FULFILLED PROPHECY,

IN PROOF OF THE

TRUTH OF SCRIPTURE.

BY THE

REV. BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE, M.A.,
RECTOR OF SHILLINGFORD;
AUTHOR OF "THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE;" "THE PRIMITIVE AND CATHOLIC FAITH;" ETC., ETC.

"We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed" (2 Pet. i. 19).

LONDON:
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1882.
WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

1. MEETNESS FOR HEAVEN.
2. THE FIRST AND SECOND ADVENT.
3. LYRA SACRA: A COLLECTION OF HYMNS ANCIENT AND MODERN.
4. REVELATION AND SCIENCE.
5. EGYPT'S TESTIMONY TO SCRIPTURE.
6. THE TRUTH OF THE BIBLE.
7. THE PRIMITIVE AND CATHOLIC FAITH.
8. ST. PAUL IN BRITAIN.
9. THE APOSTASY: AN EXPLICATION OF 2 THESALONIANS II.
10. THE BRIDE OF CHRIST.
11. TURKEY, OR THE JUDGMENT OF GOD UPON CHRISTENDOM.
12. HOW INDIA WAS WON BY ENGLAND.
PREFACE.

Comparatively few persons are aware how clear and decisive is the evidence in support of the Truth of Revelation, as against the Rationalistic tendencies of the age. It is as Lord Chief Justice Coleridge recently remarked at the trial of a noted criminal, when he spoke of "the immense and enormous preponderance of evidence" against the prisoner; just so is the strength of the testimony against the unbelieving school in the present day.

Prominent among the many proofs which are fast accumulating in confirmation of the truth of Scripture, especially those which belong to archaeology, as seen in the recently deciphered monuments of Egypt, Assyria and Babylon, the subject of "FULFILLED PROPHECY" is perhaps the most conspicuous and satisfactory of them all. Passing by the involuntary testimony which celebrated writers, such as Gibbon in his Decline and Fall, or Volney in his Ruins of Empires, have borne to Scripture Prophecy, I would adduce the testimony of one more recent traveller as to the present condition of Biblical lands in confirmation of the same.

"It is for the learned," says a distinguished officer of the United States' navy, "to comment upon the facts we have laboriously
collected. Upon ourselves the result is a decided one. We entered upon this (the Dead) sea with conflicting opinions. One of the party was sceptical, and another, I think, a professed unbeliever in the Mosaic account. After twenty-two days' close investigation, if I am not mistaken, we were unanimous in the conviction of the truth of the Scriptural account of the destruction of the cities of the plain.”

The subject of “FULFILLED PROPHECY,” as considered in the present work, may be divided into that tripartite division mentioned by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, as pertaining to “the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Church of God.”

None but those whose consciences are what the apostle terms “seared,” can deny the well-known and patent facts, which come under the head of predictive prophecy, that the Jewish people are in the condition which Moses foretold they would be, if disobedient, upwards of 3500 years ago. Their history since the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, and their present condition, is one of the most instructive proofs of FULFILLED PROPHECY.

In the Messianic prophecies, especially in the one relating to the death of the Messiah, which we find was accomplished at the very time to a day, as Daniel had predicted upwards of five centuries before, we have a very striking lesson of FULFILLED PROPHECY in the history of the four great Gentile Monarchies, the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman, during the last 2500 years, as detailed by Daniel and St. John, since Jerusalem has been trodden down by the Gentiles; and which, as the present “Signs of the

1 Commander Lynch's Narrative of the United States' Expedition to the River Jordan, chap. xvii., p. 253.
Times" seem to indicate, appears now to be drawing to a close. Amongst these Signs which bear upon the question of Fulfilled Prophecy, the most prominent may be mentioned as follows:—

1. The long-continued supremacy of Japheth amongst the nations of the earth, according to Jacob’s prophecy when dying, compared with the supremacy in ancient times, as it rested first with the descendants of Ham, and subsequently with the race of Shem.

2. The altered condition of the Jews compared with what it was in the Middle Ages, and their present gathering to the land which God gave to Abraham and his seed for “an everlasting possession.”

3. The overthrow of the temporal power of the Papacy in 1870, and the refusal of the kings of the earth to support it any longer, when the Vatican Council thought to perpetuate its power for ever. But God had willed it otherwise. And as one of the most distinguished interpreters of prophecy which the Church of England has produced justly remarks, on the subject of the Vatican Council of 1870—

"Thus it had been declared in the Divine prophecy, Apoc. xvii. 17, ‘God hath put it into the hearts of the ten kings to fulfil His will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled’ . . . . . The omission to invite the kings of the earth to the Vatican Council according to all former precedents, was too remarkable to escape notice. It was remarked on by M. Veuillot, editor of the well-known Popish journal at Paris, L’Univers, in the passage following:—‘The Bull does not invite sovereigns to sit in the council. The omission is remarkable. It implies that there are no longer (Roman) Catholic crowns—that is to say, that the order in which society has lived for the last thousand years no longer exists. What has been called the middle age has come to an end. The date of the Bull is the date of its death, its last
sigh. Another era begins. The (Romish) Church and State (of Roman Catholic kingdoms) are separated."

The above testimony of an ardent Roman Catholic is an instructive comment on the seventeenth chapter of Revelation, as showing how it has been literally fulfilled in the treatment of the Papacy by the kings of the earth.

4. The wasting away of the Turkish empire, which has been so visibly taking place during the present century, and which is figuratively expressed in the Apocalypse as "the drying up of the waters of the great river Euphrates."

5. Conjointly with the decay of the Turkish power, prophecy specially mentions the outcome of "three unclean spirits like frogs from the mouth of the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet." Believing that this refers to the varied forms of infidelity and superstition which are now so vigorous in the present day, I have entered upon the consideration of this subject at much length in the present work; mindful of the apostolic warnings—

"If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained. But

---

2 *Hora Apocalyptica*, by the Rev. E. B. Elliott, fifth edition, vol. i., Preface, pp. xxx. xxxi. I have given at length the evidence on which the Church of England in a threefold form, by her *H homilies*, by her *Convocation*, and in the Preface to the *Authorized Version of the Bible*, has authoritatively applied the menacing prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul, and St. John to the Church of Rome. The teaching of the Church of Scotland in her *Confession of Faith*, and of the Church of Ireland by the *Dublin Articles* of 1615, is of similar character.
refuse profane and old wives' fables, and exercise thyself rather unto godliness.'

And again—

"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and oppositions of science falsely so called: which some professing have erred concerning the faith.'

Mindful of these apostolic exhortations, I have endeavoured to give a long and careful consideration, not only to the subjects of the apostasy from the truth on the part of multitudes who profess the Christian religion, and which may be regarded as the great evil within the professing Church, and likewise of the varied forms of infidelity, an equally grievous sore, though external to the same Church of God. For it is a painful but undeniable fact, that the tendencies of many of those who boast themselves as the teachers of science in the present day, though a great deal of what passes under that much-abused name might be more correctly termed in the language of St. Paul "science falsely so called," can only be described as more or less infidel, and in some instances atheistic, to an extreme degree.

In order to show the feeling which exists in the present day on the part of the Rationalistic school against Christianity in general, and the evidence of prophecy in particular, it is a melancholy fact that a clergyman, who has been expelled from the ministry of the Church of England on account of his daring unbelief, commends the Jews for rejecting Christ's religion, and extols their faith as being far superior to ours, notwithstanding that the voice of prophecy

---

3 1 Tim. iv. 6, 7. 4 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.
speaks in language of unmistakable clearness as to their sufferings during the last eighteen centuries in every part of the world, on account of their rejection of the religion of the Gospel, which is so much despised by scornful infidels and apostate Christians. Pronouncing Christianity, in defiance of all history as well as of common sense, to be "a bridge from Paganism to Judaism," and the worship of Christ as a system of "half-pagan mysticism and meretricious idolatry," this degraded cleric throws down this defiant challenge—

"To the Church of Christ we cry, 'First convert the Jews, and then only may you boast of your success as miraculous.'"

While blinding his eyes to that marvellous fulfilment of prophecy alluded to above, this poor wretched specimen of unbelief, who virtually represents the character which the inspired Psalmist drew three thousand years ago, when he wrote "The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God," has the effrontery to prophecy that the Jews will never be persuaded to accept Christianity, which he asserts "has had its day, and is dying out" ! ! !

Such is the expectation of Rationalistic infidelity at the present time. Doubtless in this instance the wish is the father of the thought; but it betrays lamentable ignorance both of history in the past, as well as of history anticipated in the future, i.e., "the more sure word of prophecy," which tells us that if at the rejection of the seed of Israel when three thousand souls won to Christ were the results of a single sermon preached by a converted Jew, far greater will be the amount of spiritual blessing to both Jew and Gentile on their restoration to the Divine favour. "If the fall
of them," says St. Paul, "be the riches of the world, how much more their fulness ...... If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" (Rom. xi. 12, 15.)

Rationalistic objectors have not the faintest conception of the amount of spiritual work done amongst the Jewish people during the last half century, which is greater in proportion as regards outward success, than that which is being so zealously done by the many excellent Missionary Societies at work in the vineyard of the Gentile world. Between one and two hundred converted Jews have become ordained clergymen of the Church of England, of a very different stamp from that poor fallen minister whose expulsion we have noticed above. A modern writer observes with much force—

"How many of the 10,000,000 Jews scattered about the world are Christians we may not exactly know, but we have certain knowledge that more than 100,000 have been converted since the commencement of the London Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews," i.e., about sixty-five years ago.5

B. W. S.

P.S. I regret much, when writing the chapters on Rationalism in the 19th Century, and The Progress of Infidelity, I had not then read the admirable papers by Professor Lionel Beale on the Dictatorial Scientific Utterances and the Decline of Modern Thought, and On the New Materialism; which are to be seen in vol. xvi. of Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute, pp. 201—248. The first contains a very just exposure

5 Jewish Intelligence, March 1882, p. 56.
of the fallacious theories and untenable assumptions of Professor Huxley, and is deserving the most attentive study of every one who has been misled by the daring propositions of that materialistic teacher. The second is a brief explanation of the differences between "the new Materialism" of Huxley and others, and the theories propounded by the Rationalists, Materialists, and Agnostics, as hitherto understood. This new Materialism appears to be very similar to the theories put forth by the Positivists of New York; which are noticed at p. 272 of this work.

B. W. S.

SHILLINGFORD RECTORY,

October 23, 1882.
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FULFILLED PROPHECY.

CHAPTER I.

THE EVIDENTIAL VALUE OF PROPHECY.

If Lord Bolingbroke's axiom be correct that "history is philosophy teaching us by example," with no less truth may it be said that prophecy is forestalled history, with the impress of the authority of Almighty God. To word it still more tersely: Prophecy may be regarded as history anticipated, and history as prophecy fulfilled; or, as Bishop Butler long since defined it, "Prophecy is the history of events before they come to pass."

When we remember our Master's command to "Search the Scriptures," and see what a large portion of those Scriptures are predicative and prophetic—when to this is added the special blessing promised to the most obscurely prophetic book in the canon of Holy Scripture, "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein: for the time is at hand" 1—we are surely in the pathway of duty, when we endeavour to see how wonderfully the prediction and its accomplishment agree; since, as St. Peter teaches us, "we have a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." Hence the apostle adds, "Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the

1 Rev. i. 3.
Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

The true Catholic, who believes in the infallibility of God’s word in preference to the faith of the Roman Catholic, who believes in the infallibility of a poor fellow-sinner residing at Rome, remembers that it is better for us to study prophecy, even though we make mistakes in the interpretation, than to neglect the study of prophecy for fear of making mistakes. Josephus records a remarkable instance of the danger of neglecting prophecy, or of treating it with contempt, as multitudes of professing Christians appear to do in the present day. When Jeremiah, he says, was commanded to warn Zedekiah King of Judah of the danger he was in from his misgovernment, that Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon would take and destroy Jerusalem, and adding, “Thine eyes shall behold the eyes of the King of Babylon, and he shall speak with thee mouth to mouth, and thou shalt go to Babylon,” Josephus relates that Zedekiah was at first disposed to believe him, until Ezekiel, who was then a captive in Mesopotamia, sent his prophecies to Jerusalem in order to confirm the testimony of Jeremiah; but Zedekiah refused to believe them both, because Ezekiel had said that God would bring the prince in Jerusalem (Zedekiah) “to Babylon, to the land of the Chaldeans; yet shall he not see it; though he shall die there.” Zedekiah drew the inference that the statement of Ezekiel contradicted that of Jeremiah, and consequently rejected both as false. As we further learn from Scripture that Nebuchadnezzar “slew the sons of Zedekiah before his (the wretched father’s) eyes, and put out the eyes of Zedekiah, and bound him with fetters of brass, and carried him to Babylon,” we see how literally the combined statements of the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel were fulfilled. Hence Josephus points out the absence of all disagreement between the sacred writers in general and the prophets in particular, as, he says, “they being only prophets, have written the original
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and earliest accounts of things as they learnt them by inspiration direct from God Himself." 6

Predictive prophecy should ever be considered as both a part and an evidence of revelation—a part when first delivered and until its fulfilment; and an evidence after its accomplishment. It was essential to the character of Scripture prophecy that the prediction should not be such as be fitted the employment of supernatural agency, as the sound rule of Horace well expresses it—

"Nee Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus
Inciderit."

"Let not God interfere, unless the unravelling be such as to require the interposition of the Divine mind."

The value of the predictive element in Scripture is seen in this, that it affords a conclusive proof of the Divine Authorship of Scripture. And since the coming of the promised Messiah is the one great object of prophecy, it becomes a strong argument in support of the claims of Christianity and of its Author, which cannot be gainsaid. Hence the Dean of Chichester forcibly remarks—" Unbelief never grapples fairly with hostile evidence of any sort. It can disallow the supernatural, though it cannot disprove it. And prophecy, because it draws so largely on a belief in the Divine, must accordingly at all hazards be disallowed. But how shall this be effected? Your attention is invited to the last invented method of dealing with this department of sacred evidence; the newest device for unfaithfully handling this portion of the Deposit. It consists in resolving 'prophecy' into 'forecast.' By proposing to substitute the word 'forecast' for the word 'prophecy,' modern unbelief ignores the predictive element; tacitly assumes that what God and man have in every age called 'prophecy' is nothing else but a shrewd guess. In this way, what has hitherto claimed to be divine is declared to be human. It lies in the term—which is a convenient one, doubtless, for the achieving of a wicked purpose: seeing that, besides forethought and deliberation, it connotes judicial gravity, and as much of scientific skill as the subject-matter will admit. If astrology

---

6Josephus, Antiq. x. 7, § 2; Contr. Apion, i. § 7.
were still believed in, the learned in such lore would, I suppose, be declared to *forecast* a man's future from the aspect of his stars. 'Forecast' implies, in fact, no more than the lawful exercise of the reasoning faculty on matters which are confessedly within its ken—as when a man undertakes to *forecast* the consequences of his own actions. And so the expression is a more convenient one by far than 'anticipation,' which is vague, and as often as not is doomed to disappointment: and 'augury,' which smacks too strongly of heathendom and foolishness: and 'presentiment,' which belongs to the emotions and to superstition: and 'conjecture,' which, in its simplicity, throws off the mask and says what it means; which is just what unbelief *never* does, because it never dares to do it.”

Scripture prophecy, then, not the lucky guesses of men, whether believers or sceptics, discloses the fundamental truth and principles of the Almighty's righteous government, as the moral hinge on which the historic events of time and the solemn issues of eternity are ever turning. In this respect it essentially differs from Pythonic divination, which attempted to pry into the future without any moral influence, as it could only offer an ambiguous reply to the questioner of the oracle who had paid best for the information he wished to receive. What can afford a more striking confirmation of the truth of Scripture prophecy than the prediction concerning the supremacy of the Japhetic race, as witnessed by the existence of Christianity at the present time, on the condition of the Jewish race during the last eighteen centuries? And then compare them with the pretended predictions of heathen divination—such, for example, as the response which Pyrrhus King of Epirus received when consulting the oracle at Delphi. The intentionally deceptive answer he received in reply to his enquiry ran thus:—

*Aio te, Æacide, Romanos vincere posse;*

which, from the peculiarity of the Latin construction, might be

---

7 Dean Burgon's Sermon preached before the University of Oxford, in reply to the Rev. Brownlow Maitland's *Argument from Prophecy,* pp. 30, 31.
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read in two ways,—either that Pyrrhus would conquer the Romans, or be conquered by them. Of course, he interpreted the response of the oracle in his own favour, and thus hurried to his ruin.

The whole burden of prophecy may be said to be comprised in its earliest utterances, and subsequently expanded as the phases of the world's history and the development of the divine scheme rendered necessary.

"The word of God," wrote the late Edward Irving, "is as a seed, in which the whole majestic form or various parts of the future oak or plant lie undisclosed, ready to reveal themselves according to their times, seasons, or circumstances. There is no break, leap, or start; its course proceeds by a slow and sweet and beautiful progression. The first great promise contains the whole of the revelation and prophecy of God in an embryo state. The lapse of ages is a soft, sweet, silent development of the one seed sown in paradise, which in its growth changes the earth into paradise, and reproduces that kind of blessedness the world was then deprived of, in the restitution, regeneration and complete blessedness of man and his habitation. Like the stately branches of an oak, which begins in an acorn, the end and the purpose being to generate an acorn, while during the progress of its growth it covers every beast of the earth with its kindly shade, and nestles every bird of heaven in its ample branches; so this promise was sown in the soil of a perfect and perfectly blessed state, while men still dwelt in paradise, and its end is to produce perfectly blessed men, dwelling in paradise again; while during all the ages of its growth, it blesses the immortal spirits of men with salvation, and its leaves are for the healing of the nations."

The several books of Scripture prophecy speak the same grand old story of the coming Deliverer from first to last, from Moses to Malachi; and the story finds its complete interpretation in the person and work of our Saviour Jesus Christ, as revealed in the New Testament. It would have been a miracle of the highest order in the history of literature to suppose it possible that a series of separate treatises, bearing ever and anon on the subject of events of the most intense interest to the human race, and spread over nearly twelve centuries,

8 The Exodus occurred probably circa B.C. 1580; and the prophecy of Malachi, when the Canon of Old Testament Scripture was completed, may be dated B.C. 400.
should have told the same story with undeviating uniformity, amidst every variety of circumstances, and in the teeth of bitter adversaries and perpetual antagonisms, except upon the supposition that the impress of one great Master-mind was stamped upon them all. The differences between the Bible on the subject of prophecy and every other uninspired prediction, is the difference between the coarse effects of a painting and in the perfect finish of a natural landscape. If we apply the microscope to the most delicate work of art we see the beauty, which we admire so much with the natural eye, becomes uncomely. If we apply the same to a blade of grass or the petal of a beautiful flower, its grace is considerably magnified by the beauty of the closer inspection. There are effects in art, but there are depths in nature, just as there are depths in the infallible word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

All the manifestations of God, whether to persons or by prophecy, from the time when our first parents transgressed to the close of the Apocalypse, point to the Advent of the Messiah, and of His being slain, a sacrifice for sin, as the culminating point of the predictions contained in the Old Testament; just as the prophecy of the Saviour's return, no longer as the Man of sorrows, but as King of saints, is the chief object of the New. The glory of God is declared by every prophecy. His foreknowledge appears to such finite creatures as ourselves to be one of His highest attributes. Believers in the integrity and infallibility of His word are comforted, and their faith is strengthened, when they find that the experiences through which they are passing, the troubles that are befalling them, or the difficulties that they encounter, have been foreseen and foretold by their God. And the testimony of God's only begotten Son as the Author of prophecy, and the testimony borne to Him as the promised Deliverer and Messiah, is the spirit of prophecy. Hence we learn from Scripture that the promised seed of Abraham, the chosen people of God, in their history, their doctrine and ritual, as well as in their government, all present one grand prophecy of the future Redeemer.
In studying the prophetic Scriptures, it may be well to bear in mind the wise words of St. Augustine, when he thus speaks in his Commentary on the 119th Psalm: "The more open it seemeth, the deeper it seemeth to me; so that I cannot even show how deep it is." Maimonides, one of the most learned of the Jewish Rabbies of the Middle Ages, has a very pertinent remark on the subject, which it may be profitable to remember, as an encouragement to "search diligently" concerning "the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." Hence, remarks the Hebrew doctor, "Prophecy resideth with them who are great in wisdom and virtue, whose affections are set, not on earthly things, but on heavenly. To such the Holy Spirit giveth light and understanding, that man's soul is associated with the angels, and he is changed into another man."

On the question of evidence in relation to one very important factor in prophecy concerning the resurrection of Christ from the grave, which may be said to be the cardinal truth of the Christian religion, the late Dr. Arnold of Rugby has justly observed, "I have been used for many years to study the history of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidences of those who have written about them, and I know of no one fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better or fuller evidence of every sort to the mind of a fair enquirer, than the great sign that God has given us, that Christ died and rose again from the dead." And although our Lord's prediction, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead," has received ample fulfilment in the present day by the mode with which Scripture is treated by Rationalists, Sceptics, and avowed Infidels, the evidence is so overwhelmingly strong in our favour, that the Christian may witness the ceaseless attacks of those who ignore or oppose revelation without the slightest fear.

The arguments to meet the denial of our Lord's resurrection, on which the truth of Christianity may be said to hinge,
consist of two kinds—the conduct of its early adherents, and the testimonies of its determined foes. As regards the former, this fact is undeniable, that in the course of a few years a small band of uneducated men, chiefly fishermen, were so fully persuaded of the reality of Christ's resurrection, and succeeded in persuading so many others, as Tertullian says, of every rank in life, and in every part of the Roman Empire, which then embraced the whole of the civilized world, to believe the same, that the mighty system of Paganism, the growth of a thousand years, sank to nothing in the conflict with its more powerful rival; and for the last sixteen centuries it may be asserted without fear of contradiction, that Christianity has swayed the destinies of mankind; not as some erroneously suppose by the conversion of the world, but in accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Master's prophecy, "This Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations: and then shall the end come." ¹

The testimony of the adversaries of Christianity is equally decisive as to the spread of that "new superstition," as they were wont to characterize the only religion which enjoyed a revelation from on high. From Tacitus to Marcus Aurelius, through the first two centuries of the Christian era, we have a long catena of heathen authorities who bear testimony to the existence as well as to the marvellous spread of this new religion. If we quote one of them, the earliest in point of time, and the most celebrated as an historian in point of reputation, it will be amply sufficient for our purpose. Tacitus, who was born within little more than twenty years after the crucifixion, and is admitted to be the most distinguished heathen historian of the age, thus describes the rise and origin of the Christian religion. After recording Nero's act of setting fire to Rome, and his endeavour to lay the guilt "upon a set of people who were held in abhorrence for their crimes, and called by the vulgar, Christians," Tacitus continues as follows—

¹ Matt. xxiv. 14,
"The founder of that name was Christ, who suffered death in the reign of Tiberius, during the governorship of Pontius Pilate. This pernicious superstition spread not only over Judæa, where the evil originated, but through Rome also, whither every thing bad on earth finds its way, and is practised. Some who confessed to being Christians were first seized, and afterwards, by their information, a vast multitude (\textit{ingenae eorum multitudin}) were apprehended, who were convicted, not so much of the crime of burning Rome, as of hatred to mankind. Their sufferings were aggravated by insult and mockery; for some were disguised in the skins of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs; some were crucified; while others were wrapped in shirts covered over in pitch, and set on fire when the day closed, that they might serve as lights during the night. These cruelties caused the sufferers to be pitied; and though they were criminals and deserving the severest punishments, yet they were considered as having been sacrificed not so much to the public good, as to gratify the cruelty of one man." 

From the evidence afforded by this famous heathen historian, we may conclude without doubt these several things.

1. That the Founder of the Christian religion was put to death in Judæa by its governor, Pontius Pilate, during the reign of Tiberius Caesar.

2. That in the country in which Christ was put to death, the religion which He founded spread with such wonderful rapidity, that in less than 40 years after His death a very large number of its adherents were found within the walls of the capital of the civilized world.

Such testimony on the part of a distinguished heathen historian, and a pronounced foe to the Christian religion, is most valuable evidence, not only respecting the fact of the rapid spread of the Gospel, but also in reference to those very predictions which Christ declared to His disciples before being put to death by Pontius Pilate, viz., that He would rise from the grave, after having been entombed for "three days and three nights;" and that His Gospel would be preached as a witness to the truth of His religion among all nations, which it has been with more or less zeal during the last eighteen and a half centuries, and continues so to be preached with more vigour and success than ever even to the present day.

2 Tacitus, \textit{Annals}, lib. xv., c. 45.
CHAPTER II.

THE SUPREMACY OF JAPHETH.

The chief subjects of prophecy set forth in Scripture may be summarily described under these several heads.

1. The Messianic prophecies relating to the promised Deliverer, made to man directly after Adam had fallen from that high estate in which he was originally created, "after the image and likeness of God."

2. The supremacy of Japheth in accordance with the prophecy of Noah, which reads in Genesis ix. 27, "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant.

3. The condition of the children of Israel or the Jewish race at the present time throughout the world, as foretold by Moses in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, and other Hebrew prophets.

4. The treading down of Jerusalem as predicted by Christ—"Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

5. The rise of a great ecclesiastical power, described by Daniel under the metaphor of a "little horn;" by St. Paul as "the man of sin," "the lawless one," and "the head of the apostasy;" by St. John as "the great whore that sitteth upon many waters," and "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth."

6. Signs of the "perilous times in the last days," mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul; and in the Apocalypse of St. John.

7. Special prophecies relating to Nineveh, Babylon, Tyre, and Egypt; and their condition in the present day.
Reserving the prophecies relating to the Messiah, I propose to notice in this chapter the second subject of prophecy in the above list, which treats of the supremacy of the Japhetic race, as is so strikingly manifest in the world's history during the last 2000 years.

We may safely assume the correctness of the Mosaic record respecting the tripartite division of the human race, as descended from the three sons of Noah, which has been confirmed by modern research in comparative philology as well as in ethnology. The celebrated Oriental scholar, Sir William Jones, in his Asiatic Researches, has discovered traces of three primeval languages, corresponding to the three grand aboriginal races, which he calls the Arabic, the Sanscrit, and the Slavonic, into which all others resolve themselves. And Professor Max Müller says—

"These two points comparative philology has gained. Nothing necessitates the admission of different independent beginnings for the material or the formal elements of the Turanian (Ham), Semitic (Shem), and Aryan (Japheth) branches of speech; nay, it is possible even now to point out radicals, which, under various changes and disguises, have been current in these three branches ever since their first separation." 3

Therefore we see in this conclusion from comparative philology that confirmation of the Mosaic record which reduces all languages and three distinct stocks, and primarily before Babel to the time when "the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech." 4

Even independent of the question of inspiration, no ancient author has ever produced a work on ethnology to be compared for value to the Mosaic account of the origin of nations, as recorded in the 10th chapter of the book of Genesis. Of modern authors, while on the one hand we have Cuvier, perhaps the highest authority in the matter, dividing mankind into three races; on the other hand, we find many writers, who, disdaining to recognise the value of the Mosaic record, speculate in a variety of ways regarding the number of races in which the

3 Max Müller in Bunsen's Christianity and Mankind, vol. iii., p. 479.
4 Gen. xi. 1.
human family ought in their estimation to be divided. Blumenbach numbers 5; Lesson, 6; Fisher, 7; Bory de St. Vincent, 15; Desmoulis, 16; Morten, 32 families; while his disciples Nott and Gliddon run the number up to 115! ! !

The Authorized Version reads Noah's prophecy thus, "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." 6 There is apparently an omission in the text, else how are we to explain the fact that the name of Ham, who committed the offence, is not mentioned, but Canaan's substituted instead? Origen mentions a tradition amongst the Jews, which was subsequently adopted by Jewish and Christian writers, such as Aben Ezra, Theodoret and others, that Canaan first saw his grandfather uncovered, and informed his father Ham, who did not reprove him as he ought to have done. The expression in the context, "his younger son," seems to support this view, as the term literally rendered reads, his "little son," pointing rather to his grandson Canaan, than his son Ham. Hence the Arabic version, and one copy, if not more, of the Septuagint reads the whole prophecy in the following way, which seems to accord with the metre of the Hebrew:

"Cursed be Ham, the father of Canaan;
A servant of servants shall he be to his brethren.
Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem;
And Ham, the father of Canaan, shall be his servant.
God shall enlarge Japheth,
And he shall dwell in the tents of Shem;
And Canaan shall be his servant."

The Targum of Onkelos, Philo and some others understand "he" to refer to God as dwelling in the tents of Shem; but the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan and the greater number of Christian interpreters consider Japheth to be the subject of the proposition, as indeed seems to be the far more probable meaning of the Patriarch's prediction. And this is seen in two

---

6See Genesis and Science, by Dr. John Arnold, p. 105.
6Gen. ix. 25—27.
different ways. First, as regards religion; secondly, in respect to worldly power: the first, the spiritual sense; the second, the literal. As Isaiah expresses it, “Gentiles shall come to thy light, and kings to the brightness of thy rising: the abundance of the sea shall be converted unto thee, the forces of the Gentiles shall come unto thee” (lx. 3, 5). Nearly all those nations whose history and language prove them to be of the Japhetic stock, have been converted to a belief in the religion of the God of Shem; and as regards the political supremacy of Japheth in modern times, as the learned Bochart two and a half centuries ago well observed—

“To the descendants of Japheth belonged all Europe and Lesser Asia, Media, Iberia, Albania, part of Armenia, and all those vast countries to the North, which formerly the Scythians and now the Tartars inhabit: not to say anything of the new world (America), into which the Scythians might have passed through the straits of Anian.”

Thus it may be safely affirmed that the prophecy of the patriarch Noah teaches us the following particulars.

1. That the world should be divided among the descendants of Noah, but that Japheth should have the most important portion for his inheritance.

2. That the descendants of Shem should preserve the knowledge of the true God by the revelation made to Abraham and Moses, until the time when the Gospel was preached to mankind.

3. “That the descendants of Ham and Canaan should be depressed, and reduced to a condition of servitude.

Speaking generally, it may be assumed that the descendants of Shem have colonized Asia; of Ham, Africa; and of Japheth, Europe and America. The following commentary on the 10th chapter of Genesis is given by Abulfaragi, an Armenian physician of the 13th century, who subsequently became a bishop and primate of the East, in his History of the Dynasties:

“In the 140th year of Phaleg, the earth was divided among the sons of Noah. To the sons of Shem was allotted the middle of the earth; viz., Palestine, Syria, Assyria, Babel, Persia and Arabia. To the sons of

1 Bochart’s Phaley, iii., c. 1, col. 149.
Ham—Africa, Egypt, Nubia, Ethiopia, Scindia and India. To the sons of Japheth—the North, Spain, France, the countries of the Greeks, Slavonians, Bulgarians, Turks, and Armenians."

The science of modern ethnology, which may be said to be the product of the 19th century, entirely confirms the conclusions of the learned Armenian physician of the 13th century; and there can be little doubt in the minds of those who have studied the subject, that the 10th chapter of Genesis is both the earliest and best account of the way in which the earth was divided among the sons of Noah after the Flood, about twenty-five centuries before the Christian era.

The genealogy of Noah's descendants may be thus briefly explained:

I. The Race of Shem.
1. Elam, from whom sprang the Persians, &c.
2. Asshur, from whom sprang the Assyrians, &c.
3. Arphaxad, from whom sprang the people of Mesopotamia, Eber, Abraham, Israel.
4. Lud, from whom sprang the Lydians, &c.
5. Aram, from whom sprang the Syrians, &c.

II. The Race of Ham.
1. Cush, from whom sprang the Ethiopians, Chaldeans, &c.
2. Mizraim, from whom sprang the Egyptians, &c.
3. Phut, from whom sprang the Libyans, &c.
4. Canaan, from whom sprang the Canaanites, &c.

III. The Race of Japheth.

Japheth is represented in the 10th chapter of Genesis as having seven sons, and from them are supposed to have sprung the following nations according to the science of ethnology, as it is presented to us in the present day.

