which he did—"and the things which are," which he did likewise—"and the things which are after these," which he also did, — and ended

historian gathered his views respecting Christ's coming; but does not attempt an explanation. He runs off to the Medish nonsense, that Popery was predicted by the Apostles, and that, therefore, they could not have meant what they said. The fact is, the Apostles did believe Christ's coming to be near; it was near; but not in the sense of the Medites.

60 μετὰ ταῦτα, i. e. as Beza renders it. Scribe quae vidisti, et quae sunt, et quae post hae sunt futura. The same remark applies to chapter iv. verse 1. The truth is, I believe, that the book of Revelation does not contain a single original prophecy; it is rather a Revelation of former predictions. Dr. Hammond may be consulted with great advantage, in its details, until he enters upon his crotchet about the 1000 years of purity and perfection subsequent to Constantine. Le Clerc's supplement to Hammond also contains much useful information; Bossuet and Grotius contain a great deal that is good and valuable; but the only satisfactory works, which I have read, on this most purely Eastern composition, are those of the late
the whole, as all the prophets did, and Daniel in particular, with the establishment of Christianity—GLORIOUS, PERFECT CHRISTIANITY.

Dr. Lee; namely, that appended to his *Dissertations*, published in 1830; his *Inquiry*, published in 1849; and *The Events and Times, &c.*, published in 1851. It may be mentioned here that, in the 1830 publication, Dr. Lee improperly placed the persecuting powers in Rev. xvii. 16, 17, beyond the limit assigned to prophecy by Daniel, Their "hating" and "desolating" the whore must be understood metonymically, i.e., as doing so *in effect*. For similar usages see Isa. iii. 8, 9, 14; ix. 20; Sec.
APPENDIX.

No. 1.

Since the foregoing pages were printed, the Rev. P. S. Desprez has published—"The Apocalypse Fulfilled; or an Answer to Apocalyptic Sketches by Dr. Cumming." It will readily be seen that the details of Mr. Desprez's volume do not at all interfere with my general principle. Of course, I believe that he is right in maintaining that the Apocalypse is fulfilled—for all prophecy is fulfilled, as shown above.

This is not the place to enquire whether Mr. Desprez's events of fulfilment are more correct than those of writers entertaining the same view in general result, who have gone before him.

I have no doubt that the book will receive the attention it deserves, while I regret that Mr. Desprez borrowed so much from professor Moses Stewart, who is by no means an able or accurate commentator, and, still more so, that the work has appeared as "an answer to Dr. Cumming," whose publications on such subjects are so wild as not to deserve more than a moment's consideration from any thinking person.
APPENDIX.

One remark of Mr. Desprez's, I must notice here. In p. 137, he says—"Had the same powerful arguments, which can be brought to support these views, been at hand to support the Trinitarian doctrine, the world would never have heard of Faustus, Socinus, or Dr. Priestley." Does Mr. Desprez mean to assert that the proofs of the Trinitarian doctrine are not as strong as those respecting Christ's coming spoken of by the prophets? The latter Mr. Desprez irrefutably establishes; but it has been quite as clearly proved that there is a distinction in the Godhead—viz.,—The Father: The Son: and The Holy Ghost.

No. 2.

contingat doctrina Christi illustrari, ejusque legibus emendari. In Epilogo: σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία.

Everybody knows that the words "kingdom of God," and "kingdom of heaven," are used in different senses in the New Testament.

Another friend objects: "Popery very soon succeeded Christianity." But what of this? So did Mohammedanism. We have since had Socialism and Mormonism. What, I should like to know, have any of these to do with the fulfilment of prophecy in the establishment of Christianity? If we are to believe, with the Medites, that Daniel contains the history of the world to its close, we may well believe that all these, and a thousand other abominations, are predicted; but if we must believe Daniel himself, Christianity was "the end" of his visions, ch. vii. 28. Another friend tells me, that "it is unreasonable to suppose that the Almighty should leave us without any prophecies to guide us during our sojourn on earth." St. Paul answers this, —"He hath in these last days spoken to us by His son," Heb. i. 2, who graciously assures us, that our "Heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him." Luke xi. 13. Those who want or wish for more, are thanklessly unreasonable, and shall not have their curiosity gratified. Besides, this is precisely the Romanist's argument for the infallibility of the Church. He says, "we want an
infallible Church to guide us, therefore we have one;" the Medite says: "we want prophecy, therefore we have it." The reply to each is: Be satisfied with what God has given you, and intrude not into those things which you have not seen, nor can see.

No. 3.

A consideration which seems to have great weight, with some people, against the conclusion arrived at in the preceding pages, may as well be noticed here. It is, that "universal peace was predicted during Messiah's advent—Isai. ii., xi., lxv.,—while wars have raged, and still rage, throughout the world." I answer: Prophecy terminated in the erection of Christianity, as the successor to the fourth great universal heathen monarchy,—as shown above,—and who knows not that universal peace did prevail at our Saviour's advent,—who knows not that the temple of Janus was closed? And even in countries beyond the Roman Empire, all was quietness and peace. See pp. 43, seq., above. Besides the reason assigned, in Isa. xi. 9, shows that it is the character of Christianity that is described in the glowing terms of the prophecy, and not its compulsory effect upon individuals. The Poli Synopsis Criticorum—Poole's English Synopsis, and even Matthew Henry, may be consulted with
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advantage on these places. The one fault with such commentators is, that, after they have fully explained the meaning of the prophecy, they run off to matters on which the prophets are silent. In truth, however, the objection I am considering, has been taken from the Jews. When hard pressed, they contend for a peaceful Messiah; but seem, on the whole, to prefer a carnal Conqueror. I have seen it stated, somewhere, that the Asian Jews had a strong notion that Oliver Cromwell might be the Messiah. When it suits their purpose, they will—Medish like—literalize apparently opposite prophecies.

ERRATA.

In p. 33, note, for "sec. p. IX, 28," read, sec. IX, p. 28.
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