1. Gomer appears to have been the eldest son of Japheth; and to have been the ancestor of that race which the Assyrians called Gimiri, or Kimiri, and the Greeks, Kimmerii, who waged war in Asia Minor during the seventh century B.C., according to Strabo (i., p. 90), in conjunction with a Thracian people named "Treres." They have been identified with the Cimbri...
of Roman times, and were found in Britain when Cæsar first invaded Britain. The descendants of these Cimbri formed the largest portion of the nation at the time of the Norman conquest, notwithstanding the incoming of the three tribes of Jutes, Angles, and Saxons six centuries before; and a portion of them still know themselves by their old name of Cymry, utterly ignoring the name which we English give them of "Welsh." From this Celtic race sprang the chief nations of Western Europe, which appears to have been peopled throughout from the earliest ages by the descendants of the Japhetic stock: none of the Semitic race are known in history to have attempted any conquests in Europe.

2. Magog, the second son, appears to have been the ancestor of the great race of Scythians, who in the seventh century were dominant in the country between the Caucasus and Mesopotamia, and who gradually spread over the northern parts of both Europe and Asia.

3. Madai, the third son. Of him, Rawlinson says in his Origin of Nations, "there cannot be the shadow of a doubt, that in placing Madai among the descendants of Japheth, the author of Genesis x. intended to notify that from that patriarch sprang the great and powerful nation of the Medes" (p. 172). The Medes were the progenitors of those known in modern times by the names of Indo-Europeans and Aryans. These latter are found in each of the three great stone inscriptions of Darius King of Persia (b.c. 521—485) at Behistun, Persepolis, and Nakhsh-i-Rustam, indicating the inhabitants of a province which formed part of Media. Herodotus (vii., 62.) tells us that "originally the Medes were called by all people Aryans."

4. Javan, the fourth son. This is said to be the nearest expression in Hebrew of the Greek term rendered as "Ionians," the original form of which in Greek was Iafon-es. Hence the Orientals used this term invariably of the Greeks, and eventually of the Latin races as well; and these two nations, Greeks and Romans, have for upwards of 2000 years dominated in Europe and the rest of the world.

5 and 6. Tubal and Meshech are the ancestors of those
races which inhabited the districts of Tobolsk and Moskow, and now represented by the mighty Empire of Russia.

7. TIRAS, the seventh and youngest son of Japheth. This is the most obscure of all the names in the Japhetic list. Josephus informs us that by the name of "Tiras" the Thracians are the people intended. And it is the belief of the best of modern ethnologists that the Thracians were the progenitors of the Teutons, the Thracian tribe of the Getae having grown into the great nation of the Goths; while the tribe of the Daci, or Dacini, became the ancestors of the modern Danes. Of the former, Herder thus speaks:

"From the shores of the Black Sea, the arms of the Germans were terrible throughout Europe. One Gothic empire extended formerly from the Volga to the Baltic. In Thrace, Italy, Gaul, Spain, and even Africa, different German nations, at different periods, settled and founded kingdoms.

"By them all the modern kingdoms of Europe were founded, their distinctions of rank were introduced, and the elements of their jurisprudence were inculcated. More than once they attacked, took, and plundered Rome. Several times they besieged, and even made themselves masters of Constantinople. At Jerusalem they founded a Christian Monarchy; and in the present day, partly by the princes whom they have seated upon every throne in Europe, and partly by the kingdoms they have founded, they exercise more or less dominion, either as possessors, or by their manufactures and trade, over all the four quarters of the globe." 9

Such is the statement respecting the settlement of one of the Japhetic races in Europe by a master in ethnological science; which, says another, when writing on the same subject—

"Basing itself on the facts of language, lays it down as a grand discovery that one of the great families into which the human race is divided comprises the five divisions of—1, Aryans; 2, Celts; 3, Teutons; 4, Grecio-Italians; and 5, Slavics. Moses, anticipating this discovery by a space of above 1000 years, gives as members of one family—1, Madai, or Aryans; 2, Gomer, or Celts; 3, Tiras, the Thracians (Teutons); 4, Javan, the Ionians (Greeks); and 5, Magog, the Scythians and Sarmatians (Slavics)." 1

8 Josephus, Antiq. i. 6, § 1.
9 Herder's Philosophy of Man, b. xvi., c. iii.
1 Rawlinson's Origin of Nations, p. 178.
Hence, says Lenormant, in speaking of Noah's prophecy respecting Japheth—

"La race de Japheth est donc celle que l'on désigne aussi, pour peindre l'étendue de ses domaines, sous le nom d'Indo-Européene. C'est celle à laquelle nous appartenons.... Cette bénéédiction et cette prophétie se sont accomplies, car la descendance de Japheth n'est pas devenue seulement la plus nombreuse et la plus étendue, elle est aussi la race dominatrice du monde, celle qui chaque jour encore s'avance vers la souveraineté universelle." 2

The subject of Noah's prophecy may be thus summarily expressed.

1. That the descendants of Ham should serve those of his brethren.
2. That a peculiar blessing should be with the descendants of Shem.
3. That the descendants of Japheth should possess great temporal dominion.

The name Ham signifies "burnt," or "black," which was peculiarly applicable to the countries occupied by this race, as seen from the earliest times by the monuments of Egypt in the ancient Ethiopian, and retained by the modern negro. The kingdoms of Egypt and Babylon, the latter formed by Nimrod "the mighty hunter," and the first Empire of Assyria, with its ancient capital of Nineveh, as well as the later nations of Tyre and Sidon and Carthage, were all formed by the descendants of Ham; and their condition at the present day compared with what they once were, and what the kingdoms and empires formed by the descendants of Japheth now are, tells with sufficient clearness its own tale. When it is remembered that Egypt for many centuries after the Noachian Flood was chief among the nations of the earth, and that she has become during the Christian dispensation exactly as Ezekiel foretold twenty-four centuries ago, "the basest of the kingdoms: neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them that they shall no more rule over the nations," 3

2 Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne de l'Orient, par Francois Lenormant, i., p. 20.
3 Ezek. xix. 15.
THE SUPREMACY OF JAPHETh.

we have one of the many proofs which history affords of the truth of Scripture prophecy.

It is interesting also to note that supremacy among the nations, when it ceased with the race of Ham after the days of the Ramessian kings of Egypt, of whose reigns, i.e., of the first three kings of that dynasty, we have now such ample records, remained for many centuries with the descendants of Shem, as seen in the second empires of Assyria and Babylon, until it finally passed to the Greeks and Romans of a Japhetic stock, with whom it has remained ever since.

As the name of Canaan is thrice repeated in Noah's prophecy, and he seems to have first come under the curse as a "servant of servants unto his brethren" for reasons already given, we see how far this was fulfilled in ancient times. The earlier abominations of the descendants of Canaan were visited by the vengeance of heaven on the guilty cities of Sodom and Gomorrah; which subsequently ended in the expulsion, extermination or subjugation of the Canaanites by Moses, Joshua, and David. So great were the impieties of this guilty race, that "the land itself vomited out her inhabitants" in order to make room for the descendants of Shem, in the person of the children of Israel.

Procopius, in his history of the Emperor Justinian and the wars of Belisarius in Mauritania, relates that—

"The Girgashites and the Jebusites, and other nations mentioned in the history of the Hebrews, formerly inhabited Canaan, and on their expulsion from that country by Joshua, first sought a settlement in Egypt, but not being admitted there, passed on through the north of Africa, building many cities, until they passed the pillars of Hercules."

Procopius further mentions that near a fountain in Tingitana (the present Tangiers) are two stela of white stone, thus inscribed in Phœnician letters—

"WE ARE THOSE WHO FLED FROM THE FACE OF THE ROBBER JOSHUA, THE SON OF NUN."

As the genuineness of this inscription has been questioned by Ewald and other Rationalists, it is satisfactory to know that

4 Lev, xvi, 25. 5 Bell. Vand., ii. 10.
Moses Chrenenses mentions it in his *History of Armenia*, i. 8, and that it has been accepted by such authorities as Bochart, Selden, Grotius and Rawlinson. If the history of the ancient world proves the stern reality of the curse upon the descendants of Ham, the history of modern times demonstrates the fact more clearly still. Since the time when Egypt became "the basest of kingdoms," and the Carthagarians of the race of Canaan were annihilated by the rising power of Rome sprung from a Japhetic stock, what people or what state of Africa has been anything save one long continued series of misery, degradation and crime? And if there be one thing in the history of the world more truly horrible than any other, or which more exactly fulfils the conditions of the prophecy respecting the curse on the posterity of Ham, it is that of the *African slave trade*. When the European, three centuries ago, found that the constitution of the negro fitted him for hard labour under a burning sun, he eagerly coveted his services in the newly-discovered field of commercial enterprise. Thus the white man made the black man his victim, sending the kidnapper to entrap him, establishing slave depots on the coast of Africa, treating him in all respects as an article of ordinary commerce, as was recently the case in the United State of America, where he used to be reckoned as "chattels;" and reducing to a regular system an accumulation of horrors which are almost too foul for the historian to repeat. But the wickedness of man illustrates the truth of God, by accomplishing His faithful word. And a more exact fulfilment of the prophecy which foretold Ham's descendants becoming "a servant of servants to his brethren," than that which the slave trade has so long afforded, it is impossible to conceive.

The word *Shem* in Hebrew signifies "renown," which was peculiarly characteristic of that patriarch's descendants, both in a temporal as well as spiritual sense. The finest regions, and the most fertile portions of the globe—viz., all South Asia, including Arabia, Assyria, Mesopotamia, Hindostan and China—were allotted to the Semitic race. The chief "renown,"
however, of Shem's posterity was that the six great religions of the world, the false as well as the true, came from this race—viz., Judaism, Christianity, Brahmanism, Buddhism, Confucianism, and Mohammedanism. Jehovah was essentially the God of Shem in a peculiar manner, just as He was the God of Abraham because of the covenant made with him; for Shem and Abraham were destined to be lineal ancestors of the blessed "seed of the woman," the Redeemer of mankind, the subject of a still earlier prophecy delivered on the occasion of Adam's fall. And to this Noah may have alluded in the devout ejaculation, "Blessed be Jehovah, the God of Shem!" And how accurately Noah's prophecy concerning the blessing of Jehovah as the God of Shem has been accomplished, let the condition of the nations which profess Christianity in the present day, as compared with their state before the promulgation of the Gospel, tell its own tale.

The third branch of Noah's prophecy refers pointedly to the enlargement of Japheth, whose name in the Hebrew tongue has that signification: "God shall enlarge Japheth, and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant." The Hebrew of "enlarge" is letter for letter the same as the name Japheth. The prophecy looked forward to the wide territory which was eventually the lot of the Japhetic race, extending through the four quarters of the globe. And history records the amazing enlargement of the boundaries of the race of Japheth; whose posterity diverged eastward and westward, after having first peopled Europe in its entirety, through the whole extent of Northern Asia as far as the Eastern Ocean, whence they probably crossed into America by what is now called "Behring's Straits." Thus they gradually enlarged themselves, until in course of time they encompassed the earth, as seen in the European powers of the present day.

Nearly 2000 years elapsed after the family of Noah emerged from the ark, before this enlargement of Japheth can be said to have commenced. His descendants first passed from Europe into Asia, appropriating to themselves the inheritance of the
race of Shem; from thence they passed into Egypt, subduing the descendants of Ham. The long career of conquests by the Greek and Latin races, both of whom were descended from Japheth, over the descendants of Ham and Shem, could never have been foreseen by human sagacity. Many causes combined to expect encroachment upon the Japhetic race, such as superiority of wealth and numbers among the descendants of Shem, rather than the reverse. Nor was this unattempted. The great struggle between the Persians and Greeks was an attempt on the part of Shem to dwell in the tents of Japheth; and how plainly history records the former's discomfiture need not be said. Three hundred of the sons of Japheth are said to have stopped at Thermopylae the legions of Persians who sprang from Shem. Marathon, Plataea, and the great victory of Cimon at the Eurymedon by land, Salamis and Mycale by sea, alike tell the same tale of myriads of Asiatics falling before the avenging sword of Greece. And when in later years the Greeks became united under one head in Alexander "the Great," they poured with incredible celerity from the Hellespont to the Indus, and from the Indus to the outer border of Egypt. And Greece, which presents so small an appearance on the map of the world, may be thus said to have made parts of Asia and Africa entirely her own. Moreover, the permanent success of Alexander's conquests presents a striking contrast with the ephemeral ones of Napoleon over nations like his own of the Japhetic stock; inasmuch as his rapid rise, and still more rapid, deservedly rapid, fall, can only be compared to the gourd of Jonah, which came up in a night and perished in a night. Whereas large portions of Asia and Africa have been permeated for ages by the laws and institutions of Greece. Greek was the language of the court, of the government, and the world of letters; and there was spread over Asia, from the Ægean to the Indus, and back again to the Lybian desert, an outward veneer of Greek civilization, and thus the first step was taken respecting Japheth's foretold supremacy over the descendants of both Ham and Shem.

But if "the enlargement of Japheth" began by the great
victories of Alexander, still greater, still more important, and far more enduring were the conquests of the Romans, sprung from the same stock, and destined in the course of time to rule the world. At the commencement of the great struggle between Rome and Carthage, prolonged through three wars, Carthage was a great city, originally founded by the descendants of Ham, containing nearly a million of inhabitants, possessed of a fertile country at home, and mistress of Sicily and Sardinia abroad. She was able, after the contest had commenced, to add Spain to her other colonies; so that, had she been permitted in the providence of God to have added Italy to her dominion, Carthage, and not Rome, might have achieved the conquest of the world. But it was ordered otherwise, and notwithstanding the wonderful abilities of Hannibal, and his repeated victories over the Latin race, the end came at last. Nearly half a century after the great conqueror of Rome had passed away, came Scipio Africanus the younger, who, though he knew not the God of Israel any more than Cyrus did, was yet, like Him, an instrument in God's hands for bringing mighty events to pass which had been foretold in Scripture, and which thus became Fulfilled Prophecy. The resistless sword once wielded by Joshua of the line of Shem, was placed in the hands of a descendant of Japheth, and the remnant of Canaan of the race of Ham, from whom the Carthaginians sprung, now fell beneath its edge. Carthage was destroyed as completely as ever Jericho and Ai had been, and made like them a perpetual desolation. And the words which the Roman historian puts into the mouth of Hannibal, Agnosco fatum Carthaginis, were fulfilled to the bitter end.

History records that no sooner was Rome delivered from the

---

6 Supremacy amongst the nations of the earth from the dispersion at Babel unto the present day may be thus defined. For the first half from about B.C. 2350, it was divided between the Hametic and Semitic races, such as Egypt, Assyria, Israel and Babylon. For the second half it rested with the nations descended from Japheth, such as the Greeks and Romans, and all the Aryan races which have settled down in Europe, and have gradually formed the Christendom of modern times.

7 Livy, lib. xxvii.
only rival which seemed likely for a time to be able to compete with her, than she rapidly advanced to universal empire. Corinth was taken the year in which Carthage was destroyed; and Macedonia, the hereditary kingdom of Alexander, submitted at the same time. Soon all Greece owned the sovereignty of Rome; and after Greece, Asia; and after Asia, Egypt. So that when Augustus Caesar shut the temple of Janus B.C. 8—7, and the promised Deliverer in the person of Jesus Christ was born, Rome was the mistress of the civilized world, which in the first century of the Christian era extended from Hadrian's wall in Scotland in the North, to the banks of the Euphrates in the far East. The words of Noah were then literally accomplished, "God shall enlarge Japheth; and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem, and Ham, the father of Canaan, shall be his servant."

The supremacy of Japheth has been seen in modern times in a still more marked manner than it was even in the culminating period of the Roman Empire. The three chief races which have settled in Europe within the last 2000 years, and from which the greatest modern nations have come, are the Sclavens, the Teutons, and the Celts, represented in the present day by Russia in the first, Germany and England in the second, France, Spain, and Portugal in the third. Before the Reformation of the 16th century, the last three representatives of the Celtic race were wonderfully enlarged by the discovery of the Western Hemisphere, and by their obtaining possession of the greatest part of North and South America. Since the Reformation, the enlargement of Japheth is seen in the two most extensive and powerful nations of modern times, viz., Russia, of Slavonic descent; and England, like Germany with her powerful army, though the most hybrid nation in the world, yet chiefly sprung from the Teutonic race. And how wonderful has been the enlargement of Japheth, as witnessed by the extension of the British Empire within the last two centuries! Superior to Rome at the height of her power in extent of territory and population, the words of the poet Cowper, in his Ode to Boadicea, have been more than realized:—
"Regions Caesar never knew
Thy posterity shall sway;
Where his eagles never flew
None invincible as they."

"There is no prophecy in the Bible," says that distinguished Orientalist, Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, "to my mind, which has been more forcibly, and so truly and wonderfully fulfilled as this; and I only wonder that any one reading these passages and comparing them with what has been taking place for the last 2,500 years, after a lapse of 43 centuries, could ever doubt the inspiration of the Pentateuch; but the fickle and carnal mind of man would rather believe an imaginative argument of a fellow-man than trust to more sacred truths. The descendants of Japheth, represented by the Romans, Greeks, Medes and Tartars, have been holding under their sway not only the Holy Land, but all the country which was formerly governed by different descendants of Shem, viz., the Assyrians, the Arameans, the Chaldeans, and the Arabians; and even now, when the Turk is reviled and detested not only in Europe but in Asia, he occupies the dwellings of Shem, and to reform or dispossess him of his sway requires more than the human brains of the greatest statesmen in Christendom can accomplish."

Such is a brief sketch of the way in which Noah's prophecy respecting supremacy to the descendants of his son JAPHEH has been literally fulfilled amongst the nations of the earth.

---

CHAPTER III.

THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

The condition of the twelve tribes of Israel during the last eighteen centuries, since the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, affords a stronger testimony to the truth of the "sure word of prophecy," than even the Supremacy of Japheth; for some who have not studied ethnology may dispute the fact of the European nations having sprung from Japheth; but no one, unless bereft of reason, can deny that the Jewish race have undergone a series of sufferings during that period, greater and of longer continuance than any other nation since the world began. Moreover, Balaam's prophecy concerning the twelve tribes of Israel, "Lo, the peopleshall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations,"⁹ has been verified by history in a way which testifies in an irresistible manner to the truth of God's word. For the condition and existence of the Jewish race in this world at the present time, and their wonderful preservation amidst the entire disappearance of nations contemporaneous with their own, notwithstanding the ravages of war, the wear of time, and the ceaseless hostility of the Gentiles, affords us ample assurance that, though according to the prophecy they have been literally for centuries, as Moses foretold, "an astonishment, a proverb, and a byword among all nations,"¹ they will one day be restored to the land of their fathers, and assume a very different position from what they have been in the past; and the signs of the times appear to show that their "redemption draweth nigh."²

A modern writer, when describing the present condition of the Jews, has truly observed that we thus have—

⁹ Numb. xxiii. 9. ¹ Deut. xxviii. 37. ² St. Luke xxii. 28.
"A preacher such as never preached to a reckless world before, on repentance and judgment to come, since the days of Noah; a preacher who bears the signs of his commission stamped upon the man, both in body and mind; a preacher who, like Adam, can speak from experience of the sorrows of ruin and degradation; a preacher who has been preaching ever since the Church of Christ upon earth began, and shall preach until the end draws nigh. What? Is there indeed a corner of Christendom unpenetrated by that mysterious stranger, who bearing in his peculiar features the lineaments of Abraham, and thus, at a glance, announcing to us from what high estate he hath fallen; cherishing in his spirit all the sullen pride of ruined greatness exhibiting in his dealings all the caution and timidity of the despised stranger; attracting by his attachment to the carnalities of the abrogated law continued mockery and derision; moving by his superstition, his obstinacy, and his blindness, the pity of some, the contempt of others, the neglect of all; deprived even of the only ordained assurance of pardon, by being denied all means of sacrifice; and holding in his hand the Word of God without a spirit to understand it;—is there, indeed, any Church in Christendom before which the Jew, this awful monitor, has never appeared? Oh! his prophetic character seems to cling to him still; everywhere he appears as God's herald to warn against disobedience, to proclaim His judgments; and wherever he appears there should be, as in the presence of the prophets of old, humiliation and awe. Thus doth this preacher, traversing daily Christ's kingdom, unceasingly admonish churches and individuals; and standing in our luxurious cities, should be to us as Jonah amid Nineveh, summoning us to repentance and mourning." 3

The history of the Jews during the last eighteen centuries plainly confirms the prophecies of Moses respecting their predicted sufferings if they refused to hearken to the voice of Jehovah, as delivered to them by the mouth of His servants and prophets. Before they entered on the inheritance of the land, which God had promised to Abraham and his seed as an "everlasting possession" if they kept His word, Moses was inspired to foretell, in the fifth volume of the Pentateuch, or Book of Deuteronomy, as it is usually termed by Christians, the judgments which would overtake the children of Israel if they disobeyed the law of their God; and which their subsequent transgressions, their repeated rebellions, their persistent idolatries, as evidenced in the worship of the golden calf at the
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3 The Church of God, by the Rev. R. W. Evans, p. 89.
time of the Exodus, and other abominations such as the worship
of Baal and other heathen idols during a thousand years, down
to the time of their captivity in Babylon, as well the culmina-
ting point of their crimes as witnessed in their rejection of the
promised Saviour, and their crucifixion of Him who would have
delivered them, together with their fearful imprecation uttered
in the Judgment Hall of the Roman Governor, "His blood be
upon us and on our children," the echoes of which have been
reverberating throughout Christendom during the last eighteen
centuries,—all these things combine to show alike the cause of
as well as the judgment itself, which has been inflicted on
that guilty race.

"It shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord
thy God, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee....
The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation and rebuke in all that
thou settest thine hand to do .... The heaven that is over thy head shall
be brass, and the earth that is under thee shall be iron. Thou shalt
be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth ... The Lord shall smite
thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart. Thou shalt
be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee. Thy
sons and thy daughters shall be given unto another people, thine eye shall
look and fail with longing for them all the day long; and there shall be no
might in thine hand. The fruit of thy hand, and all thy labours,
shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be only
oppressed and crushed away. Thou shalt become an astonishment, a
proverb, and a byword, among all nations whither the Lord shall lead
thee ... The stranger that is within thee shall get above thee very high;
and thou shalt come down very low ... He shall be the head, and thou shalt
be the tail ... The Lord shall bring a nation against thee from far, from
the end of the earth, as swift as the eagle flieth; a nation whose
tongue thou shalt not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which
shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favour to the young ... 
And he shall besiege thee in all thy gates, until thy high and fenced walls
come down, wherein thou trustedst, throughout all thy land, which
the Lord thy God hath given thee. Thou shalt eat the fruit of thine
own body, the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters in the siege, and in the
straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee ... If thou wilt not
observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, then
the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed,
even great plagues and of long continuance ... And ye shall be left few in
number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou
wouldest not obey the voice of the Lord thy God. And ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it. And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there you shall serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind. And thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shall have none assurance of thy life: In the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see."

What language can adequately describe the sufferings and persecutions of the poor, blinded, and scattered children of Israel during eighteen centuries of misery, degradation, and ruin! Yet we must attempt to show briefly how fully all that was predicted by Moses of the descendants of the twelve tribes of Israel, has been literally accomplished since they have been "removed into all the kingdoms of the earth," and have become "an astonishment, a proverb and a byword among all nations, whither the Lord has led them." Shortly before our blessed Master was rejected by His own people, and put to a cruel death, at the time which Daniel 5 had predicted to a day, and nearly six centuries before it came to pass, he had foretold, according to the testimony of the synoptic Gospels, that when His disciples, who heard Him speak, should see Jerusalem encompassed with armies, and the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, set up in the holy place of the Temple, that this would be the beginning of that tribulation which Moses had predicted would be of long continuance, when the children of Israel would fall by the edge of the sword, and be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem would be trodden down by the Gentiles, as it is to this day, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.

Within forty-two years after these words were uttered, all
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4 Deut. xxviii. 15—67.
5 Daniel's prophecy concerning the cutting off of the Messiah was delivered in the first year "of Darius the Mede," the Viceroy of Cyrus, B.C. 538.
6 Matt. xxiv. ; Mark xiii. ; Luke xxi.
was literally accomplished. Jerusalem was surrounded by the Roman armies, and when after the desperate resistance of the Jews, which enabled them to resist the power of Rome for some years, Jerusalem fell, then the idolatrous ensigns of the Roman armies were erected in the Temple "over against the eastern gate," and "sacrifices were offered" to the gods of the heathen. Titus gave orders for the entire demolition of the city and the Temple, which was done so effectually, that, as Josephus says, "there was nothing left to make those who visited the spot believe that the place had ever been inhabited." The Talmudists and Maimonides alike mention—

"That Turnus, or Terentius Rufus, captain of Titus' army, did with a ploughshare tear up the foundations of the Temple; and did thereby signally fulfil those words in Micah iii. 12, 'Therefore shall Zion for your sakes be ploughed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest.'"

Jeremiah (xxvi. 18), two centuries later, quotes this prophecy of Micah in justification of his warning to the reckless Jews at the time of the Babylonian captivity. There is no historical record of the ploughshare having then passed over Jerusalem; though it certainly did after the Roman conquest. It is, however, doubtful whether this actually occurred after the war by Titus, or sixty years later, after the revolt of Bar-cochab, during the reign of Hadrian; for by a singular coincidence the demolition of Jerusalem was committed by Titus to one of his generals named Terentius Rufus; and the Roman prefect in Palestine at the commencement of Bar-cochab's revolt, named Tynnius, was called by the Rabbies Tyrannus, or Turnus Rufus "the wicked." This has caused some confusion among historians, who record the fact of Jerusalem having been "ploughed up" according to the prophecies of Micah and Jeremiah.

7 Josephus, B. J., vi., c. vi., § 1. Tertullian tells us in his Apology, that "the religion of the Roman soldiers consisted almost entirely in worshipping their ensigns, in swearing by them, and in preferring them before all other gods." (ch. xvi.)
8 B. J., vii., c. i., § 1.
From this time commenced that memorable tribulation of long continuance predicted by Moses, which has continued with more or less severity for the last eighteen centuries, and which elicited from the greatest of their native historians the admission—"All the calamities which have ever happened to any from the beginning, seem not comparable to those which befel the Jews." Archbishop Usher gathers from Lypsius that the number of Jews who perished in the seven years' war amounted to no less a number than 1,337,490.

Although the war did not actually last quite three and a half years, yet, as Josephus records, four years before the war began, one Jesus, the son of Ananus, a small farmer, when Jerusalem was in peace and prosperity, came into the city at the Feast of Tabernacles, and commenced to cry aloud in the Temple, "A voice from the East, a voice from the West, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the holy house, a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides, and a voice against this whole people." This cry, says Josephus, he continually kept repeating day and night for the space of "seven years and five months," without growing hoarse or being tired therewith, until the very time that he saw his presage fulfilled in earnest by the siege, when it suddenly ceased; for one day, as he was crying with his utmost force, "Woe! woe! woe to the city again, and to the people, and to the holy house!" just as he added at the last, "Woe! woe! woe to myself also!" there came a stone from one of the engines, which struck him and killed him.9

Besides the numbers already mentioned who were slain during the war, Josephus speaks of the 97,000 captives, adding that "the multitude of those that perished exceeded all the destructions that either men or God ever brought upon the world." The Jewish Rabbies, in relating the history of that mournful period, unconsciously adopt the solemn language of the Apocalypse, and declare that "the horses during that war waded up to their bits in carnage." During the siege, when some hundreds of the Jews daily stole out of the city in the vain

9 Josephus, B. J. vi., c. v., § 3.
attempt to procure a morsel to alleviate the intolerable pangs of hunger, the Roman soldiers seized them, first whipped them, tormented them, and then crucified them; Titus consenting, in the hope that the seditious inside the city would yield when they saw the tortures to which their fellow-countrymen were exposed. So the soldiers, as Josephus relates, "out of wrath and hatred which they bore the Jews, nailed those they caught, one after one way and another after another, to the crosses, by way of jest, when their multitude was so great, that room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses wanting for the bodies."  

At the termination of the siege, when the Roman soldiers were tired with slaughtering the wretched Jews, and nearly 100,000 captives remained to be disposed of, after selecting the tallest and most beautiful of the young men for his triumph at Rome, "Titus ordered all above seventeen years of age to be put in bonds, and sent to the Egyptian mines (as Moses predicted); and likewise sent a great number into the provinces as a present to them, that they might be destroyed upon their theatres by the sword and by wild beasts; while those under seventeen years of age were to be sold for slaves."  

After the infliction of this severe punishment on the children of Israel the whole of the surrounding country became a desert, while wolves and hyænas went howling through the streets of the desolate cities. A great fair was held under the historic Terebinth tree, beneath which it was believed that Abraham, the great patriarch of the Jewish race, had 2000 years before pitched his tent. Thither, says Dean Milman, speaking of the revolt in the second century, "his miserable children were brought in droves, and sold cheap as slaves; others were carried away and sold at Gaza; others were transported to Egypt."  

Since that time, every age and every part of the globe has witnessed the massacres, the persecutions and oppressions, by heathen and Christian alike, of that doomed race once raised so very high, and then brought down so very low. Half a century after the destruction of Jerusalem, they had recovered sufficient strength to raise a revolt against the Roman power.
during the reign of the Emperor Hadrian. The horrors which
the Jews first inflicted on the Greek inhabitants of Cyprus
and of Egypt, and which the Romans subsequently repeated
upon the Jews, will scarcely bear mention. The loss was
enormous; their own traditions report that as many fell in this
revolt as Scripture enumerates the number of the Israelites
who came out of Egypt with Moses, viz., 600,000. Dion
Cassius, the historian of Rome, puts it down at 580,000 (ch. ixix.)
as the number of those who were killed, besides a vast number
who were consumed by famine, and sickness, and fire during the
time of this lingering war, which was caused partly by the
persecutions under which the Jews had been suffering for the
last half century, and partly by the expectation of their pro-
mised Deliverer appearing. The episode of Rabbi Akaba and the
impostor Bar-cochab is too long to be detailed here: suffice
it to say, that when the revolt against the Roman power was
determined upon, the hoary and enthusiastic Rabbi introduced
the impostor to an assembly of the people as “the star
that is come out of Jacob; for the days of the redemption
are at hand.” Such was the introduction of the pretended
Messiah, one of the many false Christs of whom our Lord
had forewarned His disciples, who was first called Bar-
cochab, “the son of a star,” but subsequently called by his
disappointed followers Bar-Cosba, “the son of a lie;” who from
a robber had learned the magician’s trick of keeping lighted
tow in his mouth, by which he was enabled to breathe forth
flames, to the terror of his enemies and the unbounded con-
fi dence of his partisans.

Unfortunately, this second Jewish war against the Roman
power had no Josephus to record its history; and the details
we possess must be gathered from the scanty notices of Dion
Cassius and the legends of the Talmud. Julius Severus, the
most able of the generals which Rome then possessed, had been
sent for out of Britain, to effect the final destruction and sub-
jugation of the Jewish race. Commencing with the due
cautions of an experienced general, Severus speedily succeeded
in destroying 50 of their strongest fortresses, as well as 985 of
their most populous towns, when the slaughter was so immense that all Judæa was, as Dion says, in a manner laid entirely bare, and became a "waste, howling wilderness." The Emperor Hadrian, to annihilate for ever all hopes of the restoration of a Jewish kingdom, established a new city on the site of Jerusalem, peopled by a colony of foreigners. This was named Ælia Capitolina, and dedicated to the chief of the heathen gods, Jupiter. Of the capitol Gibbon declares, what Milman doubts, that "either from design or accident a chapel was dedicated to Venus on the spot which had been sanctified by the death and resurrection of Christ." 3 Christian historians, such as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Eusebius, Sulpicius Severus, together with the Babylonian Talmud, are agreed in declaring that an imperial edict was promulgated prohibiting any Jew from entering the new city on pain of death, or even approaching its environs, so as to contemplate at a distance its sacred heights. And in order to carry more completely into effect this severe edict the image of a swine was erected over the gate leading to Bethlehem, where nearly a century and a half before the true Messiah had been born.4

In the third century the Jews rebelled against the Roman power in the reign of Alexander Severus, and suffered greatly in consequence. In the following century, Chrysostom declares that "the Jews again rebelled in the time of Constantine; who, causing their ears to be cropped off, dispersed them as vile fugitives and vagabonds in various countries, where they carried this mark of infamy along with them, that all might be instructed to make no more such attempts." 5

In the fifth century, Socrates relates that in consequence of fresh rebellions they were driven out of Alexandria, where they had been settled since the time of Alexander the Great, and dispersed in various countries; showing how the Jews were at one time deceived by an impostor who pretended to be Moses,

3 Decline and Fall, ch. xxiii.
4 The Jewish war ended A.D. 136; and the true date of the Nativity was probably B.C. 7.
who had come down from heaven to lead them to their own land through the sea, into which many threw themselves and miserably perished. 6

In the seventh century they were again expelled from Jerusalem, whither they had so often attempted to return, by the Emperor Heraclius, in consequence of the hatred which the Jews still bore to the followers of Him, whom their fathers had crucified. For when Chosroes II., King of Persia, invaded Syria, the Palestinian Jews sided with the invader, with whom they entered Jerusalem, then a Christian city, and perpetrated a dreadful slaughter of its inhabitants. Horrible to relate, they are said to have purchased cheaply the captives of their allies for the sake of putting them to death. The victories of Heraclius, however, quickly put a stop to their momentary triumph.

During that century the Spanish Jews experienced the first of those sweeping proscriptions under the Gothic kings, which they subsequently suffered in almost every part of the civilised world. Edicts were made against them with this significant title, "Statutes against Jewish wickedness, and for the general extirpation of Jewish errors." The edicts which Hadrian had issued five centuries before for the suppression of Judaism—such as forbidding the rite of circumcision, reading the law of Moses, and the observance of the Sabbath-day—were repeated by the eighth Council of Toledo, A.D. 653; and subsequent councils passed still more rigorous laws against them. One hundred lashes on the naked body, chains, mutilation, banishment, and confiscation, were the punishment of those who practised Jewish rites. The acts of the twelfth Council of Toledo concerning the Jews, carried refinement in persecution to the highest possible pitch. Under King Egica, when the Saracens were spreading along the African shore opposite Spain, a rumour of a general conspiracy of the Jews was noised abroad, and a decree was passed to disperse the whole race, sell them as slaves, confiscate their property, and seize all their children under seventeen years of age to be brought up as Christians.

An interesting episode in the history of outcast Israel and scattered Judah is connected with the city of Toledo. When it was recovered from the Moors by Alfonso, King of Spain, A.D. 1085, the Jews of that city waited upon the conqueror, and assured him they were part of the ten tribes whom Nebuchadnezzar had transported into Spain, and not the descendants of the Jerusalem Jews who had crucified Christ. Moreover, they pointed to the proof that when Caiaphas, the High Priest, had written to the Toledo Synagogue to ask their advice respecting the person who was then going through the Land of Promise proclaiming Himself as the promised Messiah, and how He should be treated, the Toledo Jews returned answer that in their judgment the prophecies seem to be fulfilled in this person, and that therefore He ought not to be slain. This reply they produced to Alfonso in Hebrew and Arabic, as translated by command of King Galifre. Alfonso listened to the story, and had the letter rendered into Latin and Castilian, and deposited among the archives of Toledo. The Castilian version is printed by Sandoval, p. 71, as a letter from "Levi, Chief of the Synagogue, with Samuel and Joseph of of Toledo, to Eleazar, High Priest, with Annas and Caiaphas, the Holy Land. Salutation in the name of the God of Israel."

As we have here one of the few instances of the ten tribes of Israel being mentioned in any authentic record of history, it may be well to give a brief summary of this portion of the once favoured race of Abraham. Although they appear to have been free from the crime of having put to death the Son of God, as was the case with the other two tribes composing the house of Judah, there is no doubt that Moses' prophecy included alike the descendants of all the twelve tribes, which were known after the death of Solomon until the Babylonish captivity, as the kingdoms or houses of Israel and Judah.

We gather from Scripture, and this has been amply confirmed by the disentombment of the Assyrian monuments, and the marvellous skill by which Oriental scholars have deciphered the Cuneiform inscriptions, that in the seventh and
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Eighth centuries B.C., Tiglath-pileser, Sargon, and Esar-haddon were the instruments in God's hands for deporting the whole of that guilty nation of the kingdom or house of Israel from Samaria, and settling them in various parts of the Assyrian empire. We learn from what has just been said that Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, was the first to alter the scene of their captivity by translating a colony of them to Spain, which so far confirms the testimony of that ancient writer Megasthenes, who mentions that Nebuchadnezzar's conquests extended as far as "the Pillars of Hercules." The apocryphal Book of Esdras speaks of a large emigration—which probably occurred in the fifth century B.C.—of the Israelites from Media to a country called "Arsareth," which is supposed to represent a part of Roumania, not far from the shores of the Black Sea. Josephus, in the first century of the Christian era, speaks of the ten tribes as existing in his day, "beyond the river Euphrates, and now so vast a multitude as not to be estimated on account of their numbers." Jerome, writing four centuries after Josephus, says—"The ten tribes of Israel inhabit to this day the cities and mountains of the Medes, as their fathers did a thousand years before." Benjamin of Tudela, a famous Jewish traveller of the twelfth century, made various attempts to discover his lost brethren; and mentions them in his Travels, when visiting the Jews of Androva, on the north-west of the Caspian Sea. He says, "In Samarcand, the city of Tamerlane, there are 50,000 Jews, under the presidency of Rabbi Obadiah; and in the mountains and cities of Nubor, there are four tribes of Israel now resident there, viz., Dan, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali." Rabbi Petachia, of Ratisbon, who followed Benjamin of Tudela about half a century later, when speaking of his "forty days' pilgrimage from the tomb of Ezekiel to the river Sambation," says, "Beyond the deep and broad Sambation dwell the remnant of the ten tribes of the house of Israel in independence, awaiting the advent of the promised Messiah."

7 Euseb. Prep. Evang., lib. x. 8 Esdras xii. 40—48. 9 Antiq. of Jews, xi., c. v., § 2. 1 Commentary on Hosea, c. i.
History records little more respecting the whereabouts of the ten tribes of Israel during the 2000 years which had then elapsed since the time of their deportation by the kings of Assyria; and it remained for our own day to witness the flood of light which has been thrown upon outcast Israel as a people, and their amalgamation with their dispersed brethren of the house of Judah, by the discovery of the Karaite Cemetery in the Crimea, which is of so important and interesting a nature that we must endeavour to give a brief account of the same.

In the year 1839, at the request of Prince Woronzoff, Governor of Odessa, and President of the Archæological Society of Russia, the Karaïtes of Eupatoria, in the Crimea, who may be regarded as the Protestants of the Jewish religion, appointed Abraham Firkowitsch, the Chacham, or chief communal professor among them, to draw up a report of the monumental inscriptions on their tombs, and the Hebrew Rolls of the Old Testament possessed by the Karaïtes in the Crimea. Firkowitsch visited Tschufut Kalah, i.e., "the Jews' Fortress," the seat of a very ancient Karaïte community, and other places in the Crimea, when he collected fifty-one Biblical MSS. and fifty-nine copies of old tomb inscriptions. On the occasion of a second visit in 1853, he carried off to St. Petersburgh no less than seven hundred copies of these inscriptions, taking squeezes of one hundred of the most important, in order that there might be no error in the transcript. In 1863, he had eight stones containing inscriptions sawn off, and carried to St. Petersburgh. Professor Chwolson and Adolf von Neubauer have given accounts of these interesting inscriptions, as well as the Hebrew Rolls and MSS., which vary in point of age from the fifth century b.c. to the eleventh century A.D. One of these Rolls, marked No. 2, and written in "the 1501 of our exile," answering to A.D. 804, says—

"We must inscribe here the wonders which God has done for us, as who can recount what has happened to us all during the fifteen hundred years we have lived in this exile. We have come into the hands of fire-worshippers and of water-worshippers; they have plundered, wasted, and shed our blood; they have taken our sacred books, and made mockery of
the same. Our latest enemy, Prince Gatam, would have destroyed us, had not God sent us help in our brothers, the Chazars, who have become Jews, with their Prince Nissam at their head. These have saved our sacred Rolls, and have captured the fortress Theodora in the year in which we are now living, 4565 of the creation, 1501 of our exile; so may God continue to help us, and to send Elijah our prophet in our days! Amen."

Other records discovered by Firkowitzsch fully prove, what various Arabic authorities have asserted, that in consequence of one of the Chazar kings having been converted to the Jewish religion, there set in a most flourishing era of peace for the Chazar monarchy, which lasted 150 years, from the middle of the ninth to the end of the tenth century, where Jews, Christians, and Mussulmans lived peaceably together, when the laws of the Chazars, in anticipation of the nineteenth century, proclaimed liberty of conscience to all mankind. The Prime Minister was an Israelite; six other ministers of state consisted of two Jews, two Christians, and two Mussulmans; when a happy period of peace and prosperity ensued until A.D. 1000, at which time the Chazar monarchy was overthrown, and the remnant of the Israelites were driven further westward, and settled in the Crimea and on the shores of the Black Sea.

Professor Chwolson relates that the Jews of Mangelis, a village near Derbend, had concealed an ancient record in the walls of their old synagogue, which, on being brought to light, proved to contain various facts relative to the history of the ten tribes of Israel, since their dispersion from the land where they had been originally carried captive by the kings of Assyria. One of these facts is stated as follows:—

"I, Joshua ben Elijah, one of the Karaites, found the text of the Travels of Jehudah ben Mosheh Misrachi, which Abraham ben Simcha, of Kertsch, had copied from an inscription on an old Pentateuch Roll in Hamadan. I copied it (A.M.) 5273 (A.D. 1513) on Tuesday, fifth month Sivan, on the Eve of Pentecost.

"I, one of the faithful in Israel, Abraham ben Simcha, of Kertsch—A. Exil. 1682 (A.M. 4746 = A.D. 986), when the envoys of the Prince of Rosh,

2 Derbend is a town in the kingdom of Bokhara, about 300 miles north of Cabul, and 1200 miles east of the cities of Media, the scene of the original captivity of the ten tribes of Israel.
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Meshech, and Tubal, came from the city of Kiow to our master the Chazar Prince David, in order to search into matters of religion—I was sent by Prince David to Persia and Media in order to purchase ancient copies of the Pentateuch, Books of the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, for the Chazar communities. In Elam (Ispahan) I heard that in Shusham (Hamadan) an ancient Roll existed, which the children of Israel shewed me when I came there. At the end of this Roll was inscribed the description of the Travels of Rabbi Jehudah the Corrector."

The inscription of Jehudi reads thus:—

"I, Jehudah Misrachi, son of Mosheh, of the tribe of Naphtali, which was exiled with the captives carried away together with Hoshea, King of Israel, and the tribes Simeon and Dan, as well as some families of the other tribes of Israel, which Shalmaneser had exiled from Samaria and its daughter cities to Halah, and Habor (Cabul), and Hara (Herat), and Gozan, to the places of exile of the sons of Reuben and Gad, and half the tribe of Manassah, which Pileser had exiled, and permitted to settle there, and from which they have been scattered throughout the entire East, even as far as China (Isaiah xlix. 12) . . . . I returned from wandering in the Crimea amid the dwellings of the families of Israel and Judah, the exiled from Jerusalem, when under the Kings of Media, Cyrus, and Cambyses they obtained possession of the Crimea, and settled there. Thus the exiles of Shalmaneser and of Nebuchadnezzar were mingled together in one people."

Abraham ben Simcha (A.D. 986) says:—

"They are also our brethren, the Jews, which Titus carried away first to the Grecian cities Byzantium and its neighbouring towns, from which they have spread since the time of Julian (A.D. 361—363), the friend of the Jews and Emperor of Byzantium, to the city of Trapezunt, &c.; wherefore they speak Greek to the present day."

There is a point of some moment to be determined in connection with these transcripts. It appears that Abraham ben Simcha, when he discovered the old Pentateuch Roll in Hamadan, with the description of the travels of Jehudah the Corrector, adds, "The Jews told me that the father of Jehudah was the first inventor of the vowel signs and accents:’’ from which Professor Chwolson infers that "about the middle of the tenth century Rabbinical envoys from Jerusalem came to the Crimea to propagate their opinions; and they pointed the Biblical MSS., which were before without points.’’ But this is by no means certain; as Chwolson’s conclusion appears to rest
upon the assumption that the visit of Abraham ben Simchab's visit to the Crimea A.D. 986, and Jehudah's, were made in the same century. Whereas the words of Jehudah seem to imply a far earlier age; though their chief importance rests upon the statement that "the exiles of Salmaneser, (i.e., the ten tribes of Israel) and the exiles of Nebuchadnezzar (i.e., the house of Judah and Benjamin) were mingled together in one people."

We have already seen that the Jews were expelled from Jerusalem by the Emperor Heraclius (A.D. 628), at which period we might naturally suppose the amalgamation of the twelve tribes again into one people took place; but the inscription which Firkowitzh discovered at Mangeliis, near Derbend, shows that the Greek-speaking Jews, descended from the Jerusalem captives of Titus, came there towards the close of the fourth century, more than 200 years before Heraclius expelled the Jews from their city of Zion, when doubtless the amalgamation began to take place; and again renewed in the seventh century, when driven forth by the hostility of Christians from the land of their fathers. Hence, observes Dr. Davidson in his remarks on the Karaite inscriptions of the Crimea—

"If the remains of the ten tribes are to be sought in one or more regions not very remote from each other, they should be found in Caucasasia and the Crimea, where the Israelites preserved the memory of their captivity, as the old grave inscriptions testify."

It was in this century that the Mohammedan religion was founded, and its leader, by the precepts of the Koran, has infused into the minds of his followers a spirit of intense hatred towards the despised Jew. In all Mohammedan countries, Persia, Arabia, Egypt, Africa, and Turkey, they have been treated with the utmost cruelty, mockery and scorn. "It is impossible to express," says Miss Pardoe, a distinguished writer on Turkey, "the contemptuous hatred in which the Osmanlis hold the Jewish people, and the veriest Turkish urchin who may encounter one of the fallen nation on his path, has his mite of insult to add to the degradation of the outcast and wandering race of Israel." She records also an
instance of the literal fulfilment of one of Isaiah's prophecies—
"As for my people, children are their oppressors; I will give
children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them;"—on seeing a Turkish child ten years of age striking to the
ground a feeble Jewess, and the manner in which the boys
amuse themselves by tormenting and abusing Jews. 3

It was not so, however, at the rise of the Mohammedan
religion. Within five years of the Hegira (July, A.D. 622),
the Emperor Heraclius burnt alive a whole synagogue full of
Jews at Jerusalem, after he had induced them to surrender
on the promise of sparing their lives. And the frightful
persecutions which the Jews of Spain in the seventh century
received at the hands of the Goths, made them receive with
open arms the Mohammedan invaders, who, with a liberality
which ought to have put Christians to shame, restored them to
complete liberty of person and property. The forced con-
versions which took place in the Byzantine empire during the
eighth and ninth centuries compelled large migrations of Jews
to seek refuge in the Crimea and the borders of the Caspian Sea,
in order to avoid acceptance of a faith they had such good
reason to detest.

During the next two centuries history does not record much
respecting the sufferings of the despised Jews, until we come to
the era of the Crusades, when the fanaticism of nominal
Christians was inflamed to an extraordinary degree against
them. Speaking of the first Crusade for the recovery of the
Holy Land from the Saracens, A.D. 1096, Gibbon says, "Of
these and other bands of enthusiasts, the first and most easy
warfare was against the Jews, murderers of the Son of God.
In the trading cities of the Moselle and the Rhine their
colonies were numerous and rich; and they enjoyed, under the
protection of the emperor and the bishops, the free exercise of
their religion. At Verdun, Treves, Mentz, Spires and Worms,
many thousands of that unhappy people were pillaged and
massacred; nor had they felt a more bloody stroke since the

3 Isa. iii. 4, 12; Miss Pardoe's City of the Sultan, p. 363; Al Koran,
ch. xvii., entitled, "The Night Journey revealed at Mecca."
persecution of Hadrian. A remnant was saved by the firmness of the bishops, who accepted a feigned and transient conversion; but the more obstinate Jews opposed their fanaticism to the fanaticism of the Christians, barricaded their houses, and precipitating themselves, their families, and their wealth into the rivers or the flames, disappointed the malice, or at least the avarice, of their implacable foes.”

David Ganz, a Jewish chronicler, speaking of the same Crusade, declares that “the Jews felt it a most calamitous time, being robbed, and pillaged, and killed by the Christian soldiers as they marched along.” The sufferings of these children of Israel so much moved the eminent St. Bernard, that he wrote to his brother-clergy and people not to persecute them; “for they are,” he observes, “dispersed into all lands, that while they suffer the just punishment of their horrid wickedness, they may be witnesses of our redemption.”

In the following century the condition of the Jewish race seemed to be still more dismal. As there appears to be a progress in the calamities which Moses foretold would overtake the whole people of Israel if they preferred the worship of heathen deities to that of the true God, so it proved in the event, as their sufferings grew greater and greater. For in 1142 no less than 120 of their congregations were utterly overthrown. They were expelled from France and Germany, and spoiled of their worldly goods; and, as Rabbi Levi Ben Gersom records, “sent away with only their clothes upon their backs.” Rabbi Zacut complains of no less than ten grievous persecutions in his own age, when, he says, it was attempted to “abolish the very name of the Jews out of the world.”

In the second volume of the *Monumenta Franciscana* we have an account of the treatment which the Jews were accustomed to receive in England in that century. Under the head of A.D. 1250, the following tale is given. “This yere a Jew felle in-to a drawte on a Saturday, and he wolde not be drawne owte that day for the reverens of hyss Sabbot-day, and Sir Richard Clare,
that tyme beyng erle of Gloucheter, seynge that he wolde not be drawne owte that day, he wolde not suffer hym to be drawne owte on the Sonday, for the reverensof the holy Son-
day, and soo there the falsee Jue perished and dyde therein."

In the thirteenth century England became especially noted for her persecution of the despised and hated children of Israel. The whole nation united in the endeavour to get rid of this detested race. The scene enacted twelve centuries before at the rock of Massada, a strong fortress in Palestine, where a thousand Jews perished by the mutual slaughter of themselves, their wives, and their children, was repeated *literatim at verbat-
tim* at York; when 1500 of the Jewish people, including women and children, being refused all quarter, frantic with despair, mutually killed one another. Each master was the murderer of his own family, when death became their only deliverance. The barons of England, to their infamy and shame, in order to ingratiatethemselves with the populace during their contest with Henry III., ordered 700 Jews to be slaughtered at once, their houses to be plundered, and their synagogue to be burnt. A contemporary chronicler 6 recording the events of 1240, mentions that at Norwich four Jews, charged with having circumcised a Christian boy with Jewish rites, were torn asunder by horses, and then hanged. Another chronicler 7 says in the year 1279 as many as 280 Jews and Jewesses were hanged in London, besides multitudes in other cities of England, for clipping the king's coin; all the Jews being arrested in one day. The sovereigns of England often extorted money from them by the most unscrupulous means; and the extortions of Henry III. at length became so enormous, that they had at length sought permission to leave the king-
dom. But even this was denied them, until the "greatest of the Plantagenets," as Henry's son has been justly named, granted them permission to depart; and four centuries elapsed until they were permitted to return by the wise permission of the great Protector Oliver Cromwell.
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When Edward I., in 1290, banished the Jews from the realm of England, 16,000 of them were allowed to remain on their conforming to the outward profession of Christianity; and these must have intermarried with the native English, and the distinction of race become lost in the surrounding population. Just as occurred seven centuries later, when Mr. Disraeli, the son of Jewish parents, having been surreptitiously baptized in infancy, entered Parliament at a time when it was forbidden to a Jew, married an English lady, and eventually rose to be Prime Minister. A curious testimony has been borne to the sufferings of the Jews in Spain by this distinguished Jewish family. Several of the family are buried in the Hebrew burial-ground, Mile End Road, London; the tombs of Lord Beaconsfield's grandfather and other relatives have recently been restored; and the inscriptions on the repaired sepulchres give some interesting information relative to the family of the Disraelis. The tomb of Abigail Mendes Furtado, mother-in-law of Benjamin Disraeli the elder, records that, after suffering the torture of the Inquisition in Portugal, she fled to England, where she educated her children in the Jewish faith.

Sir Walter Scott, in one of his historical romances of that period, describes the Jews as "a race which during the dark ages was alike detested by the credulous and prejudiced vulgar, and persecuted by the greedy and rapacious nobility. Except, perhaps, the flying fish, there was no race existing on the earth, in the air, or on the waters, who were the objects of such an unremitting and relentless persecution, as the Jews at this period. It is a well-known story of King John, that he confined a wealthy Jew in one of the royal castles, and daily caused one of his teeth to be torn out, until, when the jaw of the unhappy Israelite was half disfurnished, he consented to pay a large sum which it was the tyrant's object to extort from him."

The historian Hallam likewise speaks of the sufferings of the Jews during the middle ages in the following terms:—

"They were everywhere the objects of popular insult and oppression, frequently of general massacre. A time of festivity to others was often the season of mockery and persecution to them. It was the custom at Toulouse
to smite them on the face every Easter. At Beziers, they were attacked with stones from Palm Sunday to Easter, an anniversary of insult and cruelty generally productive of bloodshed, to which the populace were regularly instigated by a sermon from the bishop. It was the policy of the kings of France to employ them as a sponge to suck their subjects' money, which they might afterwards exact with less odium than direct taxation would incur. It is almost incredible to what a length extortion of money from the Jews was carried. A series of alternate persecution and tolerance was borne by this extraordinary people with an invincible perseverance, and a talent of accumulating riches which kept pace with the exactions of their plunderers. Philip Augustus released all Christians in his dominions from their debts to the Jews, reserving a fifth part to himself. He afterwards expelled the whole nation from France.\(^8\)

During the twelfth and three following centuries they were repeatedly driven forth from France and Germany, whenever a sufficient number of them had secretly crept back to excite the notice and hostility of the governments; while in Italy, Hungary, Poland, and Spain persecutions awaited them which it would be too tedious to recount. And in this last country the storm was so overwhelming, that, as they confess in a Rabbinical work called *Juchasin*, upwards of 200,000 were compelled to turn Christians in order to save their lives. While in Portugal, the terrible words of Moses' prophecy, "Among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life,"\(^9\) appear to have been accomplished with more than usual severity, by that dreadful massacre of the Jews which was made at Lisbon for three days together; where, as Bishop Patrick in his Commentary records—

"Men were not suffered to die of their deadly wounds, but were dragged by their mangled limbs into the market-place, where the bodies of the living and the slain, with others half alive, half dead, were burned together in heaps, which spectacle was so horrible that it quite astonished the rest of this wretched people, 2000 of whom perished in this barbarous manner. Parents durst not mourn for their children, not children sigh for their

\(^8\) Hallam, vol. i., pp. 233, 4.  
\(^9\) Deut. xxviii. 65, 66.
parents, when they saw them haled to the place of torment: so that their hearts no doubt were ready to break with grief and sorrow."

Their banishment from Spain is recorded by a Jewish author in these words:—

"A decree was made and proclaimed publicly, that all the Jews should change their religion in three months' time. Abarbanel, who had then a place at court, petitioned the king to revoke the edict, and be content with those estates which they offered him; but all in vain, for 300,000 old and young, men and women, and he among the rest, went away upon foot one day, not knowing whither to go. Some went to Portugal, others into Navarre, where they conflicted with many calamities; for some became a prey to wild beasts, or perished by famine and pestilence. Others committed themselves to the sea, hoping to find rest in some other countries. But on the sea they met with new disasters; for many were sold as slaves when they came on any coast, many were drowned, many burnt in the ships which were set on fire; in short, all suffered the just punishment of God the Avenger: for after all this, a plague came and swept away the rest of the miserable wretches, who were hated by all mankind; so that all that vast number perished by one calamity or other, except a very few."

Sufficient has been said concerning the condition of this despised and persecuted race during so many ages of the Christian era (and the spirit which has recently been evoked against them in Germany and Russia gives us an idea of what the sufferings of the Jews must have been during the dark ages), to prove how exactly their history verifies the most minute predictions of what Moses 3500 years ago had predicted should befall them, if they were disobedient to the laws which God gave them. The bare recital of facts by both Jewish and Christian authors ought to be sufficient to convince the most sceptical that Moses was inspired of God; and the records of history, too well authenticated to be disputed, afford the best testimony to the truth of those prophetic denunciations against the Israelites so fully set forth in chapter xxviii. of the Book of Deuteronomy. One of the most distinguished of the French Protestant historians has well said respecting the condition of the Jewish race:—

"Kings have often employed the severity of their edicts and the hands of the executioner to destroy them: the seditious multitude has performed
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massacres and executions infinitely more tragical than the princes. Both kings and people, heathens, Christians, and Mohammedans, who are opposite in so many things, have united in the design of ruining this nation, and have not been able to effect it. The bush of Moses, surrounded with flames, has always burnt without consuming. The Jews have been driven from all places of the world, which has only served to disperse them in all parts of the universe. They have from age to age run through misery, and persecution, and torrents of their own blood." 2

It must be plain enough to every believing Christian that the condition of the Jewish people during the last eighteen centuries since the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, is the most powerful evidence, save to those who are wilfully blind, to the truth of "FULFILLED PROPHECY." This, however, is strenuously denied alike by the avowed infidel and the semi-sceptic. Respecting the former, we see the force of our Lord's warning words, "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead."

Of the latter we have a painful specimen in a work which created some noise a few years ago—probably more because it was published under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, than for any merit of its own. I refer to a work entitled, The Argument from Prophecy, by the Rev. Brownlow Maitland, which has been justly described by a distinguished Biblical critic as—

"Another of the many insidious attempts which have been made of late years to undermine the faith of Christian men: an indirect denial of the teaching of the Church concerning Holy Scripture. Mr. Maitland has taken prophecy for his special province, and resolved it into Forecast... If the author has rightly understood the nature and office of prophecy, there is no help for it but that our Divine Lord and His apostles must have been even scandalously mistaken, and are to be regarded as untrustworthy guides in a very high degree.... Here is a clergyman disdaining for himself all pretensions to learning, who yet refers to every most famous specimen of ancient predictive prophecy, only in order to cast discredit on it: insinuating distrust in one quarter, openly avowing disbelief in another: giving us nothing in exchange for what he takes away, and never assigning a reason for the thing he does. Here is one who seems religiously to abstain from the accumulated stores of Hebrew learning which are accessible to every one in

2 Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, vi. 1., § 1.
the writings of Dr. A. Mc Caul and Dr. W. H. Mill; of Dr. Pusey, of Dean Payne Smith, of Professor Gandell, of Dr. William Kay: but whose sympathies appear to be entirely with the unbeliever. To all appearance, he has thrown in his lot with the Rationalistic school, and is willing to be one of its apostles. He reproduces the old exploded errors, revives the old thread-bare objections, and warns his reader against so much as a single real instance of predictive prophecy exists.”

Severe as this judgment is against the reasoning of Mr. Maitland’s Argument from Prophecy, it is well deserved, as a careful study of his book sufficiently shows. Nor was the courteous reply which the Archbishop of Canterbury gave to Mr. Maitland’s appeal on his own behalf less damaging to the author, since the primate remarks with just force—

“... You seem to me to exhibit an almost exaggerated candour in admitting the force of the reasoning of sceptical critics. ... If I were arguing in favour of the divine origin of Christianity, with a man who had unfortunately convinced himself of the accuracy of all Bishop Colenso’s conclusions concerning the authenticity and genuineness of the Pentateuch, I should naturally base my arguments on propositions which had no connection with the erroneous criticism to which he was pledged; but I should take care to give my opponent no shadow of ground for supposing, that because I avoided controverting those criticisms, I believed them to be incontrovertible.”

This is a just reproo of one who surrenders every point of importance to man’s unwearied foe, who, as good old Latimer quaintly said, is a bishop never out of his diocese, but watching ceaselessly to destroy the Christian religion. Satan is ever trying to separate not only Christians, but also one piece of evidence from another. For he well knows that our strength lies both in the union of Christian men and also in the cumulative force of Christian arguments when taken together. Though Mr. Maitland seems to admit the force of the “cumulative argument” (p. 18), he appears to argue as if the reasoning of Dr. A. Kuenen, a noted Dutch infidel, was to be accepted (p. 21) in preference to Davison, a distinguished interpreter of prophecy on the orthodox side (p. 30).

Many passages might be collected from Mr. Maitland’s
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works to show his readiness to admit what he calls the "powerful attacks" of our foes at the expense of our friends who are valiant in the cause of truth. I shall, however, confine myself to two passages, in which Mr. Maitland's style of enforcing the "argument from prophecy" is sufficiently apparent.

Respecting the well-known historical fact of the dispersion of the Jewish race throughout the world on account of their sins, and their not being mixed up with the nations where they have been scattered, but dwelling always alone, as Balaam foretold 3500 years ago, and as Moses so fully sets forth in the 28th chapter of Deuteronomy, the evidence of its truth is so overwhelming, as we have already seen, that those only who are permeated with infidelity can doubt it or dispute its force; nevertheless, Mr. Maitland contents himself with observing—

"To some persons, the predictions of this remarkable event (the dispersion of the Jewish people) seemed to furnish one of the most convincing and unanswerable proofs of supernatural prescience. But there can be no doubt that the fact of modern critical research has been materially to weaken its evidential force" (pp. 190, 191, first edition).

Mr. Maitland either becoming conscious of the impropriety of such a bold and utterly false conclusion appearing in a work published under the auspices of a Society claiming to be "Christian," or gradually awakening to the serious mistake he had committed in putting forth a statement so contrary to fact as an argument in support of prophecy, endeavoured to modify the effect of his error in a second edition, by expressing himself in the following way.

"It is true that in the treatises on Hebrew prophecy which preceded the application to the Sacred Scriptures of the methods of scientific criticism, the predictions of this remarkable event (the dispersion of the Jewish people) were very generally relied upon, as furnishing one of the most convincing and answerable of supernatural prescience in the prophets of Israel; but there can be no doubt that the argument thus framed is less potent than it was, and that the effect of modern critical research has been, whether justly or not, materially to weaken its evidential force" (pp. 190, 191, second edition).
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There is not very much difference between Mr. Maitland's style of argument in the two editions of his work; but such as it is, it seems to shew that he is partly conscious of the error he has committed, as well as the unwisdom he has displayed, in so readily surrendering one of the strongest proofs of the value of evidential prophecy which Holy Scripture affords against our infidel foes.

But Mr. Maitland thinks to support the duty of surrendering by the following admissions.

Speaking of Leviticus xxvi. and Deuteronomy xxviii., which foretell as plainly and as clearly as language can express that in the event of the disobedience of the twelve tribes of Israel, "I, Jehovah, will scatter you among the heathen, and your land shall be desolate and your cities waste... and thou shalt become an astonishment, a proverb and a byword among all nations whither the Lord shall lead thee," Mr. Maitland says—

"On these remarkable chapters, although, strictly speaking, they are rhetorical and minatory rather than predictive, the argument securely rested, so long as the Mosaic authorship of them passed unchallenged. But the aspect of the question is greatly altered now that the sceptic can allege that these very chapters are among the foremost of the passages to which many modern critics, on historical and philological grounds, have most confidently assigned a date posterior to the fall of the kingdom of Israel" (pp. 191, 2),—i.e., nearly 1000 years after the age of Moses!

It is difficult to decide whether simplicity, ignorance, or unbelief could have induced a clergyman professing to uphold the Argument from Prophecy, to make use of such reasoning as this. It may be the part of an infidel to speak of the solemn denunciations of Jehovah against His chosen race if disobedient, conveyed to them by their great lawgiver Moses, who spake as he was "moved by the Holy Ghost," to be merely "rhetorical" effusions—anything rather than acknowledge the truth and force of prophecy, so wonderfully fulfilled as it has been during the last 2000 years, that it may be regarded as a standing miracle visible to the world during that prolonged period; but it is impossible that any Christian should adopt such reasoning in defence of the faith. Mr. Maitland contends that
the argument of the Christian is no longer tenable, because certain German infidels have boasted that they have proved Moses, as Volney boasted in respect to Christ, to be nothing better than a myth of the same reality as the Egyptian Osiris; and that the Pentateuch is a forgery of many centuries later than the exodus of the children of Israel!

Whether Mr. Maitland is as simple minded as the Zululander who perverted Bishop Colenso, I cannot say; but for any one in the present day who pretends to be an upholder of the value of prophecy, to admit that Colenso or all the sceptics, whether German or English, from Astrue down to the present day, have in the slightest degree shaken the testimony which our heavenly Master has borne to the words of Moses, and which has been the unswerving belief of both the Jewish and the Christian Churches for the last 3,500 years, betrays such lamentable ignorance of the value of the prophecy, that we can only feel pity for the man who thus endeavours to uphold so unrighteous a cause.

It may be well, however, to quote one or two authorities in confutation of Mr. Maitland’s style of reasoning respecting the genuineness and authenticity of the Pentateuch, or as it is so frequently termed, “the law of Moses.”

“It is to me incredible,” says the late Dean Milman, who was the reverse of anything like a bigot in favour of what is rightly termed the orthodox view, “that the books of Moses could be written after the exile, or even during the monarchy, or the seeming anarchy which preceded the monarchy . . . . The internal evidence in the Mosaic records is to me conclusive. All attempts to assign a later period for the authorship, or even for the compilation, though made by scholars of the highest ability, are so irreconcilable with facts, so self destructive, and so mutually destructive, that I acquiesce without hesitation in their general antiquity. Especially as now, after the discovery of written characters in Egypt, perhaps elsewhere, certainly anterior to the Exodus, all difficulty as to there having been written documents of some length in the time of Moses vanishes away.”

The Prisse Papyrus now in the Louvre is a case in point. It is a lengthy written document belonging to Manetho’s
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fourth dynasty of Egyptian kings, and is fully five centuries prior to the time of Moses. As a specimen of the infidel reason for rejecting the books of Moses, Von Bohlen, a noted German sceptic, adduces the fact of Pharaoh having given Abraham amongst other presents "asses and sheep," as a proof that the writer of Genesis never could have been in Egypt, because, as he says, the Egyptians did not possess such useful animals; whereas Sir Gardner Wilkinson, in his Ancient Egyptians (i. 130, second series), describes a tomb, whose owner lived in the reign of Pharaoh Suphis, more than a century before the time of Abraham, on which is inscribed his numerous stock, and amongst other animals mention is specially made of "asses 760, and sheep 974." So much for a sceptic's objection to the authenticity of the Pentateuch.

Mr. Maitland has apparently relied upon Bishop Colenso for his assertion that the passages in the Pentateuch foretelling the dispersion of the Jews belong to "a date posterior to the fall of the kingdom of Israel;" but if he had remembered the contempt with which the bishop's criticism were received by Hebrew scholars, whether Jews or Christians, he would probably have hesitated before following so unsafe a guide.

Some specimens of this are given in the Rev. Joseph McCaul's pamphlet, Bishop Colenso's Criticism Criticised, from which I make the following extracts. Dr. Hermann Adler, son of the Chief Rabbi in London, in a letter to the Athenæum, says—

"Dr. Colenso assigns as one of the reasons why it had been left to him to discover the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch, the little progress which Biblical studies have as yet made among the English clergy, and the neglect of the study of the Hebrew language. Dr. Colenso is not, I fear, much in advance of his brethren. A Jewish child would set the bishop right on this point, &c. Who but a smatterer in Hebrew would pervert the plain language of Deuteronomy xxiii. 12, in the way which Bishop Colenso does?"

In a similar strain a Hebrew clergyman of the English Church, the Rev. Alex. Levi, writing to the Record, observes, that "unbelieving Jews are scoffing at the recent whimsical
display of ignorance and audacity on the part of an English bishop."

If any one wishes to see a conclusive reply to the wild assertions which are so common in the present day against the Pentateuch, he cannot do better than carefully study three of the essays in *Aids to Faith*, viz., "On the Genuineness and Authenticity of the Pentateuch," by Professor Rawlinson; "The Mosaic Record of Creation," and "On Prophecy," both by the late Dr. McCaul, Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, King's College, London, probably the ripest Hebrew scholar of the nineteenth century.
CHAPTER IV.

THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

How pathetic the lament which Christ uttered over the doomed city of Zion, then probably at the culminating point of its earthly grandeur, but which the divine mind foresaw within a very few years would be so entirely destroyed, that the prophecy delivered eight centuries before—"Zion should be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem become heaps"—would be literally and exactly fulfilled, as the Talmud admits was the case, when Terentius Rufus, the Roman general, tore up the foundations of the Temple with a plough-share,—"O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets, and stonest them that are sent unto thee; how often would I have gathered thy children together, as a hen doth gather her brood under her wings, and ye would not! Behold, your house is left unto you desolate: and verily I say unto you, Ye shall not see me, until the time come when ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."  

Does our Lord give us any clue to consider when this time shall be? I think so. Although it is quite certain from many passages of Scripture that "no man knoweth the day or the hour, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only"—relative to the time of Christ's second Advent, when Israel shall sing, "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord"—Christ has left His church a sign by which the faithful may know when the end draweth nigh.

In the address delivered by Christ to His disciples from the mount of Olives, when they had called His attention to the beautiful buildings of the Temple, on the restoration of which Herod had spent enormous sums during the previous half
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6 Micah iii. 12. 7 Luke xiii. 34, 35. 8 Matt. xxiv. 36.
THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

century, He told them, “Verily I say unto you, There shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down . . . . . . And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations: and then shall the end come. When ye, therefore, shall see the abomination of desolation, spoken of by Daniel the prophet, stand in the holy place—whoso readeth, let him understand—then let them which be in Judæa flee into the mountains.” 9 Or as St. Luke reports the same address, Christ said, “When ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know the desolation thereof is nigh. Then let them which are in Judæa flee into the mountains . . . . for there shall be great distress in the land, and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled.” 1

There are some Futurists who interpret the report of these two evangelists, as if they were recording two different events; but this is a very grave mistake, as history shows that the early Christians understood our Lord’s words in such a manner, as to have been preserved from the destruction which overtook the Jewish nation when Jerusalem was captured by the Roman army. Josephus records with surprise that Cestius Gallus, after commencing the siege of Jerusalem, all of a sudden, without any apparent cause, raised the siege and withdrew his army, when the city might have been easily taken; by which means the Christians were enabled to make their escape, which they accordingly did, and passed over the Jordan to a place called Pella, and other mountainous districts, in remembrance of their Master’s warning. They remembered that He had told them, when Jerusalem was seen surrounded with armies, they were to know that “the abomination of desolation,” foretold by Daniel, would shortly be set up in the Temple, and were to take occasion, so unexpectedly afforded them, of escaping from the doomed city, and to flee to the mountains. And this warning

---

was intended not only for those residing in the city, but for all "which are in Judaea," as the horrors of the Roman invasion extended over the whole country.

The Jews in Jerusalem neglected the warning, and consequently perished, as our Lord in another pathetic lament had distinctly foretold: "When he was come near to Jerusalem, he beheld the city and wept over it, saying, If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes. For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side." When Titus resumed the siege which Cestius Gallus had raised, one of his first acts was to dig a trench and build a wall round Jerusalem, five English miles in length, with thirteen forts, all of which was done "in three days," by which means the Jews were so tightly enclosed in the city that no one could henceforth escape. Then came the siege, the fall and destruction of the city. The miserable remnant who were not slain in the siege were carried captive into all nations; and Jerusalem has been trodden down by the Gentiles ever since.

Our Lord's prophecy respecting the fall of Jerusalem is further amplified. "They shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." The time of the ministry of John the Baptist, of Christ Himself and His apostles, previous to the fall of Jerusalem, embracing a period of about half-a-century, was the time of visitation to the children of Israel in a way of mercy; which being disregarded, they have suffered from another kind of visitation in a way of wrath and vengeance ever since. The cause of the destruction of Jerusalem was undoubtedly the Jews' rejection of Jesus Christ as the promised Messiah; but they pretend to assign other causes for the fatal event. The Talmudists, however, do not quite agree among themselves on
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this point. Jerusalem was destroyed, says R. Abai, because the people profaned the Sabbath (Ezek. xxii. 26); says R. Abbu, because they ceased reading the Shema morning and evening (Isa. v. 11—13); says R. Hamenuna, because there were no more children of the school of Rabban (Jer. vi. 11); says R. Ula, because there was no more shame among the people (Jer. vi. 15); says R. Isaac, because small and great were placed on the same level (Isa. xxiv. 23); says R. Amram, because they did not reprove one another (Lam. i. 6); says R. Judah, because they despised the disciples of the wise men, as it is said in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16. With the exception of this last reason, which is so far true as it applies to the Incarnate Son of God and His apostolic messengers, it is quite evident that the Jewish authorities endeavoured to shift the true cause of their ruin, and to ascribe it to every other reason save the real one.

Hence, in addition to the mocking way in which the true Messiah is spoken of by the Talmudic doctors, they have invented a series of legends to manifest their hatred of Titus, who was as much an instrument in God's hands for their punishment, as Nebuchadnezzar had been seven centuries before, or as Cyrus, "my shepherd, saith the Lord," had been when appointed to restore the captives of Judah and Israel to the land of their fathers. Thus they manifested their bitter hatred against that famous Roman conqueror Titus in the following terms:—They gloat over his shattered health, which they attribute to divine vengeance, and among their legends they minutely record the nature of his sufferings. They say that he desecrated the Temple on Mount Zion with orgies very suitable to the shrine of Venus. Assailed on his return from Italy, and nigh perishing by tempest, he had impiously exclaimed, "The God of the Jews who drowned Pharaoh has power on the waters, but I am more than His match on land." Jehovah suffered him to gain the shore, when He sent a gnat to creep into the nostrils of the scorner, and to lodge itself in his brain. For seven years the restless insect banqueted upon his inside, One day, the emperor passing near a blacksmith's
forge, appeared to be arrested by the noise of the hammer. Four pieces of silver daily (£5 sterling) did the sufferer give to have the same noise continued in his ears without ceasing. At the end of thirty days the insect became accustomed to the clang, and resumed his ravages. Phineas, the son of Erouba, was present, with the chief nobles of Rome, at the emperor's death. They reported that when the head of the deceased was opened, a bird was discovered in the brain as large as a swallow, with a brazen beak and claws of iron!

Such were the foolish legends which the blind outcast Israelites in their rage and malice invented, in order to account for the destruction of their nation by the youthful conqueror, (Titus being only 29 at the time), who was as clearly God's appointed agent in the punishment of that doomed race, for their committal of the greatest crime recorded in the annals of the world. And it is not a little remarkable that their frenzied cry, "His blood be on us, and on our children," received so signal a fulfilment within so brief a period as forty-two years after its utterance. Moreover, the character of him who effected their ruin, and whom they so viciously reviled, is not only singularly free from the vices and crimes which stained the most part of the heathen Caesars, but Titus, by his virtuous conduct during the combined reigns of his father and his own, has deservedly earned from his admiring countrymen, as our own Alfred did in a more circumscribed area eight centuries later, the title of "The darling and delight of mankind."

The Roman conquest of Jerusalem has afforded the most striking testimony which time has left us of the truth of our Lord's prediction concerning that city. The sculptures on the well-known arch of Titus at Rome have been bearing their silent witness for upwards of eighteen centuries—a record of the desolation which our Lord foretold would come upon the nation—its capital and its glorious Temple, which was always deemed her proudest boast, as the palace of the city of the Great King—for more than a thousand of years the bond of national union, the centre of the affections of every loyal son of Israel; which fell at last only when its faithless people
departed from the covenant of their fathers—rejecting the King whom God had sent to reign over them; and scornfully refusing all offers of the Gospel of His grace, until the Temple and city were utterly destroyed, and the "sinful and foolish people" scattered in every quarter of the globe.

Moreover, in the arch of Titus we have at the present time an unexceptionable witness to the truth of "the book of the Law of Moses," as it is so frequently termed in Scripture, notwithstanding all the efforts which atheists, infidels, semi-sceptics, and half-informed Biblical critics have brought against it. When the children of Israel were delivered from their Egyptian bondage by the mighty hand of God, and Moses went up into the mount to receive from Jehovah oral instructions for making the Tabernacle and its appurtenances thereof, amongst a variety of other ornamental decorations, he was commanded to make a seven-branch candlestick of pure gold, or more exactly a candelabrum with seven golden lamps, which was required to be kept always burning during the hours of darkness, as a substitute for the natural light of day. When the candelabrum of the Tabernacle was transferred to Solomon's Temple five centuries later, there were ten golden candlesticks added, on account of the superior size of the Temple over that of the Tabernacle.

All these were carried away by Nebuchadnezzar at the time of the destruction of the first Temple, B.C. 589, and formed a portion of the desecrated vessels of the sanctuary on that memorable occasion when Belshazzar made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and the mysterious handwriting appeared on the wall, "MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN." When Cyrus restored these vessels to "Sheshbazzar, the Prince of Judah," after the seventy years' captivity in

---

* Of the many places where the Pentateuch is so named it will be sufficient to mention the following, which embraces a period of over a thousand years: Joshua viii. 31; 2 Kings xiv. 6; Nehemiah viii. 1.
* Exodus xxv. 31; xxvii. 20, 21; xxx. 7, 8; Lev. xxiv. 2, 3.
* 1 Kings vii. 49; 2 Chron. iv. 7.
* Daniel v. 1, 25.
* Ezra i. 7, 8.
Babylon had expired, we find in the Temple built by Zerubbabel only the single candlestick which Moses had originally made for the Tabernacle in the wilderness, which remained in situ until the destruction of the second Temple, which Herod had so gorgeously restored, and wherein the Saviour had taught previous to its destruction by the Romans, A.D. 70. It was then carried to Rome with other spoils, and forms the most conspicuous feature on the arch of Titus. A good photograph of this ancient sculpture will convey to the mind an exact representation of the seven-branch candlestick, which the Almighty had commanded Moses in the mount to make nearly 3500 years ago.

It may be interesting to enquire what became of the originals of these memorials of the Tabernacle in the wilderness after having been transferred from Asia to Europe, from Jerusalem to Rome, and which are still to be seen in all their pristine exactness sculptured on the arch of Titus, by far the most interesting memorial of that city, which in its pagan pride called itself "eternal," but which, like Thebes or Babylon, would have had its name erased from the earth, as Gibbon observes, "if the city had not been animated by a vital principle, which again restored her to honour and dominion. A vague tradition was embraced, that two Jewish teachers, a tent maker and a fisherman, had formerly been executed in the circus of Nero, and at the end of 500 years their genuine or fictitious relics were adored as the Palladium of Christian Rome." ¹

The arch of Titus bears the following simple inscription:

\[\text{Senatus Popvlvsque Romanvs} \]
\[\text{Divus Tito Divi Vespasiani F. Vespasiano Augusto} \]

The term \textit{Divus}, or "Deified," shows that it must have been

---

⁹ Maccabees i. 21; iv. 49.
¹ Gibbon's \textit{Decline and Fall}, chap. xlv.
erected after Titus' decease,² and sufficiently proves the estimation in which the conqueror of Jerusalem was held by his grateful countrymen after death, as compared with the feelings entertained by the same people towards some of his intensely wicked predecessors, such as Tiberius, Caligula, or Nero.

Another inscription discovered in the Roman circus mentions that the arch was erected in honour of Titus; and after recounting the high offices which he had held in the state, it adds, that, acting under his father Vespasian's counsels and auspices, he had subdued the Jews, and destroyed Jerusalem; which had either not been attempted by any previous generals, kings, or people, or had been attempted in vain.³ This tends to confirm the truth of Josephus' graphic narrative respecting the siege of Jerusalem, and the number of attempts made by Titus to prevent the destruction of the doomed city, calling God to witness that it was not his doing, but the blind obstinacy of the Jews, which brought about the entire destruction of the once favoured people of God. When the historian records that most horrible event which Moses had foretold sixteen centuries before, that the mother should "eat her own child for want of all things secretly in the siege and straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee in thy gates," and it was made known to the Romans, who refused to believe so incredible a tale, "Titus excused himself before God in the matter, declaring that he had proposed peace and liberty to the Jews, as well as oblivion of all their former evil deeds; but that they had chosen war in place of peace; and that since they had covered themselves with infamy by their cannibalism, men ought not to leave such a city upon the habitable earth, to be seen by the sun, wherein mothers are thus fed."⁴

But the fiat of the Almighty had gone forth against His once favoured people on account of their incredible crimes; and thus it came to pass that the seven-branch candlestick,

² "Divine worship," says Tacitus, "is not paid to a prince, till he has ceased to sojourn upon earth." (Annal. xv. §. 74.)
³ Marlianus, Urbis Romae Topog. iii. 8. Grævius, tom. iii.
⁴ Deut. xxviii. 57; Joseph. B.J., vi. c. iii., §. 4, 5.
and other vessels originally made for the Tabernacle in the wilderness at the time of the Exode, after journeying from the border of Egypt in Africa to their designed resting-place in the Temple at Jerusalem, after their removal by Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, and their restoration by Cyrus to the city of Zion, were by the Roman conquest transferred from Asia to Europe, where they graced the most magnificent triumph which Rome had ever seen; and having been sculptured on the arch of Titus, remain to this day a silent testimony to the truth of the prophecy uttered by Christ when He wept over the doomed city of Jerusalem.

Concerning the subsequent travels of these interesting memorials of antiquity, Josephus relates that after the triumph Vespasian erected a Temple to Peace, which Herodion describes as the most beautiful work of art in Rome, and the most richly endowed as well. There the emperor deposited the seven-branch candelabrum and the other vessels which had been brought from Jerusalem; while the Law, containing the five books of Moses, and which may have been the original copy written by Moses in the wilderness, together with the purple veils belonging to the Temple, was deposited in the imperial palace of the Caesars.

Herodion mentions that Vespasian's Temple of Peace did not last much above a century, as it was destroyed by fire during the reign of Commodus (A.D. 180—192) in a most unaccountable way, which was considered ominous of the disastrous times that ensued. The spoils of the Temple of Jerusalem were, however, saved from destruction, as we are enabled to trace them for five centuries more. Passing by the unreliable story of the seven-branch golden candlestick having been lost in the Tiber, when Maxentius, after his defeat by Constantine at Saxa Rubra, A.D. 312, was attempting to cross the Milvian bridge, Theophanes, a Greek historian of the Lower Empire, relates that at the time of the Vandal invasion A.D. 455, when Genseric took and plundered Rome, "he laded his ships with all the money

---

and the most remarkable things he could find in the city, amongst them the golden treasures of the churches, and the spoils which Titus after his capture of Jerusalem had brought to Rome."

Procopius, the secretary of Belisarius, and historian of several wars during the sixth century, mentions in his account of Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, that when he was besieging the town of Carcaso, in Languedoc, A.D. 509, there was a report spread that it contained a large amount of the treasures which Alaric I., King of the Visigoths, had carried away from Rome a century before; and amongst them were certain vessels which once belonged to Solomon, and which the Romans had brought from Jerusalem after its destruction by Titus.

It is difficult, however, to reconcile this account with what the same historian says in his History of the Vandal War, unless we may suppose that some of the spoils which Alaric had carried away from Rome, A.D. 410, had found their way back there before their being carried off by Genseric, A.D. 455, from Rome to Africa. For Procopius tells us that after the subjugation of the Vandals by Justinian’s great general, Belisarius, he brought Gelimer, their king, and a large amount of spoil from Africa to Constantinople, and among the spoils were those very golden vessels which Titus had brought from Jerusalem to Rome, and which four centuries later Genseric had transported to Africa. Procopius adds, that a Jew happening to see the spoils, and recognising amongst them the precious treasures which once belonged to his fatherland, said to a friend of the Emperor Justinian—

"That, in his opinion, it was not expedient that the spoils should be taken into the palace; for that they could never be kept in any other place than that to which they had originally belonged when Solomon placed them in the Temple of Jerusalem; that this was the reason why Genseric had captured Rome, and why the Romans had now recovered them from the Vandals."

Procopius adds, that on hearing these words, Justinian became greatly alarmed, and speedily sent them all away to Jerusalem, to be divided among the Christian churches of that city. Hence Gibbon admits, with more than his usual reverence when speaking on such matters, that—

"The holy vessels of the Jewish Temple, after their long peregrination, were respectfully deposited in the Christian Church of Jerusalem."  

This is the last authentic account which history has handed down of the golden vessels which, originally made for the Tabernacle in the wilderness, so long adorned the Temple on Mount Zion. The Rev. William Knight, in his interesting treatise on the Arch of Titus, refers to the work of an obscure writer of the name of Adrichomius, who followed Procopius after an interval of a thousand years, though necessarily for condemnation, and who gravely informs his readers that the ark of the covenant, the tables of the law, the rods of Moses and Aaron, and some portions of the shewbread, were in his days to be seen in the church of St. John Lateran in Rome. 9

Though, of course, such are only idle fables of the dark ages, just as they show to this day in the church of St. Augustine at Rome, among other relics—a wing of the archangel Gabriel, which Gregory VII. had obtained as a gift from the angel by his prayers; the beard of Noah; and the steps of the ladder which Jacob saw in his dream, on which the heavenly host were ascending and descending! This last, however, can be almost paralleled by a theory which is strongly maintained by a party of Protestants called "Anglo-Israelites" in the present day, in which they affirm that the coronation chair in Westminster Abbey contains the identical stone on which Jacob rested his wearied head, when he saw that same ladder reaching from heaven to earth. But it is difficult to conceive how such a spiritual essence as the ladder of a dream could be transformed into the material substance of wood shown in the church dedicated to the pious St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, at
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8 *Decline and Fall*, c. xli.
9 *Adrichomius, Theatrum Terræ Sanctæ*, § 77.
THE FALL OF JERUSALEM.

Rome. Credulousness, however, laughs at difficulties. Hence the famous Dr. J. H. (now Cardinal) Newman writes—

"I think it is impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman states. . . . . I firmly believe that portions of the true cross are at Rome and elsewhere, that the crib of Bethlehem is at Rome, and the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul also. Many, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncracy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. They have a right to say so, if they will; and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the Mystery of Mysteries, the Divine Incarnation?" ! ! ! 1

Of all the innumerable relics which have been shown in the churches of every country in Christendom, and of which a large number survive to this day, there is only one single one of which there is a shadow of any thing like evidence as to its present existence; and that is the Ark of the Covenant, which, as we have seen, Adrichomius, a writer of the 16th century, declares was in his day enshrined in the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome; but which certain enthusiasts of our own time among the Anglo-Israelite party assert is buried with other Hebrew relics in the Hill of Tara, in Ireland; having been brought thither by Jeremiah, when he made his escape from Egypt with his secretary the prophet Baruch, and one of King Zedekiah's daughters, the lovely Princess Tea Tephi, who, they say, married one Heremon, an Irish chieftain, and became ancestors of a race, which is now represented by Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and by which her claim to the throne of David is successfully established! Unfortunately for this romantic legend, nearly contemporary history does give some clue to the whereabouts of the Ark of the Covenant, which it may be well to remember. In the second book of Maccabees, written in the second century B.C., we find this testimony concerning the ark originally made by Moses in the wilderness:—

1 Newman's Apologia, Appendix, p. 57.
It is also found in the records that Jeremiah the prophet, being warned of God, commanded the tabernacle and the ark to go with him, as he went forth into the mountain, where Moses climbed up and saw the heritage of God. And when Jeremiah came thither, he found an hollow cave, wherein he laid the tabernacle, and the ark, and the altar of incense, and so stopped the door. And some of those that followed him came to mark the way, but they could not find it: which when Jeremiah perceived, he blamed them, saying, 'As for that place it shall be unknown until the time that God gather His people again together, and receive them unto mercy. Then shall the Lord shew them these things, and the glory of the Lord shall appear, and the cloud also, as it was shewed under Moses, and as when Solomon desired that the place might be honourably sanctified.'

It should not be forgotten, however, that Maccabees is only an apocryphal book, and therefore of no sufficient authority to decide a case of this nature. Moreover, it seems to conflict with the testimony of the real Jeremiah as certified in Holy Writ, where we find him, when alluding to the restoration of Israel, saying as follows:

'It shall come to pass, when ye be multiplied and increased in the land, in those days, saith the Lord, they shall say no more, The ark of the covenant of the Lord: neither shall it come to mind; neither shall they remember it; neither shall they visit it; neither shall that be done any more.'

2 2 Maccabees ii. 1—8. 3 Jer. iii. 16.
CHAPTER V.

THE TIMES OF THE GENTILES.

It is clear from our Lord's prophecy respecting Jerusalem, that it would be "trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," i.e., after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, Gentile nations, whether Christian or otherwise, would bear rule in the once holy city of Zion for a period until the conversion of the Jewish people to the Gospel of Christ, and the flowing in of all nations to that same Jerusalem, which shall again became "the joy of the whole earth." And we know how literally this has been accomplished within the last eighteen centuries, during which the Romans in their heathen condition, the Greeks of the Lower Empire, the Saracens after they had embraced the religion of Mohammed, the Crusaders, and the Turks, have one after another borne rule in Jerusalem from the time of Titus' conquest even to the present day.

In addition to the treading down of Jerusalem by Gentile nations, we have our Master's solemn assurance that before the Gentile rule shall cease, and the children of Israel be restored to that land which God gave to Abraham and his seed, "this Gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." And the apostolic teaching on this point is set forth by St. Paul in the eleventh chapter of that famous epistle, which Coleridge, no mean judge, is reported to have said was the finest and greatest composition that ever proceeded from the pen of man. Hence the apostle sums up his teaching in

---

these words, "I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in." 6 From which the early Christian fathers have deduced the doctrine of the conversion of the Jewish people in their nationality at the expiration of the times of the Gentiles, as Chrysostom expresses it, "When the fulness of the Gentiles is come, then all Israel shall be saved, at the time of Christ's second coming, and the consummation of all things;" or as Augustine explains the text, that "the carnal Israelites of the blood of Abraham, who do not now believe, shall hereafter be brought so to do." 7

We may easily understand the force of the apostle's argument by considering the history of the Christian Church since the day of Pentecost. "If," says St. Paul, "the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles; how much more their fulness? If the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" 8 Contrast for a moment the effect of a sermon preached by a converted Jew at the time when the casting away of the Jews commenced in all its stern reality, with the comparatively little effect which has followed all Gentile effort in proclaiming the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the heathen world. St. Peter's sermon at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost produced no less a number then 3000 converts, who "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." 9 The early Church of Jerusalem was formed exclusively of Israelite converts; and probably many other Churches, such as the Roman and the Galatian Churches were, if not exclusively, to a very great extent composed of converts from Judaism. The result was, that in a com-

6 Rom. xi. 25.
8 Rom. xi. 12, 15.
9 Acts ii. 41, 42.
paratively brief period, the Gospel was preached as a witness throughout the extent of the Roman empire, which then comprised the civilized world.

In the fourth century the Church of Christ received that fatal injury of what is called "the Union of Church and State," by Constantine's vain attempt to amalgamate expiring Paganism with nominal Christianity, the result of which was the gradual apostasy of the Christian Church, as history too faithfully presents it to us in the appalling evils of the dark ages, until the blessings of the glorious Reformation began to dawn on a benighted world. But even then it can scarcely be said that the Church of Christ has been alive to her duty of preaching the Gospel to the heathen until the present century, when all the Protestant Churches throughout the world have risen to their duty of preaching the Gospel as a witness to those of our brethren who have never heard yet of the only "name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." And yet, with all the efforts of the Gentiles, not one-fourth of the known population of the world have ever heard of this "only Name;" and which number must again be largely reduced by the remembrance that both the Greek and the Roman Churches authoritatively, and false teachers among ourselves without, or rather contrary to, authority, present their respective flocks with what St. Paul terms "another Gospel, which is not another." The consequence is, that though the Gospel, is being preached "as a witness" more extensively now than at any other time since the days of the apostles, the number of converts is painfully small, compared with what it was when a converted Jew preached on the day of Pentecost previous to the casting away of the nation of Israel from being the favoured people of God; or as it will be in that time yet future, when "the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," and the prediction of Isaiah be accomplished, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea," which will assuredly be literally and fully accomplished in

1 Acts iv. 12.  
2 Gal. i. 6, 7.  
3 Isa. xi. 9.
God's own time; and possibly through the instrumentality of the converted children or twelve tribes of Israel; for if at their casting away such marvellous spiritual blessings were made over to some among the Gentiles, how much greater will the same Gospel blessings be more abundantly poured out, when the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and Israel be again restored to God's favour as "life from the dead."

The treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentile powers may be said to have commenced long before the Roman conquest, when Nebuchadnezzar deported the house of Judah to Babylon at the end of the seventh century B.C., in order to fulfil the predicted captivity of "seventy years" in that city. The image dream of Nebuchadnezzar, and the visions which Daniel saw in the first year of Belshazzar respecting the four beasts or empires, which were to bear rule over Jerusalem, and have done so for the last 2500 years, are a wonderful testimony to the truth of God's prophetic word. And although infidelity and scepticism have done their utmost to depreciate the prophecies of Daniel, boldly asserting that either there was no such Jewish prophet in Babylon during the time of Nebuchadnezzar, or else that the prophecies which bear his name are the work of a forger of the Maccabæan age, every real discovery by science, whether in philology, archaeology, or history, have tended to show the futility of their opposition; and the genuineness and authenticity of the book of Daniel comes as triumphantly out of their alembic of criticism, as Daniel's three companions came triumphant out of "the burning fiery furnace" unsinged and unhurt.

It is not necessary to go beyond the limits of Scripture in order to ascertain what these Gentile kingdoms seen in the respective dreams of Nebuchadnezzar and Daniel really meant, which were appointed to tread down Jerusalem during the
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1 Jer. xxv. 11.
2 Dan. iii. 20, 27. The most complete answer, perhaps, that has ever been given to Biblical critics of the infidel school is to be found in Dr. Pusey's great work entitled, Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures, delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford. With copious Notes.
period known as The Times of the Gentiles; though we must go to secular history in order to show how exactly the predictions concerning them were literally accomplished, in which we have the strongest possible confirmation by unexceptionable witnesses of the truth of the prophetic word.

The Babylonian monarchy, consisting of a line of sovereigns from Nebuchadnezzar B.C. 607, to Belshazzar B.C. 537, was the first to tread down Jerusalem during the predicted period of seventy years, when the children of Israel were to pay the penalty of their transgressions by the nation being carried captive to Babylon. Daniel, in his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's image, declares that the head of gold symbolised his kingdom: "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold." These last words fix the first kingdom incontestably to that of Babylon, which had grown to greatness under Nebuchadnezzar, whose empire embraced in Asia all that pertained to the previous monarchies of Assyria, of Tyre, and of Israel; and whose conquests, we know from Megasthenes, extended over Egypt, and as far as "the pillars of Hercules," or the present Gibraltar. Not that we are to understand that Nebuchadnezzar personally and individually was the head of gold, or that he bore rule all over the earth "wheresoever the children of men dwell," for there were other kingdoms existing at the same time, such as China in the East, and Rome in the West. The head of gold represented Nebuchadnezzar and his successors as well, two of whom are mentioned in Scripture as Evil-merodach and Belshazzar, and we are not to understand that they actually exercised rule over every part of the habitable globe; but rather to understand it as the common Oriental mode of expressing a vastly extensive empire; just as St. Paul, in writing to the Colossians, speaks of the Gospel in

---

6 Dan. ii. 37—39.
his day having been "preached to every creature which is under heaven." 7 Or as St. John teaches that by the term "the Antichrist," we are not to understand, as many erroneously assert, an individual, but many persons: "For many deceivers are entered into the world . . . . this is (or according to our English idiom these many constitute) the deceiver and the Antichrist." 8

The second, or Medo-Persian monarchy, is thus described by Daniel: "After thee (not the individual king Nebuchadnezzar, but his dynasty or kingdom) shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee." 9 Scripture tells us distinctly the name of the monarchy which succeeded the Babylonian. When Daniel was inspired to interpret the mysterious handwriting on the wall, he told the affrighted king Belshazzar that the time was come for the fulfilment of Nebuchadnezzar's dream respecting the duration of the Babylonian monarchy:

"Mene, Mene, Tekel, Upharsin. This is the interpretation of the thing: Mene; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. Tekel; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. Peres; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians." 10 And so in one of the historical books of the Old Testament we read of Nebuchadnezzar, "them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon; where they were servants to him and his sons unto the reign of the kingdom of Persia." 2 Although Isaiah two centuries before had predicted the fall of Babylon by means of the Medes and Persians, as two kingdoms—

"I will stir up the Medes against them . . . and Babylon shall be as Sodom and Gomorrah. . . . Go up, O Elam (Persia); besiege, O Media."— in Daniel's time they had become as completely united as England and Scotland are in the present day; as appears by the

7 Col. i. 23.
8 2 Epistle of John, ver. 7. Unfortunately, our English version omits the definite article, which all MSS. give in the original. I believe this to be one chief cause of the very serious mistake which the Futurists have made in their scheme of interpreting prophecy.
9 Dan. ii. 32. 1 Dan. v. 25—28. 2 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20.
10 Isa. xiii. 17, 19; xxi. 2.
way in which Daniel speaks of them in his prophecy of the “ram with two horns,” and which he defines as symbolising the united kingdom of the Medes and Persians.4

The third kingdom is represented in the image vision which Nebuchadnezzar saw as “his belly and his thighs of brass,” which is defined as “another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth.” 5 Daniel tells us the name of this kingdom, which was to bear rule after the destruction of the Persian monarchy: “The rough goat is the King of Grecia; and the horn between his eyes is the first king,” 6 i.e., Alexander the Great, whose conquest of the Persian monarchy, as is well known, took place B.C. 330.

Josephus mentions an interesting confirmation of the truth of Daniel’s prophecy concerning Alexander the Great, who is termed in the apocryphal book of Maccabees (1 Maccab. i. 1) “Alexander, son of Philip the Macedonian, who reigned the first over Greece.” When he was besieging Tyre, B.C. 322, during a period of seven months, he sent to Jaddua, the high priest of Jerusalem, to demand provisions for his army, and the tribute which the Jews had heretofore paid to the kings of Persia. Jaddua refused, on account of his oath of allegiance to Darius, on which Alexander vowed vengeance on the Jews; and no sooner had he taken Tyre and Gaza, than he marched upon Jerusalem. Jaddua, foreseeing the danger which overhung the Jews, made earnest prayer to God for direction; and being warned in a dream he went forth in his pontifical robes, accompanied by a great concourse of priests in their vestments, and people clad in white apparel, to meet the conqueror, and to make submission. No sooner did they meet, than Alexander, to the surprise of every body, prostrated himself before Jaddua with religious awe. On Parmenio, one of his favourite generals, inquiring the reason of such a behaviour, Alexander replied that he did not adore the high priest, but the God whose servant he was; for while he was at Dis, in Macedonia, meditating on the invasion of Persia, this very man appeared

4 Dan, viii. 20. 5 Ibid. ii. 39. 6 Ibid. viii. 21.
to him in a dream, dressed in the same habit, inviting him to come over into Asia, and promising him success in the conquest of it. Having said this, Alexander entered Jerusalem with the high priest, and accompanied him to the Temple, where a sacrifice was offered; and Jaddua laid before the Grecian king the Prophecies of Daniel, in which it was foretold that the first King of Greece would overthrow the Persian empire. After this the king granted peculiar privileges to the Jews, and proceeded on his expedition with the full assurance of success. The favours which Alexander granted were the free exercise of the Jewish religion; exemption of the land from tribute during the Sabbatical year; the settlement of many Jews in his new capital at Alexandria, with privileges similar to those of the Greeks; while the Samaritans, who had revolted and murdered the governor whom Alexander had appointed; had their country assigned to the Jews, which was then exempted in the same way as Judaea from tribute. All this Josephus affirms on the authority of Alexander's own letters, and the testimony of Hecateus, a heathen historian.  

The fourth kingdom is represented in the image with "his legs of iron;" and in the interpretation we read, "the fourth kingdom 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." The name of the fourth kingdom does not occur in the prophecies of Daniel, as is the case with the three previous kingdoms; but the characteristics are so clear and precise, that there can be no doubt that it refers to the Roman empire, which was "reigning over the kings of the earth," at the time that Christ was born and died, when "the sceptre was departing from Judah," according to Jacob's prediction, when Jerusalem was destroyed the second time, and the children of Israel were scattered, and became "a proverb and a byword among all the nations of the earth."  

The opinion that the Roman empire, which became divided  
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2 Dan. ii. 40.  
3 Rev. xvii. 18.  
4 Gen. xlix. 10.  
5 Deut. xxviii. 37.
into East and West A.D. 364, and broken up into ten kingdoms by the incursion of barbaric races a century later, is in exact accordance with the imagery of Nebuchadnezzar's dream—the figure of a man, with two legs and ten toes on his feet; as Daniel's interpretation is thus expressed—

"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 of the 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 to 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 God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter and the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure." 3

The interpretation, which has been accepted by the great body of commentators, both Jewish and Christian alike, from the earliest times until the present day, points to the Roman empire as the last of the four kingdoms mentioned by Daniel; and Scripture, prophecy, and history alike concur in supporting this clearly attested view. Nevertheless, with that fondness for speculation in interpreting certain texts of Scripture which is peculiar to English and German critics in the present day, three entirely different views have been put forth for the interpretation of the fourth kingdom of Daniel's prophecy.

1. We have the opinion of Canon Westcott and others that the fourth kingdom is to be found in the successors of Alexander the Great, such as the kings of Syria and Egypt, the Antiochi and the Ptolemies. This opinion is contradicted by the historical fact that these two kingdoms were absorbed by the Romans before Christ was born, whose kingdom was eventually to supersede all the others.

3 Dan. ii. 41—45.
2. The second opinion is that of the Futurists, maintained principally by Drs. Todd, Maitland, and Tregelles, who contend that the Roman empire has never yet been broken up, and that it is hereafter to take place, by five kingdoms, such as Britain, France, Spain, &c., being formed out of the western portion of the old Roman empire; and five other kingdoms being formed from Austria, Turkey, and Egypt, &c., out of the eastern portion. This view is contradicted by the well-known historical fact that the western portion of the Roman empire came to an end A.D. 476, just as much as the first of the four kingdoms, the Babylonian monarchy, came to its destined end on the night that Belshazzar was slain, B.C. 537. And it is in the western portion of the Roman empire, that the ten-toed kingdoms of the prophecy are alone to be looked for and found. All analogy proves that if, as Scripture teaches, the Babylonian monarchy representing the head of the image, "Thou art this head of gold," was found in the East, the lower part of the image, or feet with its ten toes, representing ten kingdoms, must be looked for in the West, as we know was the case, and affords an unanswerable argument to the untenable theory of the Futurists.

3. If the Futurist scheme be out of court, still more impossible does a third view which has been broached by a party of enthusiasts in our own day, called "Anglo-Israelites," who declare that the "stone" kingdom of this prophecy, which was destined to absorb all the four monarchies which were to tread down Jerusalem during the times of the Gentiles, does not mean the kingdom of the promised Messiah, as Jews and Christians have alike believed for over 2400 years, but the British Empire! and that Queen Victoria is now in possession of the throne of David!!! We can only reply, as an eminent Protestant divine did to the argument once broached by Dr. J. H. (now Cardinal) Newman, that Isaiah ii. 18, which speaks of God "utterly abolishing idols," proves that the Church of Rome never has nor can be idolatrous! "Peace to all such reasoners!" 4

4 The late Rev. Stanley Faber, in his Provincial Letters, states that Dr. Newman once argued on the impossibility of the Church of Rome being
As regards the application of the fourth kingdom of Daniel's prophecy to none other than the Roman empire, we should notice carefully the imagery used by the prophet. Its "strength" is said to be that of "iron." It is not so much the durability or hardness of iron which is here referred to, as its power as an instrument of destruction. Just as iron "breaketh in pieces, and subdueth all things," of which we have such marvellous specimens of its power developed by the science of the 19th century, so this fourth monarchy would be found to subdue and conquer all opponents by means of its iron will. Virgil's description of the Roman power—

"Hæ tibi erunt artes, pacisque imponere morem,
Parcer subjectis at debellare superbos;"

has been fairly rendered into English thus—

"Be these thine arts, to bid contention cease,
Chain up stern war, and give the nations peace:
O'er subject lands extend thy potent sway,
And teach with iron rod the haughty to obey."

Jerome observes in his Commentary on Daniel, who flourished at the close of the fourth century, when the barbarians were beginning to invade the Roman empire, that the Roman kingdom, though very strong at first (i.e., when during the time of the Caesars it entered the domain of prophetic history), was weakest of all in his day. It asked the help of barbarians against its own citizens and its foreign enemies. And so "the stone cut out without hands" points undoubtedly to the kingdom of the Messiah, who was born in a supernatural manner, which would grow up, and eventually become the mightiest monarchy the world has ever seen, and the only one which will fulfil the prophecy of a "king reigning in righteousness," without worldly riches or earthly power.

guilty of idolatry, because, he says, "It is foretold that under the Gospel dispensation the idols God shall utterly abolish. But if, under that dispensation, the Roman Church be idolatrous, then the idols have not been utterly abolished. Therefore the Roman Church cannot have been idolatrous" (p. 222).

* Isa. xxxii. 1.
But the prophecy shows that this fourth kingdom would contain within itself the seeds of division, which would cause its final dissolution. As in the image the feet were "part of iron and part of clay," so this kingdom was to be "partly strong and partly broken." This has been supposed to refer to the two-fold power which so long prevailed after Rome had been invaded by the barbarians, and broken up into ten kingdoms, viz., the Secular and the Ecclesiastical powers—the Emperors and the Popes. Others interpret the symbol of the mixing of the old Roman and the incoming races which overthrew that empire, as it is said in the prophecy of the princes of the kingdom, that "they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men," as when Honoria, the sister of the Emperor Valentinian III., offered herself to marry Atila king of the Huns, in order to be revenged on her brother; or when the Emperor Anthemius gave his daughter in marriage to the patrician Ricemir, of the tribe of the Swevi.

It is, however, as historically true that the Roman empire was subverted, A.D. 476, by the incursion of the barbarians, and its subsequent division into ten lesser kingdoms, as that the previous monarchies described in the image—viz., the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, and the Grecian—were overthrown at the respective dates of B.C. 537, B.C. 330, and B.C. 30. And this will be more clearly seen by considering Daniel's vision and dream of the "four great beasts" described in the seventh chapter of his prophecies, as representing the same monarchies, which were to tread down Jerusalem during the appointed time. And these kingdoms, symbolized by the four great beasts, are not exhibited in their succession, as in Nebuchadnezzar's vision of the image, but in their diversity, as they are said to be "diverse one from another." 6

The vision which Daniel saw opens with what the cuneiform inscriptions have proved to be a remarkable testimony to the genuineness of this prophetic book. "Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the
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6 Dan. vii. 3.
heaven strove upon the great sea. And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another." 7 The whole of this dream, which Daniel had "in the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon," and the account of which he appears to have written at once (ver. 1), distinctly shows a familiarity with the symbolical emblems which were employed by the Assyrians and Babylonians in their statues and the ornaments of their gorgeous palaces, as they are now to be seen in the chief museums of Europe. Thus in the Louvre at Paris there is a bronze statuette of a horrible monster, with the body of a dog and the tail of a scorpion, the feet of an eagle, the arms terminate with the claws of a lion, and the head that of a skeleton bearing ram's horns. Four great open wings spring from the back, which bears an inscription, defining the figure to be the demon god of the southwest wind, and ordering it to be placed at the door or window to avert the terrible effects of that wind. The British Museum has two specimens of the same wind-deity. And the inscriptions on various Assyrian cylinders show the very action of the winds from the four quarters of the heavens as mentioned in Daniel's vision. And in an inscription of Sargon, king of Assyria and father of Sennacherib, who preceded Daniel by only a century, it is said,

"When Merodach permitted restoration to this house, he sent forth the four winds, East, North, West and South, and removed every particle of dust from it." 8

The four beasts which Daniel saw in his dream are thus described, "The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it" (ver. 4). Layard discovered on the stone sculptures near where Nineveh formerly stood, various mythic animals with the fore-feet of lions, and head and hind legs of eagles. The Assyrian deity, with a lion's head and an eagle's feet, flanks the portals of a doorway discovered at Kouyunjik; while amid the ruins of Nineveh he found the

---

colossal winged lions which formed the entrance to the great hall in the north-west palace of Nimroud. How instructive is this symbolical emblem of Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, who is represented by Jeremiah (I. 17) as a “lion” for strength; and by Ezekiel (xxvii. 3, 12, 17) as an “eagle” for swiftness! The selection of a lion, the king of beasts, and an eagle, the king of birds, the national emblems of that “golden” city where Daniel dwelt during his captivity, was therefore peculiarly appropriate in the description of that kingdom which in the image-dream of Nebuchadnezzar ranked as “golden,” or chief among metals.

What is meant by a lion with eagle’s wings in symbolic language may be understood from Herodotus’ record of a dream which Cyrus king of Persia, the conqueror of Belshazzar, had about seven years after the capture of Babylon, and which he thus related to Hystaspes, the father of Darius, who succeeded Cyrus’ son Cambyses on the throne of Persia, and whom Cyrus accused of conspiring against him. “Last night, as I lay in my bed, I saw in a vision the eldest of thy sons with wings upon his shoulders, shadowing with the one wing Asia, and Europe with the other. From this it is certain that he is engaged in some plot against me.” How descriptive of the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar, which extended from the river Euphrates to the shores of the Atlantic ocean! The lifting of “the lion” off his feet, as seen by Daniel in his dream, represents the overthrow of the Babylonian monarchy by the superior strength of the Medes and Persians; and the “plucking” of his wings, and giving of Nebuchadnezzar “a man’s heart,” points to the madness with which he had been afflicted, and his being stript for a time of royal power, his removal in the wilderness, and the eventual restoration of his reason.

The madness of Nebuchadnezzar, thus described by Daniel, is alluded to by Abydenus, who flourished about two centuries later, and who spoke of it in the following way: “It is

9 Layard’s *Nineveh and Babylon*, pp. 67, 73, 257.  
1 Herodotus, i., § 209.  
2 Dan. iv. 28—37.
related by the Chaldaens that as Nebuchadnezzar ascended to the roof of his palace, he was possessed by some god, and cried out, 'Oh! Babylonians, I Nebuchadnezzar forewarn you of a calamity which must shortly come to pass, which neither my ancestor Belus nor Queen Beltis can persuade the Fates to turn away. A Persian mule shall come and impose on you the yoke of slavery, the author of which shall be a Mede, the vain glory of Assyria. Before he should thus betray my subjects, oh! that some whirlpool might destroy him, and his name be blotted out for ever; or that he might be compelled to wander through some desert, where there are neither cities nor any trace of men, a solitary exile among rocks and caverns, where beasts and birds alone abide. But for me, before he shall have conceived these mischiefs in his mind, a happier end will be provided.'

The second beast in Daniel's vision was "like to a bear" with three ribs in his mouth, and to be the devourer of much flesh. (ver. 5). The inferiority of the second beast to the first is shown in the image-dream by the silver breast and arms succeeding the head of gold. Here it is seen in the inferiority of the beasts specified. The bear is inferior in point of strength to the lion; and the allusion to its two sides symbolises the two nations of Medes and Persians—one side, the Persian, by which it raised itself into greater power and renown, is that which attracts the greater notice. The "three ribs" which it had in its mouth represent the three chief conquests which Cyrus effected in the course of his reign, viz., Lydia and the kingdoms of Asia Minor; Bactria, a vast tract of country lying between the Caspian and the river Indus; Babylonia, including the empires of both Assyria and Babylon. Nevertheless, these were not the only conquests of the Medo-Persian power. "Arise, and devour much flesh," was both a charge and a prophecy, which reached its climax after Cambyses' conquest of Egypt, and the mighty victories over the Scythians of the great Darius, according to the prediction of Cyrus' dream.

3 Eusebius, Præp. Evang., lib. x.
The third beast was "like a leopard, which had upon its back four wings of a fowl; also four heads, and dominion was given it" (v. 6). Though not so strong as the lion or the bear, and therefore in the image-dream represented by the inferior metal brass, the leopard was yet the type of a crouching, swift and fierce beast, and is so described in Hosea xiii. 7, and Habakkuk i. 8. It had its peculiarities which distinguished it from the other beasts—as its four wings, four heads, wherewith it might have its attention directed to the four corners of the then known world, and so possess them, as it denoted "that kingdom of brass which should bear rule over all the earth." The four heads, like the four-headed creatures seen in Ezekiel's vision, with the faces of a man, a lion, an ox, and an eagle, looking towards the four quarters of the globe, symbolically represented that in the conquests of the third beast there was the strength of the lion, the patient endurance of the ox, the swiftness of the eagle, combined with the superior intelligence of the man. Just as Aristotle describes the contrast between the waning and sluggish character of the Asiatics with the stirring character of the Greeks. "The nations," he says, "in the cold countries and those of Europe are full of spirit, but are rather wanting in thought and contrivance; wherefore they retain their freedom, but have no fixed polity, and cannot govern their neighbours. Those of Asia are thoughtful and contriving, but spiritless, wherefore they abide in subjection and servitude. But the Greek race, as it occupies the mid space between them, so it partakes of both, for it is both spirited and thoughtful; whence it abides free, and with excellent politics, and is able to rule the world, if it should come to have one government." 5

The leopard, with its four wings and four heads, to whom "dominion was given," was a very suitable symbol of the rapidity of Alexander's conquests; and the subsequent division of those conquests after his early death among four principal chiefs, who formed separate kingdoms out of his extensive
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4 Ezek. i. 5—10. 5 Aristotle's Politics, vii. 7.
empire. This is declared in another of Daniel’s visions of the ram with two horns, one higher than the other, declared to be “the kings of Media and Persia,” who were overthrown by “an he goat from the west, with a notable horn between his eyes,” and which is explained to be “the first king of Grecia,” i.e., the wonderful conqueror, Alexander the Great. It is further stated in the prophecy that when his rapidly formed empire was “broken” up by his early death, “four notable kingdoms” should be formed out of it “toward the four winds of heaven,” but necessarily less powerful kingdoms compared with that formed by Alexander, as the prophecy expresses it, “but not in his power.”

History shows how exactly this was fulfilled; for though there were many claimants for a share in the spoils of Alexander’s empire, who obtained power for a time, and that Alexander left a son, who was entitled to the whole of it by inheritance, the battle of Ipsus, which was fought twenty-two years after Alexander’s death, shows that after that event, the prophecy was fulfilled in four “notable” kingdoms having been formed “towards the four winds of heaven.” And these were as follows: (1) Ptolemy obtained Egypt, Lybia, Palestine, Arabia and Calo-Syria, towards the south. (2) Cassander had Macedonia and Greece, towards the west, whence the he goat of the prophecy is said to have come. (3) Lysimachus took Thrace and Asia Minor, towards the north. (4) Seleucus possessed himself of Syria and other countries, like Babylon, towards the east, and is famous for having established the well-known era of the Seleucidæ, after his own name, commencing October 1st, B.C. 312.

The fourth beast which Daniel saw in his dream is described as being “dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it: and it had ten horns.”

The fourth beast, with its “iron teeth” and “ten horns,”

6 Dan. viii. 3—5, 8, 20—22. 7 Dan. vii. 7.
is necessarily the same as "the fourth kingdom" in the image-vision of Nebuchadnezzar, which is described in the same terms, "strong as iron:" its ten horns are typified by the ten-toed kingdoms symbolised in the feet of the image. And as it is described as being "diverse" from the other beasts," we may conclude that it refers to the constitution of the fourth kingdom, which is said in its ten-fold division to have been composed partly of "potter's clay and part of iron." Hence Jerome, writing about half a century before the prophecy was fulfilled in the breaking up of the Roman empire, A.D. 476, says—

"The fourth kingdom, which clearly belongs to the Romans, is of iron, that breaks to pieces and subdues all things. But the feet and toes of the image are in part iron, and in part clay, fictiles, as at this time is manifestly proved. For as in the beginning there was nothing stronger and harder than the Roman empire, so in the end of things there is nothing weaker; for, both in civil wars and in wars with foreign nations, we are reduced to need the help of barbarians like them. But at the end of all these four kingdoms, the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron, there is a Stone, the Lord and Saviour, 'broken off without hands;' that is to say, without human intercourse and seed, proceeding from a Virgin's womb, and having broken to pieces all kingdoms, is become a great mountain, and has filled all the earth. This stone the Jews and wicked Porphyry [a noted infidel] erroneously refer to the people of Israel, whom they will have to be the most mighty of all peoples, at the end of the world, and destined to break up all kingdoms, and to reign for ever.'

The ten lesser kingdoms into which the western portion of the Roman empire was broken up towards the close of the fourth century, are the same as the "ten horns" which sprang from the head of the fourth beast. Secular historians as well as prophetic writers have alike borne testimony to the fact, that after the Roman empire had been broken up by the invasion of the Goths and Vandals, it eventually became divided into ten minor kingdoms. Machiavelli and Gibbon are examples of the first class, as Sir Isaac Newton and the late E. B. Elliott, author of the Horæ Apocalypticae, perhaps the most valuable work on prophecy ever given to the Church of Christ, of the
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8 Jerome, Comment. in Dan. ii. 31, 45.
second. In the course of 150 years after the overthrow of Romulus Augustus, A.D. 476, the following ten kingdoms are to be found on the platform of the Western Roman empire.

1. The Anglo-Saxons. 6. The Visigoths.
2. The Franks. 7. The Suevi.
3. The Allemans. 8. The Vandals.
5. The Ostrogoths. 10. The Lombards.

Before proceeding to show how these ten kingdoms were the precursors of another kingdom "diverse" from the rest, it may be well to sum up some of the historic facts respecting the treading down of Jerusalem by different Gentile nations since the Roman invasion, and the scattering of the Jewish race throughout the world, in accordance with our Lord's prophecy.—

"There shall be great distress in the land (of Canaan): and wrath upon this people. And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."*1

After the revolt of the Jews against the Roman power in the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, when another of our Lord's predictions seems to have been fulfilled in the person of the impostor Bar-cochab, "the son of a star," to whom allusion has already been made,2 as Christ told the persecuting and unbelieving Jews who sought to slay Him, "I am come in my Father's name, and ye receive me not: if another shall come in in his own name, him ye will receive."3 Hadrian, who had previously visited the ruins of Jerusalem, as Epiphanius informs us,4 47 years after its destruction by Titus, i.e., A.D. 117, and decided on rebuilding the city, proceeded to put his design into execution, though some authors5 assert that he had commenced it before the rebellion of Bar-cochab, and that the Romans besieged Jerusalem a second time, just as there were two sieges

---

*2 See pp. 29, 32.  
*3 St. John v. 43.  
*4 Epiphanius, De Mens. et Pond., c. xiv.  
of Babylon by Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes within a few years of each other, and again razed it to the ground. Some of the Jewish writers affirm that more than double the amount of the children of Israel were slain in this revolt than came with Moses out of Egypt, and that their sufferings under Nebuchadnezzar and Titus were not so great as what they endured under Hadrian. Then the emperor completed his design. He rebuilt the city, which he called after his own name, and settled in it a large colony of Roman citizens, erected a temple to Venus, and ordered the statue of a hog in marble to be set up over the gate that opened towards Bethlehem. And having dispersed the remnant of the wretched Jews to the confines of the then known world, he published an edict strictly forbidding any one of that nation upon pain of death to enter the city, or so much as to gaze upon it from a distance.

Jerusalem remained a heathen city under its new name of \textit{Ælia Capitolina}, till the time of Constantine, the first Christian emperor, at the beginning of the fourth century; but so little was the place known to the heathen, that it is on record when one of the martyrs of Palestine, who suffered in the sixth persecution under the Emperor Maximin, A.D. 235, was asked of what country he was, and answered, "Jerusalem," neither the governor of the province or any of his assistants could understand what city he meant, or where that city stood.

In Constantine's time, however, after his fatal attempt to amalgamate Christianity with effete Paganism, Jerusalem began to resume its ancient name, and something of its ancient splendour. The emperor enlarged and adorned it with so many stately edifices and churches, that Eusebius, with the spirit more of a courtier than of a faithful Christian bishop, hinted that the city might now be considered as the new Jerusalem foretold by the prophets. The revived feeling for Jerusalem was much enhanced by the legend of the Empress

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{6} Auctor libri Juchasin, quoted by Mede, lib. iii., p. 440.
\item \textsuperscript{7} Euseb., \textit{Hist. Eccles.} iv., c. 6, states this on "the authority of Aristo of Pella."
\item \textsuperscript{8} Eusebius, \textit{De Mart. Palæst.}, c. xi.
\end{itemize}
Helena finding the cross on which the Saviour was supposed to have hung when He paid the penalty of our transgressions. History relates that the mother of the Emperor Constantine, said by some to have been of English birth, when nearly eighty years of age, undertook a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, a.d. 327, in the hope of discovering the cross on which the “Lamb of God” was sacrificed, and of which nothing had been known or heard for nearly 300 years. The Empress Helena’s zeal, under the guidance of a superstitious priesthood, was skilfully directed to the supposed place where the Lord had been buried. A vision is said to have disclosed the place of His sepulchre, and wonderful to relate, on digging at the spot, exactly three crosses were found to have been buried close beside it. The difficulty was to decide which was the true cross of Christ. For this emergency the priests had carefully prepared. The body of a dead man was laid upon each. With two of the crosses no effect was produced, but on touching the third the corpse was instantly restored to life. Thus what has been called “the true cross” was discovered, and so enormous has been the growth of this pretended relic, that not only almost every Roman Cathedral, and many of the great ones of the earth, possess a fragment, but it has been computed that if all the pieces of wood claiming to be portions of the “true cross,” which Helena discovered at Jerusalem three centuries after the crucifixion, were collected together, there would be sufficient to build one of the largest of the ships of the line, or as they were familiarly termed before the invention of iron ships, one of the wooden walls of old England.

Cyril of Jerusalem, writing within a century after this dis-

---

9 When the famous Complutensian edition of the Old Testament, prepared by Cardinal Ximenes, Archbishop of Toledo, who died shortly before the Bull of Pope Leo X., authorizing its publication, was issued March 22, 1520, it was found that the Latin Vulgate version occupied the place of honour in the central column, with the original Hebrew on the one side and the Greek LXX. on the other; which arrangement the editors attempted to justify by comparing it in the preface to the position of “Christ crucified between two thieves—the unbelieving Synagogue of the Jews, and the schismatical Greek Church.” ! ! !
covery of the empress, declares that "the whole earth was filled with this sacred wood;" and he compares its wonderful and fictitious increase in size and vegetation to miraculous interposition on the part of Almighty God. And Bower, in his *History of the Popes*, remarks concerning every single fragment of the cross thus discovered, that as they are all supposed to have touched the body of Christ, they are all worshipped with Divine worship."¹

At the time of this alleged discovery of the true cross, the Jews, who abhorred the Christian religion as much as, or possibly still more than, the religion of the heathen, assembled in large numbers, with the hope of recovering their idolized city of Jerusalem, and of rebuilding their glorious Temple; but the emperor sternly repressed this vain attempt of man to alter the irreversible decrees of God; and so, after punishing these wretched rebels by ordering their ears to be cut off, and their bodies to be branded, he scattered them throughout the empire as so many fugitives and slaves.²

The laws of Constantine were very severe upon the despised race of Israel, and were carried out with great rigour until the accession of his nephew Julian, commonly called "the Apostate," A.D. 361, who patronized the Jews, not on account of his liking their religion, but on account of his bitter hatred to Christianity, and his determination to destroy it as far as he could. Hence his vain attempt to render nugatory our Lord's prophecy that "Jerusalem would be trodden down of the Gentiles," by restoring the Jews to the land of their fathers. For this purpose he addressed their leaders, expressing his regret for their former sufferings, assuring them of his protection; and that if he was successful in the Persian war then commencing, he would rebuild the holy city of Jerusalem, restore them to their habitations, and join with them in worshipping the Supreme Being of the universe on the principle expressed by one of our own poets:—

¹ Bower's *History of the Popes*, vol. ii., p. 539.
"Father of all, in every age,
In every clime adored;
By saint, by savage, and by sage,
Jehovah, Jove, or Lord."

Julian's zeal on behalf of the Jews even exceeded his promise; for before he set out from Antioch for the Persian war, he attempted to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, nearly three centuries after it had been destroyed by Jewish obstinacy at the time of the Roman conquest. The emperor allotted a vast sum for the purpose, giving it in charge to Alypius of Antioch, who had formerly been the Roman governor in Britain, to carry on the work with vigour. But the historians of the time, Christian, heathen, and Jewish, alike concur in declaring that the work was entirely frustrated by some supernatural cause. For fiery balls bursting forth near the foundations rendered the place inaccessible to the workmen, who were burnt repeatedly while endeavouring to carry on their work, so that after many vain attempts the work was of necessity laid aside. The prevention of this enterprise was certainly caused by the overruling hand of Providence, as Julian and his own historian have sufficiently admitted. Dr. Warburton, in his Biography of Julian, has set the evidence of the miraculous interposition in the clearest light, refuting the objections which the infidel party have naturally brought against it. And Whitby has gathered together the testimonies for the truth of the miracles in the following order.

"Ammianus Marcellinus, an heathen; Zemuch David, a Jew, who confesseth that Julian was divinitus impeditus, hindered by God in this attempt; Nazianzen and Chrysostom among the Greeks; St. Ambrose and Rufinus among the Latins, who flourished at the very time when this was done; Theodoret and Zozomen, orthodox historians; Philostorgius, an Arian; Socrates, a favourer of the Novatians, who wrote the story within the space of fifty years after the thing was done, and whilst the eye-witnesses of the fact were yet surviving."
The treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentile powers was continued by the successors to the Roman power in the Saracens, who had vigorously adopted the religion of the false prophet Mohammed. When his next successor but one, the Caliph Omâr, captured Jerusalem, A.D. 637, he determined to erect a magnificent mosque in honour of his religion. On demanding of Sophronius, the Christian Patriarch, a suitable site for the building, and asking to be shown the remains of Solomon's Temple, the Patriarch, after twice attempting to deceive Omâr, took him at last to a gate now called Bah Mohammed, which opened on the place where Solomon's Temple formerly stood. On entering, the Caliph exclaimed, "God is great! This is the mosque of Solomon, from which the prophet told me he had made the night journey to heaven," described in the seventeenth chapter of the Korân. The Sakhrah, or Sacred Rock, was found covered with dung, which the Christians had thrown upon it out of spite to the Jews. Sophronius then proceeded to describe to Omâr the meaning of the Sakhrah, as "the very stone of which Jacob made a pillow when he had the vision at Luz," and which he called "the gate of heaven;" the Israelites called it "the site of the holy of holies," which, they say, is in the middle of the earth, and was the holy place of Israel, and is held by them in such veneration, that wherever they are they turn their faces towards it whenever they pray. Such was the superstitious belief of Greeks and Jews alike in the seventh century respecting the resting-place of "Jacob's pillow." And it only wanted twelve centuries more of "advancement in learning," as our great English philosopher expresses it, to reach the nineteenth century, when a body of speculative prophets would appear in this country, calling themselves "Anglo-Israelites," who affirm with great vigour that "Jacob's pillow," having been brought by Jeremiah, the great prophet of Judah, from Jerusalem to Ireland, more than 1000 years before the age of Sophronius and Omâr, and after resting in both Ireland and Scotland for upwards of seventeen centuries, has at length found its final resting-place in the coronation chair of Westminster Abbey, since A.D. 1296, when Edward I. carried it off.
from Scone, in Scotland, as the prize of victory; and now it is said to constitute the title-deeds of Queen Victoria to the throne of David!!!

The Saracens and the Turks have trodden down Jerusalem ever since the rise of the Mohammedan imposture, nearly 1260 years ago; and since the Turks have possessed Constantinople during the last four centuries, their persecution of their Christian subjects has been as infamous as their national sins have been vile. And I cannot close this chapter without reminding the reader of the striking testimony which Josephus, the Jewish historian, bearsto our Lord's prophecy, that Jerusalem should be trodden down of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled, so far at least as refers to the causes which brought on the Jew the most terrible judgment which ever befell a nation since the world began. And Eusebius, who wrote within about two centuries of its occurrence, justly remarks that he could not but "admire and acknowledge our Saviour's prescience and prediction to be wonderful above nature, and truly divine."  

St. Paul briefly explains the cause of the judgment in these words: "For ye, brethren, have suffered like things of your own countrymen, even as they have of the Jews: who both killed the Lord Jesus, and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they please not God... for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost." The Jews put Jesus to death when the Jews were assembled to celebrate their national and divinely instituted festival, the Passover; and it was on a similar occasion about 40 years later, that Titus shut up the immense number of Jews who came to the Passover, and who fell in the siege, within the walls of the doomed city of Jerusalem. The rejection of the true Messiah, who "came to His own," as St. John says, "and His own received Him not," was their crime; and the following of false Messiahs, like Theudas

5 The Hegira commenced 68 days before the flight of Mohammed from Mecca to Medina, with the first day of that Arabian year which coincides with Friday, July 16, A.D. 622.


7 1 Thess. ii. 14—16.
and Judas, Bar-cochab and others, to their destruction, was their just punishment. They sold and bought Jesus, as Zechariah had predicted 500 years before, as a slave for "thirty pieces of silver;" and they themselves were afterwards sold and bought as slaves for the lowest price possible. They preferred the robber and murderer Barabbas to the meek and innocent Son of God, and they were eventually destroyed through the machinations of robbers called the "Sicarii," who infested Jerusalem, murdered men openly in the streets, commencing with Jonathan, the high priest, and "persuaded the Jews to revolt against the Romans." They put the Messiah to death lest "the Romans should come and take away both our place and nation," yet that was the chief reason why the judgment overtook them by the Roman invasion. They crucified Jesus without the walls of Jerusalem, where they were subsequently crucified in such numbers, that, as Josephus informs us, "the Roman soldiers, out of hatred to the Jews, nailed those they took to crosses by way of jest, when the number of the crucified was so great, that room was wanting for the crosses, and crosses wanting for the bodies." Surely in these things we have an amount of irresistible evidence for asserting that the fearful imprecation which the Jews uttered in the Praetorium of Pilate, "His blood be on us and on our children," the echoes of which have been reverberating throughout Christendom during the last 18 centuries, has been fulfilled to the letter, in their unparalleled and long-continued sufferings at the hands of their fellow-men.

It is a remarkable fact in the history of the world, that of the 3400 years which have elapsed since the children of Israel entered the promised land, their idolized capital Jerusalem, the beloved city of Zion, has only been possessed by them, as an independent nation, between four and five centuries, from the time that David made it his capital when he had conquered the Jebusites, until the time of the Babylonish captivity. And during this long period since the Eisode, Jerusalem has been
The times of the Gentiles.

attacked, besieged, or taken upwards of 17 times; 3 twice it was razed to the ground, on two other occasions its walls were levelled, and once the ploughshare passed over it in accordance with the prediction of the Jewish prophets. 4 In this respect it stands without a parallel of any city, ancient or modern, in the history of mankind. The following is a brief summary of the sieges to which Jerusalem has been exposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1520</td>
<td>Jerusalem was besieged by the children of Judah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>of Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1047</td>
<td>King David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>970</td>
<td>Shishak, king of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>Joash, king of Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>Sennacherib, king of Assyria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>Pharaoh Necho, king of Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>590</td>
<td>Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Antiochus Epiphanes, King of Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Titus, emperor of Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>Chosroes, king of Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>637</td>
<td>the Caliph Omar of the Saracens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>the Turks, under Maleh Shah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1098</td>
<td>the Egyptians, under Sultan Aphdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>the Crusaders, under Godfrey of Bouillon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Gibbon remarks that “Jerusalem has derived some reputation from the number and importance of her memorable sieges.” (Decline and Fall, c. lviii.)

4 Jer. xxvi. 18; Micah iii. 12.
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A.D.

16 Jerusalem was besieged by Saladin, Sultan of the
   Turks ............... 1187

17 " " the Kharismian shepherds ............ 1244

After the departure of these hordes, Jerusalem again reverted
to the Turks, in whose hands it has remained, and by whom it
has been trodden down ever since.
CHAPTER VI.

THE LITTLE HORN OF DANIEL.

In the vision of the four great beasts which came up from the sea diverse one from another, the last of which was broken up into ten lesser kingdoms, fulfilled as we have already seen in the breaking up of the Roman empire by the invasion of barbaric races towards the close of the fourth century, the prophet describes another kingdom which would appear after this important historic event in the following terms—

"I considered the ten horns, and behold there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things."

And "the interpretation" of this horn, which was given to Daniel, reads as follows:—

"The ten horns of the fourth beast or fourth kingdom upon earth, are ten kings that shall arise: and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws: and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time."

Before proceeding to show how the prophecy has been accomplished, it may be well to notice a fatal error which is current amongst some prophetic students, who interpret this "little horn" of a future individual king, termed "Antichrist" who is yet to arise, and to reign in a rebuilt Babylon on the banks of the Euphrates, and subsequently to make a seven

---

5 Dan. vii. 8, 16, 24, 25.
years' covenant with the Jews dwelling in Jerusalem, and for half that period to sit visibly in the rebuilt Temple of Jerusalem, where he will be worshipped as God by "all that dwell upon earth;" and that this individual king will be either, as one terms him, "a resurrected Nebuchadnezzar," or else one of the Napoleon family! Believing this to be one of the many delusions current in this present speculative age, and not only unsupported by any Scripture evidence, but directly contrary to it, I would point out that we have sufficient proof from both Daniel and other Scriptures that the term "a king" in prophecy does not mean an individual, but a kingdom, over which a succession of kings are reigning. Thus the four great beasts of Daniel's prophecy are specified as "four kings" (vii. 17), and in ver. 23 the fourth beast is said to be "the fourth kingdom." And we have ample evidence that these four kingdoms were ruled respectively by Nebuchadnezzar and his successors over Babylon, by Cyrus and his successors over Persia, by Alexander and his successors over Greece, and by Augustus Cæsar and his successors over the Roman empire, until it was broken up by the barbarians, A.D. 476. Hence Daniel, in interpreting Nebuchadnezzar's image-dream, said to the King of Babylon, "Thou art this head of gold. And after thee shall arise another kingdom, inferior to thee," &c. 6

And as Scripture mentions by name two kings, independent of others mentioned by secular historians, "Evil-merodach" and "Belshazzar," as intervening between Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, it is evident that the pronoun "thee" refers not to the individual king, but to the rulers of the kingdom which sat upon the throne of Babylon.

So as regards the term "Antichrist," which the Futurists are so fond of interpreting as an individual king yet to arise, Scripture is still more clear than in the previous instance that it is not an individual which is meant, but "many" who are included in the term. Thus St. John, speaking by the Holy Ghost, says—"Many deceivers are entered into the world: this

---

6 Dan. ii. 38, 39.
is (or according to the English idiom, these many constitute) the deceiver and The Antichrist." 7

There are six marks specified in the vision of Daniel and the interpretation thereof, by which we are enabled to detect to whom the prediction refers.

1. It is named “a little horn” comparatively and in contrast to any of the “four great beasts.”

2. This little horn would absorb three of the ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire had been previously broken up.

3. It would possess the special characteristics of an overseer, “having eyes like the eyes of a man.”

4. And “a mouth speaking great words against the Most High.”

5. It would act the part of a persecutor, by endeavouring to “wear out the saints of the Most High.”

6. It would claim the right of “changing times and laws,” and continue “until a time and times and the dividing of time.” It will be for us to consider what power has ever appeared of whom it can be said with truth, that it has fulfilled the conditions of all these and several characteristic marks, and represents the “little horn” of Daniel’s vision.

We have already named the ten kingdoms into which the fourth beast, or Roman empire, was divided on the invasion of the barbarians in the fifth century; from which the little horn was to arise. But we are not to suppose that these ten kingdoms always remained the same, or were even so at the close of the following century, when the rise of the “little horn” may be said to have commenced. Some Futurists have argued that the Roman empire was not divided into ten kingdoms at that time, but that it will be so at a time yet future, because Protestant commentators have given a diversity

7 2 John, ver. 7. ὀ πλανοῦ καὶ ὁ ἀντίΧριστος. I believe that the unfortunate omission of the definite article in the English version has been the cause of leading astray those who are unacquainted with Greek in this important text. There is no difference of reading in any of the MSS. The true definition of “the Antichrist” is a most important factor in the right interpretation of prophecy.
of lists in the enumeration of the ten kingdoms; but this objection, as Professor Birks has justly remarked, may be met by the fact that in the sacred Scriptures we have the twelve tribes of Israel numbered in different ways, so that the number might be raised to thirteen or reduced to ten, and eight different lists be formed, yet twelve are always numbered. Just so when secular historians like Machiavelli in the 16th century, and Gibbon in the last century, or Christian writers on prophecy, like Sir Isaac Newton and Adam Clarke the commentator, all agree in asserting the fact of the breaking up of the Roman empire, and in naming ten kingdoms as being formed from it, though they do not all agree in the names, we may feel assured that those who contend the division of the fourth kingdom, or Roman empire, is yet to take place, might with the same amount of reason contend that neither the Babylonian, or Persian, or Grecian kingdoms have come to their predicted and destined end.

The "little horn" is said in the prophecy to have arisen in the place of three of the ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was divided; at which time they appear in history with the following names: — 1. The Vandals; 2. The Ostrogoths; 3. The Lombards; or as they subsequently became at the time when they were made over to the Popes of Rome, when they were reckoned — 1, as the exarchate of Ravenna, the last remnant of the Greek empire in the West. 2. The kingdom of the Lombards. 3. The city and state of Rome. These three constitute the temporal dominion of the little horn, "before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." The first of these, the exarchate of Ravenna, was given to Pope Stephen II. by Pepin, king of France, A.D. 755: the second, the kingdom of the Lombards, was given to St. Peter and his successors, as the Popes claim to be, by Charlemagne in 774: the third, or state of Rome, was vested in the Pope, both in spirituals and temporals, by Louis, king of

---

8 Machiavelli, Storie Florentine, c. i.; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, c. xlviii.; Sir Isaac Newton's Observations on Daniel, pp. 75—8; Adam Clarke's Commentary on Daniel, c. vii.
France, commonly called "the pious," in A.D. 817; and these constitute what is termed "the patrimony of St. Peter." Thus history makes it plain that the prophecy is referred to in the vision of Daniel by the name of the "little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots." And this accords with the patristic expectation of the meaning of this prophecy.

"All ecclesiastical writers," says Jerome, in his Commentary on Daniel, "teach that when the Roman empire is destroyed, there shall be ten kings who shall divide it among them; and an eleventh shall arise, a little king, who shall conquer three of the ten kings; and having slain them, the other seven shall submit their necks to the conqueror."

Considering that this expresses merely the expectation of uninspired men more than a century before it came to pass, it is very remarkable to see from history how literally it has been accomplished; and that the "little horn" of the prophecy can have reference to none other than the temporal power of the Popes, which may be said to have existed in some form or other from A.D. 610 to A.D. 1870—from the time, when the title of "Universal Priest," or Bishop, had been granted to Pope Boniface, and the Pantheon, which had originally been erected in honour of the heathen gods of Olympus, was, A.D. 610, made over by the blood-thirsty monster Phocas to the Church of Rome; when it was dedicated by Pope Boniface IV., as the existing inscription shews, to the service of their goddess Mary, "the Queen of Heaven," and the martyred saints in paradise.

The temporal power of this "little horn" is thus defined by Antonius, Archbishop of Florence, a distinguished Roman Catholic divine. After applying Psalm viii. 5, "Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," to the Popes of Rome—an interpretation which to the true Catholic must appear little short of blasphemy, and declaring that "all power in heaven and earth was given to him," the archbishop proceeds thus:

9 The inscription reads as follows:—

"Pantheon ab Agrippa Augusti Genero Impie Jovi Cæterisque Mendacibus Diis a Bonifacio III. Pontifici Deiparae et SS. Christi Martyribus Pie Dicatum."
"The Pope is greater than man, as saith Hortensius, but less than an angel, because he is mortal; but greater in authority and power. For an angel cannot consecrate the body and blood of Christ, nor absolve, or bind, the jurisdiction of which exists in a plenary manner in the Pope; nor can an angel ordain, grant indulgences, or any such thing. He is crowned with glory and honour; the glory of commendation, because he is not only called blessed, but most blessed, as saith the canon law: 'Who can doubt that he is holy, whom the summit of such great dignity hath exalted?' He is crowned with the honour of veneration, that the faithful may kiss his feet; for greater honour cannot exist than that mentioned by the Psalmist, 'adore his footstool.' He is crowned with the greatness of authority, because he judges all persons and is judged of none, unless he is found an apostate from the faith. Hence also he is crowned with a triple crown. And is constituted over all the works of his hands, to regulate concerning all inferiors; he opens heaven, sends the guilty to hell, confirms empire, and ordains the clerical orders."

The same high authority in another part of his works adds—

"With regard to the temporal and spiritual jurisdiction which is in the Church, it is to be observed, that the power is threefold and various. The first is immediate, viz., from God. The second is derivative, viz., from God through the Pope; and this is the power of all inferior prelates. The third is given for ministering or subserviency; and this is the power of the emperor and all terrestrial princes. The temporal influence of emperors, kings, and princes is given by the Most High for ministering, through the mediation of the Popes and other prelates of the Church, in whom resides the spiritual. The authority of the Pope is greater than all created power besides that of Christ, in some manner extending itself to celestial, terrestrial, and infernal things; so that what is said in the eighth Psalm concerning Christ may be said of the Pope: 'Thou hast put all things under his feet, sheep and all oxen, and beasts of the field; the fowls of heaven, and fishes of the sea.' And very aptly, because the Pope is the Vicar of Christ. He calls terrestrial things 'sheep;' celestial things 'birds;' infernal things 'fishes of the sea.' As it respects the power of the Pope over those in hell, who are designated 'fishes of the sea,' i.e., those who are in purgatory, to relieve them by indulgences. The authority of the Pope is exercised over those on the earth, viz., Pagans, who are designated 'beasts of the field;' over Jews and heretics, who are denoted by 'oxen;' over Christians, who are represented by 'sheep.' God hath subjected all these under the feet of the Pope, i.e., under his jurisdiction, as is declared in the Psalm, 'Thou hast put all things under his feet, sheep.'"
Such was the gradual development of that power which is described in Daniel’s prophecy as a “little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots.” He is termed a “little one” because he rose from small beginnings, and came to his supreme power from a mere Christian pastor, without the slightest claim or pretence to temporal power; and then gradually increased until he exercised power both in things temporal and spiritual, such as we have seen in the portrait which the Archbishop of Florence has drawn of the Papal claims as they existed in the middle ages. Nothing is more striking in the way of evidence to the truth of Scripture prophecy than to compare what is predicted both in the Old and New Testament respecting this “little horn,” with the fulfilment in every particular of the power claimed and exercised by the successive heads of the Church of Rome through many ages. The time was when the faith of that Church was such that it was “spoken of throughout the whole world.” It was ruled in the first century by Clemens Romanus, who is mentioned in Scripture as one of St. Paul’s “fellow-labourers;” and whose celebrated Epistle to the Corinthians, written at a time when there were only two orders in the Christian ministry (the presbyter and bishop then being the same), shows the loving tenderness, the humility, the unworldliness of the chief pastor of the Church of Rome, and proves the vast gulf between the teaching of that day, and the time when the head of the Roman Church bore the title of “Universal Bishop,” and boasted “that all power was given to him in heaven and earth.”

The testimony of the Papal writers to the Popes having succeeded to the power originally possessed by the emperors of Rome, is a remarkable proof of the application of this prophecy concerning the “little horn” to none other than the Papacy. E.g., Damian, a celebrated monk, and friend of Gregory VII., commonly called “Hildebrand” (A.D. 1073—1084), puts these words into the mouth of Jesus Christ as addressed to the Pope: “Ego claves,” &c., which in English read as follows:—“I have

---

4 Rom. i. 8. 5 Philip. iv. 3.
delivered into thy hands the keys of my Universal Church throughout the world, and have appointed thee my Vicar over it, which I have purchased with my own blood: and if these were not enough, I have given thee kingdoms besides. Yea, verily, I have given thee authority over the whole Roman kingdom, now vacant through the removal of the imperial power.”

The “little horn” was likewise said to possess “eyes like the eyes of man;” and in this respect to be “diverse from all the beasts that were before it.” That this refers to the sacerdotal or episcopal character of the little horn may be proved by the following reasons. The figure of having “eyes like the eyes of man” is applicable in the first instance to governors generally, as overseers of the charge entrusted to them. Thus in the LXX. we find the word frequently so used: e.g., in Nehemiah xi. 9, 14, we find Joel, the son of Zichri and Zabdiel, the son of one of the great men, described as “overseers” (ἐπίσκοποι) among the children of Judah; and so in Ezekiel iii. 17, “I have made thee a watchman (σκοπῶν) unto the house of Israel.” How peculiarly this term “episcopal” has been appropriated by the ministers and bishops of the New Testament dispensation is well known. The little horn had “the eyes of a man,” i.e., it was a seer or overseer (ἐπισκόποι), i.e., a bishop of the professing Church of Christ. Hence St. Peter is represented as telling the disciples what the Holy Ghost had predicted respecting the traitor apostle Judas, one of the chosen twelve, who had followed our Lord during His ministry on earth, by the mouth of David 1000 years before it came to pass. “It is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein: and his bishoprick (τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν) let another take.”

Now, according to the testimony of many Roman authorities, this title is peculiarly applicable to the Church of Rome; inasmuch as those claimed by and conceded to the Pope, as head of that Church, are described by Cardinal Bellarmine as follows:—

“Pope, father of fathers; the pontiff of Christians; high priest; the

6 Psalm cix. 8; Acts i. 20.
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prince of priests; the Vicar of Christ; the head of the body; that is, of the Church; the father and doctor of all the faithful; the ruler of the house of God; the keeper of God's vineyard; the bridegroom of the Church; the ruler of the apostolic see; the Universal Bishop."

So in the reported decree of Pope Pius, A.D. 150, but which of course from its date can scarcely pretend to be anything more than a forgery of a later date, we find the bishop thus described—"The laity may not accuse a bishop......bishops are to be judged by God alone, who chooses them as His eyes."

So Boniface I. (A.D. 418—423), when describing the authority of the Pope, speaks of him as "seeing with the eyes of the blessed apostle Peter." So Anastasius, librarian to Pope Adrian II. (A.D. 868—873), after comparing the five patriarchal sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem to the five senses, makes the Roman see to answer to the eyesight, as having oversight which no other see had in his opinion over the whole Church! So Pope Innocent IV. (A.D. 1243—44), in his sentence against the Emperor Frederick, speaks of the Pope as being "raised to the summit of the apostolical dignity, and therefore compelled to view most carefully the merits of all Christians" (merita intima considerationis oculo). Other examples of a like nature are to be found in the pages of Hardouin; but sufficient has been adduced to show how peculiarly appropriate is the language of Daniel's prophecy, which foretold that the "little horn" would possess "eyes like the eyes of man," when compared with the claims and actions of the Bishops of Rome.

It is also stated in the prophecy that the little horn would have "a mouth speaking great things, yea, very great things." How far this is applicable to the Church of Rome, let the teaching of her canon law speak authoritatively on this important matter; premising at the outset what authority it has within the bounds of her communion. "The canon law,

7 Bellarmine's Treatise on the Roman Pontiffs, lib. ii., c. 31; Ingoldstadt, 1590.
8 Hardouin, t. 96. 9 Hardouin, ii., 1112; v., 754; vii., 381.
1 Dan. vii. 8, 20.
or common law of our Church," says Professor Slevin of Maynooth, in his examination before the Commissioners of Education, "is contained in a work known by the name of Corpus Juris Canonici, published by Pope Gregory XIII.; and to form a complete body of Canon Law, we must add the decrees of the Council of Trent, and the different Bulls that have been issued by Popes since the time of Pope Sixtus IV." 2

The canon law of the Church of Rome may be divided into three periods: the ancient, the middle, and the modern. The first part consists of what are called the Apostolic Constitutions, the Codex Ecclesiae Orientalis, and the laws of some particular churches, embracing the first eight centuries. The second part consists of various collections made from the 9th to the 14th centuries, published by various Popes, such as Innocent III., Honorius III., Gregory IX., Boniface VIII., and Clement V.; concluding with the Decretia Extrav. Joannis, or the Decretals of Pope John XVII., published in the 11th century, and the Extravagantes Communes, containing decrees of Popes from Urban VI. to Sextus IV., published in the 14th and 15th centuries. The third part contains the Canons of the Council of Trent, and the various concordats between the Church of Rome and earthly kings.

At the time of the Reformation, Archbishop Cranmer made a collection of doctrines from the canon law, by which it may be seen how applicable is the characteristic work of the "little horn, with a mouth speaking very great things," to the power claimed on behalf of the Bishops of Rome, as it thus declares:

"The Bishop of Rome is not bound by any decrees. He hath authority to judge all men, but no man hath authority to judge him. It is not lawful for any man to dispute his power. He may excommunicate emperors and princes, depose them from their states, and free their subjects from their oath of obedience to them, and so constrain them to rebellion.

"The emperor is the Bishop of Rome's subject, and he may therefore revoke the emperor's sentences in temporal causes. The Bishop of Rome is judge in temporal things, and hath two swords, spiritual and temporal. It belongeth to the Bishop of Rome to judge which oaths ought to be kept and which not. Princes' laws, if they be against the canons of the Bishop of

Rome, be of no force. The Bishop of Rome may be judged of none but God only; for although he neither regard his own salvation, nor any one's else, but draw down with himself innumerable people by heaps into hell, yet may no mortal man in this world presume to repre hend him. For as much as he is called God, he may be judged of no man, for God may be judged of no man." 3

That Roman Catholic authorities consider the Pope possesses the right to act in a similar way at the present time, we may judge not only from the oft repeated and proud boast that the Papacy never changes, but from what her organs in the press delight to claim for her. Thus at the very time fifteen years ago, when Cardinal Manning, the titular Archbishop of Westminster, was asserting that "the attitude of England," in refusing to acknowledge the temporal sovereignty of the Pope, of which she has happily been deprived since 1870, "gives it the melancholy pre-eminence of being the most anti-Catholic, and therefore the most anti-Christian, power in the world"—the Roman Catholic Indicator was explaining to his readers what was the meaning of the apostolic maxim of honouring and giving loyal obedience to the king in the following terms—

"Rather than that our loyalty to the Holy Apostolic See should be in the least degree tarnished, let 10,000 kings and queens (Queen Victoria was then reigning) perish—i.e., let them be deposed from their thrones, and become mere individuals . . . . When the Pope and the Queen are placed in antagonism to each other, as has lately been done, and it is intimated that her Majesty will not accept a divided allegiance, we must consider who is the most important, and we should not hesitate to tell the Queen to her face, that she must either be content with a divided allegiance or none at all . . . . Whatever the boasted authority of Queen Victoria may be, it is as nothing, and less than nothing, compared with that of the Vicar of Christ." 4

Three years later Pope Pius IX. proved that he considered it was still the right of the Pope to depose kings, as in replying to an address from the Academia of the Roman Catholic religion, July 21, 1873, he argued thus:—

"There are many errors regarding the Infallibility: but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the right of deposing

4 Quoted in the Christian Observer of 1866, pp. 193, 127.
sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This right has now and again in critical circumstances been exercised by the Pontiffs: but it has nothing to do with Papal infallibility. Its origin was not the infallibility, but the authority of the Pope. This authority . . . . extended so far as to pass judgment, even in civil affairs, on the acts of princes and nations."

The little horn "shall think to change times and laws," according to the words of the prophet. By the first, i.e., "times," he shall attempt to imitate Almighty God, of whom it is said in an earlier chapter of Daniel, "He changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings and setteth up kings." We have already seen some specimens of the Pope claiming the right to remove and depose kings; which accords with a canon of the fourth Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, in which it is said—

"If any temporal prince being required by the Church, shall neglect to purge his kingdom from heresy, he shall be bound in the chain of excommunication, and if he shall not make satisfaction within a year, it shall be signified to the Pope, who may then proclaim his subjects absolved from their allegiance, and bestow it upon good (Roman) Catholics, who shall without contradiction possess the land."

And that such claims are not confined to the times of what are called "the dark ages," we may judge by the fact that as recently as the last century the body of the canon law, whereby the Church of Rome is governed, and which consists of Papal edicts, decreal epistles, imitating the imperial rescripts, was promulgated by Pope Benedict XIV. (A.D. 1740—58). Amongst many other claims to power equal with God, Benedict XIV. says:

"To the Pope it belongs to declare in what circumstances the divine

5 Quoted by Mr. Gladstone in his *Vatican Decrees*, p. 19, from a Lecture by Lord Robert Montague, himself a pervert to Rome, entitled *Civilization and the See of Rome*.
6 Dan. vii. 25. 7 Dan. ii. 21.
8 *Canon de Hereticis*. In the same spirit, the Papal Bull entitled *Bulla Cenæ Domini* excommunicates and curses kings and all authorities who oppose the will of the Pope.
To doubt concerning the power of the Pope, after he hath dispensed is sacrilegious. 

This Ferraris, a distinguished Roman Catholic divine, explains by saying that—

"The Pope can interpret and declare the divine law, that it would not be obligatory in some cases under certain circumstances; viz., when from the observance of it, either something unjust would follow, or a greater good be prevented."

But in addition to the claim of removing and deposing kings at his pleasure, the "little horn" is represented as "thinking to change times and laws." A modern author has a very pertinent remark on this subject. "He shall think to change times," says the Rev. Dr. Rule, "by a substitution of an ecclesiastical calendar for the civil. He shall ordain festivals, appoint jubilees, and so enforce observance of such times and years as to set aside civil obligations, and even supersede the sanctification of the Lord's days by the multiplication of saints' days. With regard to laws, he will enforce canon law in contempt of statute law, and sometimes in contradiction to the law of God."

These "times and laws shall be given into his hand," says the prophecy, "until a time and times and the dividing of time." By the term "time" we are to understand a year, the longest division of time; by "times," two years; and by the "dividing of time," half a year; thus making in all three and a half years, which, according to the Jewish mode of computation of 360 days to a year, would be equal to 1260 days in all; which is the number mentioned in Revelation xii. 6, 14, as the period where the true Catholic Church of Christ would be nourished and preserved from the power of the evil one; as it is figuratively expressed in the symbolical language of the Apocalypse—

"The woman (i.e., the faithful who constitute Christ's 'glorious Church')

---

1 Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt. in verbo Dispensatio, sect. xx.
of Ephesians v. 27) fled into the wilderness, where she hath a place prepared of God that they should feed her there 1260 days . . . . To the woman were given two wings of a great eagle, that she might fly into the wilderness, into her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent . . . . And the dragon was wroth with the woman, and went to make war with the remnant of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ.”

The same figurative language and the same measure of time is specified in another prophecy of the Apocalypse respecting the true Catholic Church of Christ: “The Gentiles shall tread under foot that holy city forty-two months, and I will give power unto my two witnesses, and they shall prophesy 1260 days clothed in sackcloth. These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks standing before the God of the earth.”

Thus we have Scripture warrant for concluding that the period, termed by Daniel and St. John alike, each speaking as “moved by the Holy Ghost,”—“time, times, and half, or the dividing of time,” means the same as “forty-two months,” or “1260 days,” and is equal in duration to three and a half Jewish years. That this is to be understood in the figurative mode of speech which we meet within the Old Testament is evident, for thus Ezekiel was inspired to declare the punishment of the Jewish Church in the following terms—

“I have laid upon thee the years of the iniquity of the house of Israel, according to the number of the days, 390 days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days; I have appointed thee each day for a year.”

Accepting this as a true canon for interpreting the prophetic Scriptures, we find that the power which is described by Daniel as “wearing out the saints of the Most High for a time, and times, and the dividing of time,” is the same as that described in the Apocalypse, when compelling the woman to flee into the wilderness, “where she is nourished for a time, and times, and half a time, from the face of the serpent.” And that this

---

3 Rev. xii. 6, 14, 17. 4 Rev. xi. 2—4. 5 Ezek. iv. 5, 6.
power is none other than the Church of Rome we have already seen by the characteristic marks mentioned by Daniel, and proved by an overwhelming amount of evidence.

As there seem to be one or two, or perhaps three periods alluded to in Scripture for dating both the commencement and the termination of the Babylonian captivity, which according to the prophecy was to last seventy years, and which Daniel set himself in “the first year of Darius the Mede,” i.e., B.C. 537—8, to calculate and compute the time, as it is written, “In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem;”—so there may be a double computation for computing both the commencement and the termination of the 1260 years, during which period the “little horn” was permitted by God to make war with the saints and to wear them out, to persecute the true Church of Christ, and to tread her down, until the time allotted by the Almighty for the duration of her power had expired.

And does not history show how literally this has been accomplished? A.D. 533 Justinian published his famous Decretal Letter to Pope John II., which henceforth became part of the civil law of the empire, constituting the Pope “Head of all the Churches in Christendom, and acknowledging that the Patriarch of Constantinople wished in all things to follow Rome. Counting onwards 1260 years from that date we are brought to the year 1793, the era of the great French Revolution, when the Papacy received the first of those terrible blows, which has now ended happily in the total deprivation of all her temporal power. After the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815, the Pope obtained by means of the kings of the earth an entire restoration of all his temporalities; and it was not until the Franco-German war of 1870 that the loss of the temporal power was finally and for ever accomplished. Between those two eras, 1815 and 1870, the power of the “little horn” was

6 Dan. ix. 1, 2.
growing year by year, so that had it not been for the "kings of the earth," according to the prophecy, gradually withdrawing their aid from the Papacy, we might have expected almost a revival of the power of the "little horn," as great as in the times when she deposed kings, slaughtered the saints, and proclaimed herself master of things in heaven, earth, and underneath as well. Hence we must look for another commencement for the "time, times and the dividing of time," or 1260 years of the Papal governing power. Rather more than seventy years after the Decretal Letter of Justinian to Pope John II., another notable decree of the Emperor Phocas, one of the vilest and most inhuman monsters that ever disgraced the imperial purple, confirmed the right of the Pope to the headship of all churches, as two contemporary authors, Paulus Diaconus and Anastasius, positively declare. The latter observes that "Boniface III. (A.D. 606—8) obtained from the Emperor Phocas a decree constituting the seat of the blessed apostle Peter the head of all the Churches;" and he mentions as a reason for this, which we shall consider in a later chapter, "because the Church of Constantinople had first claimed supremacy over all the Churches." About the year 610 the wicked Phocas again marked his favour to the Church of Rome by giving her the Pantheon, as we have before mentioned—a temple originally dedicated to Cybele and the twelve heathen gods of Olympus, now characteristically dedicated to the Virgin Mary (the Cybele of the Papal system) and all the martyrs; and in the rites of this corrupt form of Christian worship, which Coleridge happily described as "Christianity Paganized," we have a striking illustration of the transfer of the spirit of Paganism into Rome's so-called Christian ritual. From the year 610, counting onwards 1260 years, we are brought to A.D. 1870, when the Church of Christ saw to its intense relief the temporal power of the Papacy extinguished for ever.

As it is very important to a rightful understanding of the

prophetic Scriptures to comprehend what is commonly known as the year-day principle, denoting the period when the "little horn" should "war with the saints of the Most High," and contradicting the theory of the Futurists, who would limit the period to three and a half literal years, and by so doing destroy the whole scope and meaning of the prophecies relating to the great Antichristian power, which Scripture foretold would arise to persecute the faithful for "a time, times, and the dividing of time," we may see how this principle is found both in Scripture and amongst early Christian writers. We meet with it both in the writings of Moses and among the later prophets. Thus Moses records the intentions of Jehovah towards the children of Israel—

"As I live, saith the Lord, . . . your children shall wander in the wilderness forty years . . . . after the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty years, each day for a year (or as the idiom of the Hebrew reads, 'a day for a year, a day for a year), shall ye bear your iniquities forty years, and ye shall know the alteration of my purpose."

And so Ezekiel, writing 1000 years after Moses, uses a similar phrase in speaking of the iniquity of the houses of Israel and Judah—

"The word of the Lord came expressly unto Ezekiel the priest, the son of Buzi, in the land of the Chaldeans, by the river Chebar; and the hand of the Lord was there upon him . . . . Son of man, take thee a tile, and pourtray upon it the city of Jerusalem . . . . This shall be a sign unto the house of Israel. Lie upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days: so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee a day for a year, a day for a year."

Although it is true enough that some of the early Christian writers before the destruction of Daniel's "fourth kingdom," or the breaking up of the Roman empire into ten divisions in the fifth and sixth centuries, naturally interpreted "days" as literal days, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, Lactantius, &c., until

---

8 Numb. xiv. 28, 33, 31, 9 Ezek. i. 3; iv. 1—6.
the time of Augustine, yet no sooner had that event taken place, and the “letting” power of St. Paul’s prophecy, which we shall presently consider, had been removed by the breaking up of the empire, than we find the year-day principle admitted as the proper solution for understanding the prophecies of Daniel. Even before that event, as early as the third century, we find Cyprian and his biographer Pontius admitting the year-day principle, that a day’s respite of Cyprian’s martyrdom was to be understood as signifying a solar year. Augustine, in the fourth century, acknowledges the principle in his interpretation of the duration of the kingdom of the Apocalyptic beast. Tichonius and Theodoret, of the fifth century, adopt it in their interpretation of Scripture prophecy; the former, in his explanation of the Apocalypse, that “three and a half days are to be understood as three and a half years;” the latter, in interpreting Daniel’s prophecy of the “seventy weeks,” where he contends rightly that the seventy weeks means, not weeks of days, but of years. Andreas, bishop of Cæsarea, in the sixth century, Bede in the ninth century, Ansbert, Berengaud and Bruno Astensis in the following age, have alike adopted “the year-day principle;” so that, in fact, as Mr. Elliott remarks in his Horæ Apocalypticæ, “we have almost a catena of expositors from the fifth to the twelfth century, advocating a certain mystical, as well as literal meaning, to the beast’s period of the 1260 days.” Jewish Rabbies of the middle ages, such as the famous Saadia Gaon and Solomon Jarchi, followed suite, in interpreting the prophetic Scriptures on the “year-day principle;” and it remained for one Ribera, a Jesuit priest of Salamanca, in his Commentary of the Apocalypse, published in 1585, to invent and adopt the misleading system of Futurism in explaining away what Scripture says respecting “Babylon the Great” of Revelation, and “the Antichrist” of St. John, the evident effect of which is necessarily to whitewash the Church.

2 Augustine’s City of God, lib. xx., ch. ix., § 3.
3 Tichonius’ Homily, viii. Theodoret, Commentary on Daniel ix. 24.
4 Hor. Apoc., part iv., ch. ix., § 1.
of Rome; though as Mr. Elliott observes respecting Ribera, that—

"He had not the hardihood, which has been manifested by modern Futurists, to suppose the plunge into the distant future of the consummation to be made by the Apocalypse at its outset." 6

I think now it has been clearly seen that the marks pertaining to the "little horn," as mentioned by Daniel—such as his rise from a very small origin—his absorbing three of the ten kingdoms into which the Roman empire was divided in the fifth century—his having the eyes of an overseer, claiming to be "universal priest" or bishop overseeing all others throughout Christendom, with a mouth speaking "very great words" indeed—his long-continued persecution of the "saints of the Most High"—his attempt to change times and laws, together with the fact that his power over them was to endure, with more or less severity, for 1260 years—belong exclusively to the Church of Rome, and to none else besides.

6 Hor. Apoc., Appendix, part i., period v.
CHAPTER VII.

THE APPOSTASY IN CHRISTENDOM.

In the present chapter our object will be to consider the identity of teaching between the Old and New Testament in respect to a great dominant power, which prophecy shows would arise after the fall of the Roman empire, claiming and exercising authority throughout the Roman world, or rather beyond that limit, viz., over every creature in the world; as was said of the King of Babylon: "The God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom; and wheresoever the children of men dwell He hath given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all." The "little horn" of Daniel vii., whose characteristic marks have been considered at length in the previous chapter, claims a greater power than even that, and is therefore appropriately named in the New Testament as "Babylon the Great." Our object will now be to show the identity between the "little horn" of Daniel, the "man of sin" of St. Paul, and the "woman sitting upon a scarlet coloured beast" of St. John; each and all of whom spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost; and the fulfilment of their respective prophecies, as seen in the history of the Church and the world, is a striking testimony to the evidential value of the prophetic word.

St. Paul's prophecy respecting the "man of sin" is set forth in his Second Epistle to "the Church of the Thessalonians," which, by adopting a slightly more literal rendering than the Authorized Version, would read on this wise—"Now we beseech you, brethren, with regard to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him, that ye be

7 Dan. ii. 37, 38.
not soon shaken in mind, or disturbed, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter, as from us, as that the day of the Lord is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come except there come the Apostasy first, and that Man of Sin be revealed, the son of perdition: who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or an object of worship; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.

"Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now hindereth will continue to hinder until he be removed. And then shall that Lawless One be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him, whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe the lie: that they all may be condemned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 1

There are many marks given us in this important prophecy to enable us to know of whom the apostle is speaking; the principal ones being—1. The development of the Apostasy in the Church of Christ previous to the return of the Saviour to take His people to Himself. 2. The revelation of the Man of Sin on the removal of the hindering or preventing power. 3. The appearance of the Lawless One, whom the Lord will destroy at His coming. 4. Those who are deceived by his pretensions would be given over to strong delusion to believe the lie.

1. Let us consider what we are to understand by "the Apostasy," which in the Authorized Version is less clearly rendered by the expression "a falling away." If we refer to other passages of Scripture where the same word, as a verb or a substantive, is repeatedly used by the LXX. we shall have no difficulty in understanding its meaning. Thus, e.g., in Numbers xiv. 9, Joshua is represented as exhorting the children of

* 2 Thess. ii. 1—12.
Israel not to apostatize when they rebelled against the Lord. So when they thought that the Reubenites and others meant to forsake Jehovah by serving the heathen gods as well, the whole congregation of Israel exclaimed against their erring brethren, "Ye apostatize to day against Jehovah, so that to morrow he will be wroth with the whole congregation of Israel." So the idolatry, or "trespass," as it is termed, of King Ahaz, when "he sacrificed unto the heathen gods of Damascus," is called his apostasy. "In the time of his distress did he apostatize yet more against the Lord: this is that King Ahaz." So when Daniel was making confession of sin in Babylon for himself and the children of Israel, he cried, "To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have apostatized against him."

If we turn to the New Testament, we find St. Paul when writing to Timothy warning him expressly on this very subject. "The Spirit speaketh expressly, some shall apostatize from the faith," showing that the reference was to professing Christians. And so in the Epistle to the Hebrews the inspired writer warns his brethren, "Take heed, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in apostatising from the living God." From a critical examination of the above-mentioned passages of Scripture and others of a like nature, we may safely conclude that the apostasy predicted by St. Paul as about to arise within the Christian Church, does not mean a departure from Jehovah, or the Trinity, in the direction of infidelity or Atheism, but the adding to the worship of the true God the worship of inferior or lesser deities, so common among the heathen of old, as, alas! it has been with multitudes of professing Christians, not only in the darkness of medieval times, but also amidst the boasted light of the nineteenth century. Hence the early fathers used the expression alike with reference to man's original apostasy from God, and also to variation in doctrine from what was called "orthodox doctrine." Thus Irenæus says, "The apostles taught the Gentiles that they
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9 Josh. xxii. 18.  1 2 Chron. xxviii. 22.  2 Dan. ix. 9.
3 1 Tim. iv. 1.  4 Heb. iii. 12.
THE APOSTASY IN CHRISTENDOM.

should leave useless stocks and stones which they imagined to be gods, and worship the true God ... and that they might look for His Son Jesus Christ, who hath redeemed us from apostasy with His own blood."\(^5\)

So Dionysius, bishop of Alexandria, in opposing the carnal view held by his much-loved friend Nepos, an Egyptian bishop, respecting the Millennium, says that when "this doctrine was preached, schisms and apostasies of whole Churches followed."\(^6\)

St. Paul, in his Epistle to Timothy, referred to above, mentions the characteristic marks of the apostasy which would appear "in the latter times" in the professing Christian Church. "Now," he says,

"The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils; speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer. If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things thou shalt be a good minister of Jesus Christ, nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine, whereunto thou hast attained."\(^7\)

There are six notable marks which St. Paul gives to enable us to discover what is meant by the expression, "in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith." By the term "latter times" we are to understand the Christian dispensation, as St. Peter speaks of Christ being "manifest in these last times."\(^8\) And so in the older dispensation, as the Jewish Rabbies used to declare that the phrase "in the latter days" always means "the times of the Messiah," as the dying patriarch Jacob predicted what would befall his children's children "in

---

\(^5\) Irenæus, *Against Heresies*, iii. 5, § 3.
\(^6\) Eusebius, *Eccles. Hist.*, lib. vii., c. 24. Dionysius, however, was not a very proper judge of heretical doctrine, seeing that he himself was said to have denied the Godhead of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the blessed Trinity.
\(^7\) 1 Tim. iv. 1—6.
\(^8\) 1 Pet. i. 20.
the last days... when the sceptre was departing from Judah and Shiloh had come." And though the apostle says "some shall apostatize," as if he meant only a few would depart from the faith, as the term "some" ordinarily means, we have Scripture warrant for saying that it is occasionally used, as here, of the whole professing Church of God, with the exception of the few faithful, who have not, as in the days of Elijah, "bowed the knee to Baal." Thus in the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul explains the term on this wise, "If some of the branches be broken off... God hath concluded them all, in unbelief." So in the Corinthians, when St. Paul speaks of "some of the Israelites as idolaters," Moses specifies the same as "all the people;" and when the former characterizes the murmurers as "some," the latter describes the same as "all the children of Israel (which) murmured against Moses and against Aaron." Thus we see how the word rendered "some" bears the more extended signification of "all the children of Israel," &c.; and so St. Paul predicted when he spoke of "some apostatizing from the faith," he meant all that large body of nominal Christians which are included in the term, "the Church of Rome," out of which, as they declare by the mouth of their "infallible" Pope Boniface VIII., "there is no salvation."

The Church of Rome in its early days, when it is thought to have been composed almost exclusively of Israelitish converts, is described as having so bright and pure a "faith," that it was "spoken of throughout the whole world." But the modern Church of Rome, as it appears to the faithful in the present day, by means of the theory of development, has lapsed into that state of "Apostasy," which St. Paul predicted in his Epistle to Timothy. The most distinguished convert which the Church of Rome has made since the Reformation of the sixteenth century is admitted on all hands to be the celebrated John Henry, now Cardinal, Newman. At the time
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9 Gen. xlix. 1, 10. 1 Rom. xi. 17, 32.
2 1 Cor. x. 7; Exod. xxxii. 3, 6. 3 1 Cor. x. 17; Numb. xiv. 2.
4 Reference to the decree of Boniface VIII. will be given later.
of his secession he published his *Essay on Development,* in the year 1845; in which he attempted, very much in the same way as Mr. Charles Darwin has endeavoured to explain how man, originally created, according to Scripture, "after the image and likeness of God," has developed in the course of ages from the larvae of an Ascidian tadpole—so Dr. Newman has attempted, though in an inverse ratio, to show how the Church of Rome, whose faith was originally so bright and pure, has developed into its present condition, which the Church of England considers, and which Newman himself once considered, to be a "lost and apostate Church." For with that honesty of purpose which is so prominent a feature in Cardinal Newman's character, in the "Advertisement" prefixed to his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine,* he publishes a full account of the opinions which he once held, when at the summit of his intellectual powers, respecting the Church of Rome. It is so instructive a lesson to the true Catholic, that we cannot do better than give a brief summary of these opinions in the writer's own words as follows:—

"In writing against the Roman system," says Dr. Newman, "in 1833, in the *Lyra Apostolica,* I called it a 'lost Church.' Also I spoke of the *Papal Apostasy* in a work upon the Arians. In No. 15 of the *Tracts for the Times* I say—'True, Rome is heretical now; she was not heretical in the primitive ages. If she has apostatized, it was at the Council of Trent. Then, indeed, it is to be feared the whole Roman communion bound itself by a perpetual bond and covenant to the cause of Anti-christ . . . . Their communion is infected with heresy; we are bound to flee it as a pestilence. They have established a lie in the place of God's truth, and by their claim of immutability of doctrine, cannot undo the sin they have committed. Tract 20.

"In 1834, I said in a magazine, 'In the book of Revelation, the sorceress upon the seven hills is not the Church of Rome, as is often taken for granted, but Rome itself, that bad spirit, which in its former

---

*Many answers have been published in reply to Newman's *Essay on Development*; perhaps the most distinguished is that by the late Professor Archer Butler; gifted as he was with intellectual powers quite equal to those of Newman, equally well read in patristic divinity, and himself a convert from Romanism, he was better qualified than most men to expose the mistakes as well as the casuistry of his opponent."*
shape was the animating principle of the fourth monarchy (of Daniel). In St. Paul's prophecy, it is not the temple or Church of God, but the man of sin in the temple, the old man or evil principle of the flesh, which exalteth itself against God. Certainly it is a mystery of iniquity, and one which may well excite our dismay and horror, that in the very heart of the Church, in her highest dignity, in the seat of St. Peter, the evil principle has throned itself, and rules. It seems as if that spirit had gained subtlety by years; Popish Rome has succeeded to Rome Pagan: and would that we had no reason to expect still more crafty developments of Antichrist amid the wreck of institutions and establishments which will attend the fall of the Papacy."

In his Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church, published in 1837, Dr. Newman says:

"If we are induced to believe the professions of Rome, we shall find too late that we are in the arms of a pitiless and unnatural relative, who will but triumph in the arts which have inveigled us within her reach. Let us be sure that she is our enemy, and will do us mischief when she can. We must deal with her, as we would towards a friend who is visited by derangement. For in truth she is a Church beside herself... crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are... Thus she is her real self only in name; and, till God vouchsafe to restore her, we must treat her as if she were that evil one which governs her...

"In 1837, I also said in a review—'If you ask me how an individual could venture not simply to hold, but to publish such views of a communion so ancient, so wide-spread, so fruitful in saints, I answer that I said to myself, I am not speaking my own words, I am but following almost a consensus of the divines of my Church. They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system. While I say what they say, I am safe. Such views, too, are necessary for our position.'"

The consensus of Anglican divines, commencing with Archbishop Cranmer as representing the spirituality, and Lord Bacon as representing the temporality, who have expressed themselves as adverse to the claims of the Church of Rome, may be said to include the names of every English writer of note, such as Hooker and Milton, during the three and a half

---

centuries which have elapsed since the English Convocation rejected the usurpation of the Church of Rome on that memorable day in the history of the Church of England, February 10, 1531.

It will be sufficient if we quote the words of one of these eminent divines on the principle of *ex uno disce*, as expressive of the opinions which have been generally held by all the faithful members of the Church of England since the Reformation of the sixteenth century. About half a century ago Van-Mildert, Bishop of Durham, a moderate and cautious divine, thus expressed himself on the subject:

"I am convinced, and that upon no light or superficial grounds, but after many years of studious consideration and inquiry, that the *religion of Popery* is distinctly and awfully pointed out in Scripture as the one great apostasy from the truth, the declared object of the divine displeasure."

In addition to the testimonies of eminent individuals, let us note what has been the authoritative teaching of the three national Churches of England, Scotland, and Ireland, as they are termed, on this important subject.

The Church of England, by a canon of Convocation in 1606, taught as follows:

"If any man shall affirm that the intolerable pride of the Bishop of Rome, for the time still being, through the advancement of himself by many sleights, stratagems, and false miracles, over the Catholic Church, the temple of God, as *if he were God Himself*, doth not argue him plainly to be the *man of sin*, mentioned by the apostle, he doth greatly err."

The Church of Scotland, in her *Confession of Faith*, affirms that:

"The Pope is that *man of sin and son of perdition*, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and against all that is called God."

The Church of Ireland, in the Dublin Convocation of 1615, thus speaks at the end of the fourteenth Article:

"The Bishop of Rome is so far from being the supreme head of the

---

7 See Froude's *History of England*, chapter iv., for an excellent account of the Convocation under the presidency of Archbishop Wareham, and the conduct of the clergy on that occasion.

8 Cardwell's *Synodalia*, i. 379.
Church Universal of Christ, that his work and doctrine do plainly discover him to be "that man of sin" foretold in the Holy Scriptures, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming."

But inasmuch as it is the invariable canon of all true branches of Christ's Catholic Church in general, and of the Church of England in particular, that

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith,"¹

be it ours to endeavour now to prove that the terms "Apostasy" and "Man of Sin," which St. Paul uses in his prophecy respecting what would happen "in the latter times," i.e., during the Christian dispensation, are applicable to the Church of Rome. In this prophecy we have six notable marks by which we may discover the exact meaning of the apostasy, which the Spirit expressly warned the Church would in due time be made manifest.

1. Some would depart or apostatize from the primitive faith.
2. These would give heed to seducing spirits.
3. And to doctrines about demons.
4. And would speak lies after the manner of hypocrites.
5. They would likewise forbid marriage.
6. And would command abstinence from certain meats.

1. Now although it is certainly true that some of these marks of the foretold apostasy belong to many others besides the Church of Rome, whether Jews or Gentiles, Protestants or Papists, Episcopalians or Presbyterians, Churchmen or Nonconformists, none but the Church of Rome can be said to have within her communion all the six predicted marks of the apostasy, as the following evidence will show. We have already seen that "some" and "many" are used as convertible terms in the Pauline Epistles; so that although the Church of Rome has ever boasted, and will continue to do so up to the moment

¹ Article VI. of the Church of England.
² Bishop Mant's History of the Church of Ireland, vol. i.
of her final fall, as we know from the sure word of prophecy, of the "many" who acknowledge her claims, it quite accords with what "the Spirit expressly speaketh, that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith." Moreover, we have also seen that "Apostasy" does not necessarily mean a denial of the Trinity, but from the Biblical use of the term we learn that it means adding to that of the Trinity the worship of some other deity. Thus, e.g., in a prayer published at Rome, "with the license of the Superiors," in 1825, we have the following specimen of this species of apostasy:

"I adore you, Eternal Father. I adore you, Eternal Son. I adore you, Most Holy Spirit. I adore you, Most Holy Virgin, Queen of the Heavens, Lady and Mistress of the Universe."

Here we have an exact specimen of the predicted apostasy in placing a fellow-sinner, though "blessed among women" and "the mother of Jesus," on a par with her divine Son, and the other persons of the ever blessed Trinity, by according to her the same species of "adoration" which is given to them. Other specimens will be mentioned presently.

2. It is said that those who should apostatize from the primitive faith would "give heed to seducing spirits;" i.e., false teachers, who would be able to deceive many. In this sense St. John uses the term when he exhorts the faithful not to believe such seducers, but "to try the spirits" and their teaching by the infallible test of God's word; just as the Bereans were commended for so testing the preaching of St. Paul; as he says, "Many false prophets have gone out into the world," even in his day. For thus early had the germ of the predicted apostasy appeared in the professing Church, as St. Paul had previously declared "the mystery of iniquity doth already work."
3. Moreover, these apostates would "give heed to the doctrines of daimons." I use this word advisedly in preference to the rendering in the Authorised Version, "doctrines of devils," which conveys a very erroneous impression of the apostle's meaning; as the word for daimons (δαίμονια) is a different word from that which is employed to denote "the devil" (διαβόλος, Matt. iv. 1), who is described in Scripture under so many different names and titles.

The question, however, which concerns us now is to ascertain what St. Paul meant by the term "doctrines of daimons," as one of the prominent marks of the foretold apostasy in the nominal Christian Church. While Adam Clarke, in his Commentary on Psalm cvi. 37, justly remarks, "There is but one devil: there are many daemons;" the Septuagint Version of Psalm xcvi. 5, which in the Authorised Version reads, "All the gods of the nations are idols (Heb. 'nothing'), translates the sentence, "All the gods of the heathen are daemons." So in Deuteronomy xxxii. 17, it is said of the children of Israel, under the figure of "Jeshurun," "they sacrificed to devils' (or as in the LXX., daemons), not to God."

Bearing in mind that St. Paul was writing in the Greek language, and intended for the use of the Christian Church, the vast majority of which was composed of peoples speaking the Greek language, it behoves us to consider what the Greeks understood generally by the term δαίμονια, or daemons; as, e.g., when St. Paul was preaching at Athens, the Grecian philosophers who heard him said that "he seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods, or daemons" (δαίμονια). And in writing to "the Church of God which is at Corinth," another Grecian city, St. Paul quotes a passage from Deuteronomy already given,

6 Isa. xlv. 2.

7 The word דָּאָמִים, translated "devils," or more correctly "demons," signifies in the singular number, according to Gesenius, "most powerful, almighty," an epithet of Jehovah; and here is meant to refer to the inferior deities of the heathen, to whom the apostate Israelites sacrificed, just as apostate Christians have canonized and worshipped both dead men and women.

8 Acts xvii. 18.
to prove that "the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, or daemons (daemonioi), and not to God. And I would not that ye should have fellowship with daemons." 9

Nearly 1000 years before the days of the apostles, Hesiod, describing the race of men who lived in the period which the Greeks called the golden age, says:—

"After this generation were dead, they were, by the will of the great Jupiter, promoted to be daemons, bestowers of blessings, and this is the royal honour which they now enjoy." 1

And so Plato, who flourished midway between Hesiod and St. Paul, defines daemons as mediators between God and man. Thus in one work he says:—

"Every daemon is a middle-being between God and mortal man" 2; and in another of his works he writes, "When good men die, they attain great honour and dignity, and become daemons." 3

Thus it is evident among the Greeks the word daimon, or "daemon," was used to denote heroes and good men after death, who were deified, and regarded by their fellow-countrymen as mediators between God and man.

Now we have the evidence of one of the most eminent of the Christian fathers of the Greek Church, and who is, I believe, reckoned as a canonized saint in the Roman Church, the celebrated Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in the fourth century, who bears most ample testimony on this very subject, both as to the exact meaning of the daemons mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to Timothy, and also to the heresy which had in his day begun to creep in amongst ignorant Christians, and which in later years became so fully and fatally developed in the Mariolatry of the Church of Rome. The words of Epiphanius are most important, and read as follows:—

"Some persons 4 who flourished in the early part of the fourth century are

9 1 Cor. x. 20. 1 Hesiod, Opera, b. i., p. 120.
2 Plato's Symposium, § 28. 3 Plato's Cratylus, § 33.
4 "Some persons," i.e., the Collyridians, a sect so called from a Greek word signifying a bun or cake, of a cylindrical form, who were the first to offer divine honours to "Mary, the mother of Jesus," by presenting cakes in sacrifice on her festivals, when at the same time they worshipped her as a
mad enough to honour the Virgin Mary as a sort of goddess. Certain women have transplanted this vain folly from Thrace into Arabia. For they sacrifice a bread cake in honour of the Virgin; and in her name they blasphemously celebrate sacred mysteries. But the whole matter is a tissue of impiety, contrary to the teaching of the Holy Spirit, so that we may well call it a diabolical business, and a doctrine of impurity. In these persons is fulfilled the prophecy of St. Paul, 'Some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to fables and doctrines of demons;' for, says the apostle, 'they shall be worshippers of the dead, as they were worshipped in Israel.'5

"In like manner, also, the glory due solely to God has been changed into error by those who know the truth. We Christians must not indecorously honour the saints; but only Him who is their Sovereign Lord. Let, then, the errors of seducing spirits cease. The Virgin Mary is no goddess. To the peril, therefore, of his own soul, let no one make oblations in her name. . . . If an angel will not be worshipped, how much more will not she who was born of Anna? . . . . The body of Mary was holy indeed, but not God. The Virgin, indeed, was a virgin and honourable, but not given to us for adoration, but one that did herself worship Him who was born of her in the flesh, and who came down from heaven out of the bosom of the Father. . . . Let, then, Mary be in honour; but let the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit be worshipped. Let no one worship Mary. Let no one partake of the error which has arisen by means of holy Mary. Let Eve, our mother, be in honour, as having been formed by God; but let her not be listened to, lest she persuade her children to eat of the tree and transgress the commandment. For these silly women offer Mary a cake, or they take it upon themselves to offer it in her behalf. The whole thing is foolish and strange: it is a device and deceit of the devil. Let, then, Mary be in honour; but let the Lord alone be worshipped."6

Such was the teaching of an eminent bishop of the Church in the fourth century, and such has been the doctrine held by all the faithful respecting the blessed Mary from the time of the apostles until the present day. There is not one single father of the Catholic Church, for the first six centuries of the goddess. While they were Pagans, they were accustomed to offer similar cakes to Venus or Astarte; and after they professed to be Christians, they supposed the same honour might be shown to the mother of our Lord. Hence the stern and faithful condemnation by the Bishop of Salamis of this vain and useless folly.

5 Some have thought that these words originally stood in the text of 1 Timothy iv. 1; but this is doubtful. No MS. supports such a view.

6 Epiphanius, Panarion, a Treatise on Heresies, §§ 78, 79.
Christian era, in whose writings can be found any thing approaching to such a fatal heresy as that which Epiphanius so sternly condemns. It is true that the Church of Rome professes to distinguish between the worship due alone to God, and the honour to be rendered to dead men and women, whom she terms "saints." She gives the name of Latria to the worship to be rendered to God, and the consecrated wafer in the Lord's Supper; that of Dulia to the saints; and Hyperdulia to Mary, the mother of Jesus.

But whether this is sufficient to exculpate the Church of Rome from the tremendous sins of Idolatry and Mariolatry, let the following language sufficiently declare. Of idolatry it will be sufficient to say, that as the Church of Rome teaches that at the Lord's Supper—

"A conversion of the whole substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ our Lord takes place, which conversion is properly termed Transubstantiation...therefore all the faithful in Christ, according to the custom ever received in the (Roman) Catholic Church, exhibit in veneration the worship of Latria, which is due to the true God, to this most holy Sacrament." 7

The Church of England, on the other hand, as a faithful witness to real Catholic truth, as it has been from the beginning, teaches directly contrary, as her Articles and Rubrics authoritatively prove. Thus she declares that—

"Transubstantiation in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions." 8

Again, she declares that—

"Whereas at the Lord's Supper the communicants should receive the same kneeling, lest the same should be misconstrued or depraved, it is hereby declared that no adoration is intended or ought to be done. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine may not be adored; for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one." 9

7 Council of Trent, Session xiii., c. iv. and v. 8 Article xxviii. 9 Final Rubric to "The Order of Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion."
We have now to consider how far the honour which the Church of Rome authoritatively renders to the blessed Mary under the name of Hyperdulia, constitutes her guilty of this mark of the apostasy, which declares that nominal Christians would be guilty of worshipping dead persons, whether men or women. In the Roman Breviary, which answers in the Latin Church to our Book of Common Prayer, the following expressions will show to what lengths Papists are obliged to go in their invocation of Mary.

"Thou, O Mary, art the sole hope of sinners. By thee we hope for the pardon of our sins, and in thee, O most blessed, is the expectation of our reward. Through thee, Mary, the Trinity is sanctified. Through thee heaven exults, angels and archangels rejoice, devils are put to flight, and man himself is recalled to heaven."  

In another work of authority in the Church of Rome, its members are taught thus to pray:

"Hail, Mary, Lady and Mistress of the World, to whom all power has been given in heaven and earth. All the blessed spirits in heaven do bless and praise you infinitely, for that you are the great Mediatrix between God and man, obtaining for sinners all they can ask or demand of the blessed Trinity."

In the Glories of Mary, Alphonsus Liguori says—

"We believe that by the prayers of Mary she opens the abyss of divine mercy to whom she wills, when she wills, and as she wills, so that no sinner, however enormous his sins, may be lost, if Mary protect him. O Mary, thy office is to mediate between God and man. 'I am,' said Mary, the defence of all that have recourse to me, and my mercy is to them a tower of refuge, and therefore have I been appointed by my Lord the Mediatrix of peace between sinners and God.' Mary was chosen from eternity to be the Mother of God, in order that her mercy might procure salvation for those whom the justice of her Son could not save. It is related that Brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders: one of them was white, at its top he saw the Virgin Mary. He saw that some who twice attempted to ascend the red ladder fell back. They were then exhorted to ascend the

---

1 Roman Breviary. Office of the blessed Mary, Autumnal Portion, Lesson v.
2 The Devotion of the Sacred Heart of Mary, pp. 206, 293.
3 The Glories of Mary, translated from the Italian of the blessed Alphon- sus Liguori, revised by a (Roman) Catholic Priest; pp. 252—62; Dublin; Coyne, publisher, 1833.
white ladder. The blessed Virgin stretched out her hand to them, and they securely ascended to paradise” (p. 180).

The value of Liguori’s writings, and the doctrine contained in them as of authority in the Roman Church, may be seen in Pope Pius VIII.’s decree (May 18, 1803) stating that “they had been most rigorously examined according to the discipline of the Apostolic See, and that not a word had been found worthy of censure.”

In the Psalter of Bonaventura we meet with the following language:

“O come let us sing unto our Lady, let us heartily rejoice in Mary, the Queen of our salvation. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the right faith about Mary. For the dead shall not praise thee, Lady, neither they that are in the pit; but they who through thy grace shall attain everlasting salvation. For since, O Lady, thou wert most humble: thou didst force the uncreated Word to take flesh from thee. . . . . According to thine ordinance the world continues, whose foundation thou, too, with God, didst lay from the beginning.”

Dr. Pusey, in his Eirenicon, notwithstanding his expressed admiration for the Church of Rome, even asserting that the decrees of the Council of Trent and the Articles of the Church of England “each could be so explained as to be reconcilable one with the other,” appears to have been so shocked at the grievous Mariolatry advocated by the members of the Church of Rome, that he acknowledges—

“A new ritual has arisen, which seems to be intended to symbolize that we do not gain access even to Holy Communion, except through the blessed Virgin . . . . ‘It is through her that we have access to Jesus Christ in full confidence.’ [Hence] in Southern India and Ceylon, our churches are called by the natives ‘Jesus Churches;’ the Roman Catholic Churches, ‘Mary Churches’” (p. 107).

Sufficient has now been said to show that the worship authoritatively paid by the Church of Rome to “Mary, the mother of Jesus,” constitutes one mark or sign of that Apostasy which St. Paul, speaking by the Holy Ghost, said would appear in the Christian Church. It is true that Rome endeavours to

---

4 The Psalter of St. Bonaventura; Edit. Vatican, 1587. Permissu Superiorum. Bonaventura was Cardinal Bishop of Albano; he died in 1474, and was canonized by Pope Sixtus V. rather more than a century after his death.

5 English Church Union Circular, July 1866.
shield herself from this charge by drawing a distinction between the worship of Latria, which they confine to God, the consecrated wafer, and the cross of the Pope; the worship of Hyperdulia, which they render to the blessed Mary; and the worship of Dulia, which they give to dead men and women, whom they have virtually deified, or canonized as saints, just as the heathen of old used to do with their "good men when they die," as Plato says, "then they attain great honour and dignity, and become daemons." Scripture knows nothing of such a distinction; and the following prayers which Roman Catholics are authorized by their Church to address to those whom they call "saints," show exactly how the sin which Israel of old committed, as Epiphanius tells us, is fulfilled in them. A few prayers selected from the Roman Breviary, will sufficiently inform us on this head.

"O God, who hast translated the Bishop Dunstan, grant that we, by his glorious merits, may pass from hence to never-ending joys, through the Lord."  
"O God, grant that by the merits of St. Peter and St. Paul, we may obtain the glory of eternity."  
"O God, who by innumerable miracles has honoured blessed Nicolas the Bishop, grant that by his merits and prayers we may be delivered from the pains of hell."  

4. Turn we now to consider the next mentioned mark of the apostasy, as thus stated by St. Paul. "Some shall apostatize from the faith, speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their consciences seared with a hot iron." As this point will be more particularly noticed when we come to consider "the lying wonders" of the man of sin specified in 2 Thessalonians ii. 9, we may conveniently pass on to consider the next mark of the apostasy as mentioned by the apostle.

5. "Forbidding to marry." That this mark is exclusively applicable to the Church of Rome may be seen in the well-known fact, that though her rival the Greek Church has departed to a considerable extent from the primitive faith,

---

6 Breviary, Collect for May 19.  
7 Idem, Collect for July 6.  
8 Idem, Collect for December 6.
in the worship of Mary almost as bad as the Church of Rome, respecting marriage she is quite orthodox and sound as compared with the doctrine of the Papacy. And it is curious to observe that while Rome raises matrimony to the position of a sacrament, placing it therefore on a par with the two sacred rites of Baptism and the Lord's Supper instituted by Christ, without any authority from God's word for so doing, she refuses to thousands of her adherents the enjoyment of what she affirms to be a sacred ordinance of God!

Scripture teaches plainly enough that "marriage is honourable in all;" 9 that "a bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife;" and again it is written, "Let the deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." 1 Hence the Church of Rome, claiming to be above the laws of God and man, decreed by her Council of Trent to the following effect:—"Whoever shall affirm that persons in holy orders or regulars (which includes monks, nuns, &c., all who live according to rule) may contract marriage, let him be accursed." 2

It is an historical fact, as well known as any thing of that nature can be that for several centuries the Church of Rome did not forbid marriage to the clergy; i.e., before she had branded herself as "apostate." The monk Gratian, who wrote the Decretals in the 12th century, which were corrected by a committee of cardinals under Popes Pius IV. and V. four centuries later, and subsequently published under the authority of a Bull of Pope Gregory XIII. (1572—85), mentions in the 56th Distinction several Popes by name who were the legitimate offspring of clerical parents. Thus he says—

"Pope Hosius was the son of Stephen, the sub-deacon; Pope Boniface of the priest Jucundus; Pope Felix of Felix the priest, of the title of Fasciola; Pope Agapetus of Gordian the priest; Pope Theodorus of Theodorus Bishop of Jerusalem, &c. Very many others also," adds Gratian, "are found, who being born of priests presided over the Apostolic See. When, therefore, persons thus born have been promoted to be Supreme Pontiffs, they are to

---

9 Heb. xiii. 4. 11 Tim. iii. 2, 12.
2 Council of Trent, Sess. xxiv., Can. ix., Doct. de Sac. Mat.
be understood as born of legitimate marriage, which were everywhere lawful for priests before the prohibition came." 3

All this accords with the teaching of primitive times, as Clement, Bishop of Alexandria in the second century, says—

"God allows every man, whether priest, deacon or layman, to be the husband of one wife without reprehension.... What can the enemy of matrimony say against it, when it is allowed to a bishop who ruleth well his own house, and who governs the Church of God." 4

The edicts of Pope Siricius in the fourth, and of Pope Innocent in the fifth centuries, the first who sought to enforce the prohibition, were rejected by multitudes; and the conduct of Gregory I. in the following century produced a schism. The fifth Apostolical Canon "pronounces excommunication, and in case of contumacy deposition, against the bishop, priest or deacon, who, under pretext of religion, puts away his wife." Even as late as the 15th century, when the heretical doctrine was in full force in the Church of Rome, Pius II. was bold enough to declare that "though the celibacy of the clergy was supported by strong reasons, it was opposed by stronger."

It is impossible to state one millionth part of the appalling evils and crimes which have of necessity followed this rule of enforced celibacy in the Church of Rome, so contrary to the law of nature and the express prohibition of the word of God, notwithstanding the Tridentine decree which states—

"Whoever shall affirm that the conjugal state is to be preferred to a life of celibacy, and that it is not more conducive to happiness to remain in celibacy than to be married, let them be accursed." 5

The evil result of this enforced celibacy is seen in the abandoned lives of the Popes of the middle ages, whose character has been so faithfully drawn by their own historians. Awful and melancholy is the picture of the Popedom at this era, when, as Genebrard declares—

"Fifty Popes in 150 years, from John VIII. till Leo IX. (a.d. 883—1048), entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical."

3 Gratian, Distinct. 56, c. 13.
4 Clem. Alex., The Miscellanies, lib. iii., c. 12.
5 Council of Trent, Sess. xxiv., Canon 10.
Cardinal Baronius, in his Annals of the same period, says that—

"Many shocking monsters intruded into the pontifical chair, who were guilty of assassination, simony, tyranny, sacrilege, dissipation, perjury, and every kind of wickedness."

6. The last-mentioned sign of the predicted apostasy was concerning fasting—"commanding to abstain from meats." There is a remarkable ellipsis in this sentence, requiring the word "commanding" to be inserted in order to make the apostle's meaning more clear. By the term "meats" there appears to be a reference to the forbidden food under the Jewish law, mentioned in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the sacred writer speaks of the ill-directed conscience, which laid undue stress upon, or "stood only in meats, and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation." Hence he takes the opportunity of inculcating a doctrine in direct contradiction to that mistaken theory, by saying, "It is a good thing that the heart be established with grace; not with meats, which have not profited them that have been occupied therein." 6 A modern commentary has well said on this prohibition—

"Here the apostle points out two instances of the hypocrisy of the lying teachers who were to enjoin the worship of demons (or deified dead). Under the false pretence of holiness, they were to recommend abstinence from marriage to the monks, and friars, and nuns; and under the equally false pretence of devotion, they were to enjoin abstinence from meats to some men at all times, and to all men at some times. But there is no necessary connexion between the worship of demons and abstinence from marriage and meats; consequently, the Spirit of God alone could foretell that these two hypocrisies were to be employed for the purpose of recommending the worship of demons." 7

How difficult the Papal mode of enforcing "fasting" is from God's order, we may judge from what the prophet Isaiah says on that subject.

"Wherefore have we fasted, say they, and thou seest not? Behold, in the day of your fast ye find pleasure, and exact all your labours. Behold, ye fast for strife and debate; ye shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your

6 Heb. ix. 10; xiii. 9. 7 Macknight, Comment. in 1 Timothy iv. 1—3.
voice to be heard on high. Is it such a fast that I have chosen? a day for a man to afflict his soul? Is it to bow down his head as a bulrush, and to spread sackcloth and ashes under him? Wilt thou call this a fast, and an acceptable day to the Lord? Is not this the fast that I have chosen? To loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, and to let the oppressed go free, and that ye break every yoke? Is it not to deal thy bread to the hungry, and that thou bring the poor that are cast out to thy house? when thou seest the naked, that thou cover him; and that thou hide not thyself from thine own flesh?

It has been seen in the foregoing remarks, and will be more fully set forth in the succeeding chapters, that the six characteristic marks, which the Holy Ghost gave to the Church by the apostle Paul, by which the faithful would be enabled to detect the predicted apostasy, have one and all been fulfilled in the doomed Church of Rome, which nevertheless will remain so self-satisfied, and so wrapped up in her delusion, as virtually to be saying, as she is now doing, in the words of the Apocalypse, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow."

---

8 Isa. liii. 3—7  
9 Rev. xviii. 7.
CHAPTER VIII.

THE MAN OF SIN.

Previous to our entering into the consideration of this important prophecy, it may be well to give a more literal rendering than the Authorized Version of the exact words which St. Paul was inspired to write "unto the Church of the Thessalonians," respecting that awful power which would one day appear within the borders of the nominal Church, and claim the attributes of Almighty God. The prophecy is contained in the first twelve verses of the second chapter of the Epistle to the Thessalonians, and reads thus:—

"Now we beseech you, brethren, respecting the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, nor disturbed, either by means of a spirit, or of word, or letter as from us, as if the day of the Lord were immediate."

"Let no one deceive you by any means: for that day will not come, except the apostasy shall have previously appeared, and the man of sin shall have been revealed, the son of perdition; even he who opposeth and exalteth himself exceedingly against every one that is called God, or an object of reverence; so that he as God taketh his seat in the shrine of God, showing himself forth that he is God."

"Do ye not remember that when I was with you, I was wont to tell you of these things? And now ye know what it is which restraineth, in order that he (the man of sin) may be revealed in his own proper time. For the mystery of lawlessness is now working [within the Church]; only until he that now restraineth shall have been removed out of the way. And then the Lawless One shall be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the manifestation of his coming."

"Even him, whose coming is according to the inner working of Satan in all power, and signs, and wonders of lying, and in all deceivableness of
unrighteousness to them that are perishing, because they received not the love of the truth, in order to their being saved.

"And therefore God will send them strong delusion in order that they should believe the lie, that all may be judged who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness." 1

As we enter upon the consideration of this important prophecy of St. Paul concerning "the man of sin," it may be well to note a few things which the literal rendering of the passage seems to show.

1. The term "the apostasy," which in the Authorized Version is rendered "a falling away," proves that the apostle is referring to the same subject, of which "the Spirit speaketh expressly" in his Epistle to Timothy, and which has been fully considered in the chapters on "The Little Horn" and the "Apostasy" in Christendom.

2. The man of sin is not to be understood of an individual who is yet to appear in the world, but of a succession of individuals, as we meet with so frequently in Scripture: e.g., In Numbers xxxv. 25—28, the line of High Priests is mentioned as "the High Priest." In 1 Samuel viii. 11, the kings of Israel are called "the king." In Daniel ii. 37—39, a succession of several kings from Nebuchadnezzar to Belshazzar is spoken of in the singular number. In Isaiah v. 3—7, the whole nation of Israel is described under the term "the man of Judah," the Hebrew word rendered "men" in the Authorized Version being in the singular number. In Romans i. 17, all the faithful are included in the word of singular number, "the just" man. In 2 Timothy iii. 17, St. Paul speaks of a succession of Christian ministers under the term "the man of God." And in Titus i. 7, he speaks of the higher order of ministers under a singular noun as "a bishop." So St. John, in his second epistle, ver. 7, describes "the Antichrist" as "many deceivers." All these passages serve to show the usus loquendi of Scripture in describing a line, or succession of individual kings or ministers, by a singular noun, as in St. Paul's description here of THE MAN OF SIN.

1 2 Thess. ii. 1—12.
8. The man of sin is represented as exalting himself exceedingly, not "above every one that is called God," as the rendering of the Authorized Version implies, but "against" Him, as the Greek preposition ἐν proves. And the absence of the definite article before the name of "God" shows that the reference is not to Jehovah, but to those earthly rulers, or to the idols of the heathen, who are often called "gods" in Scripture; as, e.g., in Numbers xxxiii. 4, where it is said, "the Lord executed judgments upon their (the Egyptian) gods." So in Psalm lxxxii. 1—6, it is written, "God judgeth among the gods . . . . I have said, ye are gods."

4. The man of sin is said also to exalt himself against or over every object of worship or reverence among men. The word used by St. Paul ἰδεῖς naturally suggests an allusion to the Roman emperors, who were the chief objects of reverence with their Pagan subjects in the time of the apostles, and who always bore the title of Sebestos, the Greek equivalent of the Latin Augustus. The only other place where the word occurs in the Greek Testament is in Acts xvii. 22, 23, in St. Paul’s address to the men of Athens—"I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious (εὐαυτομοσετέρους; lit., too much given to the worship of your deified heroes). For as I passed by, and beheld your devotions (τὰ σεβασματα), I found an altar with this inscription, To the Unknown God." Hence St Paul’s reference to Sebestos in his definition of the man of sin, as an object of worship or reverence distinct from that which is paid to the Almighty.

5. The man of sin was to take his seat as a god in the temple of God Almighty. The term "sit," or take his seat, contains an evident allusion to the cathedral, or principal church of a bishop’s see, in which what is called his "throne" is erected, wherein he takes his seat. St. Paul does not say that he would have his seat in the ἵππων Θεου, but ναὸς—not in any outer court, but the inner part of God’s house; that part where He is supposed more particularly to dwell ναϊεῖα, as in the holy place of the Temple at Jerusalem, into which the priests alone were allowed to enter. And that the apostle meant to refer to the nominal
Christian Church is plain from the fact, that where he is speaking of those who constitute it, he employs the word ναὸς; as, e.g., to the members of “the Church of God, which is at Corinth,” notwithstanding their notorious sins and their disorganized state, “ye are the temple (ναὸς) of the living God,” and “what agreement hath the temple (ναὸς) with idols?”

Hence the early Christian writers employed similar terms to define the Church of Christ on earth, including in that term “the tares and the wheat”—“the good and the bad fish.” Thus Tertullian, in speaking of his fellow-Christians, says, “We are the temple of God.” And Augustine the same, “We are all and each of us His temple.”

Chrysostom, in explaining St. Paul’s prophecy, expected that “the man of sin would have his seat not only at Jerusalem, but in the Catholic Church likewise.” And Theodoret, on the same subject, declares that the apostle calls “Churches the temple of God, in which endeavouring to show himself as God, the man of sin will seize the pre-eminence.” Hence the learned Bochart has justly remarked, that “after the death of Christ, the apostles never called the Temple at Jerusalem ‘the Temple of God,’ but as often as they used the phrase always meant the Christian Church.”

The hindering or restraining power which prevented the development of the man of sin, though it was “already working” in St. Paul’s time, is spoken of both in the masculine and neuter gender—“he that restraineth,” and “that which restraineth;” and inasmuch as the verb is not followed in either instance by an accusative case, we understand St. Paul to mean that this restraining power would not check the man of sin by any direct action upon him, but would occupy a position so as to prevent this manifestation before God’s appointed time, when he would be manifested in that time and season.

2 Cor. vi. 16. See also 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17; vi. 19; Eph. ii. 21; 2 Thess. ii. 4.
3 Tertullian, De Cor., Mil., ch. ix.
4 Augustine, De Civit. Dei, x. 3, § 2.
5 Chrysostom, Homil. iii., on 2 Thess. ii.
6 Theodoret, Comm. on 2 Thess. ii.
That the Thessalonians, to whom this epistle was addressed, knew what the restraining power was, is evident from St. Paul’s words, “Remember ye not, that, when I was yet with you, I told you these things?” (ver. 5.) And as he also exhorts them to “stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle” (ver. 15), what the restraining power was must have been a current tradition in the Christian Church at that time. Now it is a well-known historical fact that the universal belief amongst the early Christians, i.e., the immediate successors of apostolic times, was that the restraining power meant nothing more or less than the heathen empire of Rome, and the reigning emperor or the chief of the state for the time being; which interpretation may serve to explain the use of both the masculine and neuter gender, as well as afford another instance of the singular person “he who restraineth” denoting a succession of persons who would prevent the manifestation of the man of sin until the appointed time. And there was a just reason why the apostle abstained from naming openly the restraining power, but contented himself with reminding them that he had privately told them what it was. The epistles were read in public, and it would have been unnecessarily indiscreet on the part of the apostle to have publicly declared that “the man of sin” would not be revealed, until the Roman empire, which it was the pride of the people to call “eternal,” which their great poet had defined as “Imperium sine fine,” and whose coins bore the boasting inscription, “Römæ aeternæ,” had fallen or been overthrown. St. Paul had wisdom as well as zeal, and would not needlessly expose those whom he was addressing to persecution, or tempt the enemies of Christ to the sin of being persecutors, by openly proclaiming the downfall of the Roman empire.

The following extracts from the writings of Christians of the second and succeeding centuries, will show their opinions on this subject. Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, the disciple of Polycarp,
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7 Virgil. Æneid. i. 379.
who himself received instruction from St. John, was probably the first to mention the downfall of the Roman empire, as he speaks of the ten kings or kingdoms, the outcome of Daniel's fourth monarchy, mentioned also by St. John in the Apocalypse, "among whom the empire, which now rules in the earth shall be divided." 8

Tertullian, writing towards the close of the second century, adopts the same interpretation, saying—

"We Christians are under a particular necessity of praying for the emperors, and for the continued state of the empire, because we know that dreadful power which hangs over the whole world (the man of sin) is retarded by the continuance of the time appointed for the Roman empire." 9

And in another of his works the same author observes, when speaking of the restraining power, he explains that it is—

"The Roman state, the departure of which, when it is scattered among ten kings, shall bring in Antichrist, and then shall the Lawless One be revealed." 1

Jerome, writing two centuries later than Tertullian, explains St. Paul's prophecy in the same way:—

"Let us therefore say, what all ecclesiastical writers have delivered to us, that when the Roman empire is to be destroyed, ten kings will divide the Roman world among themselves, and then will be revealed the man of sin, the son of perdition, who will venture to take his seat in the temple of God, making himself as God." 2

Many other of the early Christian writers might be quoted in confirmation of the same opinion, but sufficient has been said to show that the tradition respecting the restraining power, which was known to the Thessalonian believers, pointed distinctly to the Roman empire, and several of them have mentioned the reason why the apostle prudently refrained from naming openly what the restraining power was which prevented the manifestation of the man of sin. Thus Chrysostom writes—

"If St. Paul had said that the Roman empire would soon be dissolved,

8 Irenæus, Adv. Haer., lib. v., ch. xxv., § 3; and ch. xxvi., § 1.
9 Tertullian, Apolog., c. 32. 1 Tertullian, De Resur. Carn., c. 24.
2 Jerome, Comment. in Daniel, c. vii.
the heathen would have destroyed him as a rebel, and all the faithful with him, as persons who took up arms against the state. But St. Paul meant the Roman empire. And when that shall have been taken away, then the man of sin will come. For as the power of Babylon was dissolved by the Persian dynasty, and the Persian was supplanted by the Greek, and the Greek by the Roman, so the Roman will be dissolved by Antichrist, and Antichrist by Christ."

We have thus the universal consent of the Christian fathers, from Irenaeus to Chrysostom, that the restraining power which prevented the manifestation of the man of sin was the Roman empire; and inasmuch as St. Paul had informed the Thessalonians what it really meant, it is more than incredible, it is utterly impossible to suppose, that the tradition could have been so perverted as to deceive the whole Church in the ages immediately succeeding that of the apostles. Hence we may feel confident that we possess the tradition which was known to the Church of the Thessalonians, in explaining the restraining power of none other than the Roman empire, which was broken up into ten kingdoms by the invasion of the barbarians towards the close of the fifth century of the Christian era.

Hence in our own day an eminent Roman Catholic historian and statesman says in his history of the Church that—

"The Bishop of Rome mounted the throne voided through the fall of the empire...... And little by little they came to take the place left vacant by the successor of Augustus."

Turn we now to consider how far the Popes, as successors to the imperial power, have fulfilled the conditions of the prophecy which the Holy Ghost inspired St. Paul to predict respecting the "man of sin." We have already seen by Scripture analogy that the expression "the man of sin" cannot refer to an individual who is yet to appear, either from the family of Napoleon, or as a "Resurrected Nebuchadnezzar," as some Futurists imagine; for then, inasmuch as the Roman empire was broken up into ten kingdoms in the fifth century, it would leave fourteen centuries unaccounted for in the scheme of Scripture prophecy. We are therefore compelled to
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3 Chrysostom, Opera, t. ii., p. 530; Edit. Benedict.
understand it of a succession of rulers, who have for many centuries borne temporal sway in three of the ten kingdoms which came into existence after the breaking up of the Roman empire.

The chief points for us to consider in our examination of this prophecy will necessarily be—

1. How the Pope or Bishop of Rome may be said to have his seat in the temple of God, exalting himself as God against or above all that is called God.

2. In what respect the Pope may be said to fulfil the character of "the Lawless One."

3. What we are to understand by the expression of St. Paul, when he speaks of "the Mystery of Iniquity."

1. We have already seen that by the term "temple of God" the early Christians, who knew what the restraining power meant, understood the Universal Church, or the entire body of professing Christians. Now this is just what the Popes of Rome claim for themselves, as the right to exercise authority over all Christians. It is not that this claim has ever been admitted in any age; as, e.g., the Greek Church, which in early days was numerically superior to the Latin Church, has ever protested against this usurpation, but the Popes have nevertheless claimed it in the words of one of their number, whom Roman Catholics are now compelled to regard as speaking with the voice of infallibility:—"We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."5

Bishop Andrewes, in his controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine two centuries ago, gave a catena of the early Christian writers, who understood St. Paul's use of the term "temple of God" in this prophecy to denote the body of professing Christians who constitute "the Church." And the action of the "man of sin" specified here in evidence of his exaltation against every αἰθασμα, "object of reverence," is said of his sitting in the holy place, or ναός, of the Church of God. Moreover, it should not be forgotten

that in the only other place in the New Testament where the word ἐκπάςμα occurs (Acts xvii. 23), it is used in connexion with the word “altar.”

Now a very important ceremony in connection with the election and consecration of every fresh Pope, seems to explain fully the meaning of the prophecy respecting the man of sin in the temple of God, and being there worshipped as God. In Picart’s *Ceremoniale Romanum* 6 we have a full account of this ceremony, from which the following extract is taken.

"First adoration of the Pope after his election. . . . . . In his chair before the altar of the chapel in the conclave, there the cardinal dean first, and after him the rest of the cardinals one by one, adore his holiness upon their knees.

"The second adoration of the Pope. . . . . . The Pope rises, and, wearing his mitre, is lifted up by the cardinals, and is placed by them upon the altar to sit there. One of the bishops kneels, and begins the ‘Te Deum.’ In the mean time the cardinals kiss the feet and hands and face of the Pope.

"After the coronation, the second cardinal deacon places the tiara or triple crown upon the Pope’s head, saying, ‘Receive this tiara, embellished with three crowns, and never forget when you have it on that you are the Father of princes and kings, and the Supreme Judge of the Universe; and on earth, the Vicar of Jesus Christ our Saviour.’"

This ceremony of adoring a fellow-creature has been observed by the Church of Rome for many centuries, and is termed by Roman Catholic writers “The Adoration.” It is represented on a coin struck in the Papal mint, with the inscription, *Quem creant, adorant*—“Whom they create (Pope), they adore.” And the language which the Roman Catholics are in the habit of using on such occasions may be judged by the following address of Cardinal Colonna to Pope Innocent X. at his coronation, Sept. 15th, 1644—

"Most Holy and Blessed Father, Head of the Church, Ruler of the World, to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven are committed, whom the angels in heaven revere, whom the gates of hell fear, and whom all the world adores, we specially venerate, worship, and adore thee, and

6 The *Ceremoniale Romanum* is written in Latin, and was compiled by the Roman Catholic Archbishop Marcellus, and is dedicated to Pope Leo X. (1513—22), having been printed at Rome in 1516.
commit ourselves, and all that belongs to us, to thy paternal and more than divine disposal."

Thus we see that at the coronation or inauguration of a Pope, he is placed by the cardinals on what they called "God's altar." There he sits enthroned, with the "altar" as his footstool; and there the cardinals kneel before him, adore him, and kiss the feet which tread upon the altar of the Most High! Can we wonder at such exciting the amazement of even devoted Roman Catholics, who realize in any degree the fearful profanity of the whole affair? We give the testimony of two Roman Catholic witnesses, with an interval of nine centuries apart, in order to show the effect which such adoration of a fellow-sinner must necessarily produce on all whose minds have not been warped by a system of Papal ethics.

"What do you conceive," asked Arnulph of Orleans at the Synod of Rheims, A.D. 991, under the presidency of Archbishop Gerbert, respecting the reigning Pope John XV.—"what, reverend fathers, do you conceive this man to be, sitting on a lofty throne, glittering in purple clothing and in gold? If he is destitute of charity, and puffed up with knowledge alone, he is Antichrist, sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God." 8

And so in the same sense the Rev. J. C. Eustace, a Roman Catholic priest of our own time, remarks on the profanation of this mode of adoration of the Pope, saying—

"In this piece of pageantry I object not to the word adoration, but why should the altar, the beauty of holiness, the throne of the Victim Lamb, the mercy seat of the Temple of Christianity, be converted into the footstool of a mortal? The practice ought to be suppressed." 9

The extent to which this adoration was carried at the coronation of Pope Alexander VI. (Borgia), A.D. 1492, one of the most infamous monsters of vice that ever occupied a throne, may be judged from the following couplet which appeared on the occasion—

"Cæsare magna fuit, nunc Roma est Maxima, Sextus
Regnat Alexander, ille ver, iste Deus." 1

"Cesar was a mere man:—Pope Alexander was indeed God!"

7 Banck, Roma Triumphant, p. 384; Franeker, 3rd edit., 1666.
8 Gieseler, ii. 81. 9 Eustace's Tour through Italy, vol. ii., p. 631.
1 Corio., Storia di Milano, par. 7, p. 8880.
The first sign of this profanation of all true worship appears during the reign of one of the most degraded and infamous of the heathen emperors of the Roman empire, when Caligula (A.D. 37—41) offered his foot to be kissed by any who approached him, which created great indignation throughout the city. Seneca ² declaimed against it in his usual manner as the last affront to liberty! and the introduction of a Persian slavery into the manners of Rome. Yet this servile act, as we have already seen, is now the standing ceremonial of professing Christian Rome, and a necessary condition of access to the reigning Pope at his coronation, though derived from no better origin than the pride of an infamous pagan tyrant.

Within half a century after the death of Caligula, we find one of his successors, the Emperor Domitian (A.D. 81—96), adopting this style of addressing his officials—"Our Lord and God commands so and so;" whence, says his biographer, "it became a rule that no one should style him otherwise either in writing or speaking."³

Without dwelling upon the fact that the Popes or Bishops of Rome assumed the title of Pontifex Maximus, which was borne by the heathen emperors and rejected by the Christian emperors, it will be necessary for us carefully to consider how they, who originally professed themselves loyal and obedient subjects of the empire, came gradually to acquire such power as to claim, and to have their claim recognised, as having no superior; to be above all law, not to be judged by any man—in short, to be nothing less than, as the prophecy had predicted, to be regarded as God upon earth.

To quote the words of various Popes themselves, and to begin with one of these infallible authorities of the fifth century, we find Pope Gelasius (A.D. 492—6) saying to the Emperor Anastasius that—

"Being Roman born, I do love, worship, and reverence thee as the Roman Prince. And that the presidents or bishops of religion, knowing

² Seneca, De Benef., lib. ii., c. 12.
³ Suetonius, Life of Domitian, c. xiii.
the empire to have been conferred on him by Divine Providence, did obey his laws." 4

In a different spirit Pope Felix III. (A.D. 526—30) taught—

"It is certain that, in causes relating to God, it is the safest course for you, that, according to his institution, ye endeavour to submit the will of the king to the priests." 5

After him, however, Pope Gregory I., commonly though questionably termed "the Great," acknowledged that the—

"Emperor was his lord by God's ordinance superior to all men, to whom he (the Pope) was subject, and whom in duty he was found to obey." 6

And so Pope Agatho (A.D. 678—82), in the Sixth General Council assembled by the Emperor Constantine IV., "Pogonatus," calls Constantine "his lord;" and avows "himself, together with all presidents of the Churches, to be servants to the emperor." And Pope Leo II. (682—4), when acknowledging the acts of the Sixth General Council, calls the emperor "the prototype (first and foremost) son of the Church," and terms the whole body of priests "the meanest servants of his royal nobleness."

After this a change appears to have come over the spirit of the Papacy respecting the apostolic canon of rendering obedience to the emperor, as St. Paul taught the early Christians at Rome five centuries before, "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." 7 For Pope Gregory II. (A.D. 715—31), in addressing the reigning emperor, Leo III., "Isaurus" (A.D. 727), declared that—

"All the kingdoms of the West did acknowledge St. Peter (and conse-

4 Pope Gelasius I. Epist. 8, ad Anast. Imp. Nevertheless, Gelasius tells the emperor that "the necks of kings and princes are put under the knees of priests."

5 Pope Felix III. Distinct. x., c. 3.


7 Rom. xiii, 1, 2.
quently the Popes, who pretended to be his successors) as a God on earth: ὁ Θεὸς ὑπ' ἐπίγνωσιν.”

A century and a half later we find Pope Nicholas I. (A.D. 858—68), who is said by some to have been the first bishop who excommuni cated princes, writing to the Emperor Michael in 867 as follows:—

“It is evident that the Pope, who was called God by Constantine, can neither be bound nor released by the secular power, for it is manifest that God cannot be judged by man...... The Canons have decreed that all appeals of the whole Church be brought to the examination of this See (of Rome), and that no appeal be made from it, that she may thus be judge of the whole Church, while she herself cannot be judged by any.”

During the next two centuries, including the Papacy of Gregory VII., commonly called “Hildebrande” (A.D. 1073—84), the claims of the Bishops of Rome grew to an almost exorbitant height, until the time of Pope Innocent III. (A.D. 1198—1216), who decreed that—

“It was not fit that any one should be invested with authority who did not serve the Holy See—that he would not endure the least contempt of himself or of God, whose place he held on earth. For the Roman Pontiff occupies on earth, not simply the position of a mere man, but that of a true God.”

Hence, in writing to Peter, Bishop of Mentz, he calls himself as Pope—

“The Viceroy of the true God, by which he possessed a divine judgment, was able to make something out of nothing—that his will stood for reason—that he could dispense with holy laws, and could convert righteousness into unrighteousness by converting and changing ordinances.” And in his sermon (de Consecra. Pontiff), Innocent III. described the Pope to be the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the successor of Peter, the anointed of the Lord, the God of Pharaoh; short of God, beyond man; less than God, greater than man; who judges all men, and is judged of none.

“The Pontifical power doth as much exceed the royal, as the sun doth exceed the moon. Since the earth is seven times greater than the moon, and the sun is eight times greater than the earth, therefore the Pontifical dignity is 56 times greater than the royal dignity.”
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8 Pope Gregory II., Epist. i., Bin. t. v., p. 508.
9 Pope Nicholas I., Epist. viii.
1 Pope Innocent III. in Deret. Greg. IX., lib. i., tit. 33, cap. 6; Turin, 1621.
The doctrine of the Papal supremacy was carried to an extent which is scarcely credible during the darkness which brooded over the Church in the medieval ages. It was determined by a high authority that "the same honour which is due to Christ as God is due also to the Pope, because the honour is paid to the power; and the power of Christ and that of the Pope are one." Moreover, that Latria also, which is the service due to God, must be rendered to the Pope: because all service is due to the Pope; therefore Latria is due to him. Some of the Papal doctors distinctly taught "THF POPE IS GOD." Others said, "All the princes of the earth adore and worship him AS THE HIGHEST GOD;" and that "a dispensation from sin granted by the Pope must be valid, because he is GOD UPON EARTH." Lastly the Gloss to the Extravaganza of Pope John XXII. (a.d. 1316—34) distinctly describes him by the fatal title of "OUR LORD GOD THE POPE." Hence the canon law of the Church of Rome repeatedly asserts that the Pope, as "Roman Pontiff, bears the authority not of a mere man, but of the true God upon the earth."

It should be remembered in considering St. Paul's prophecy respecting the man of sin, it is not recorded that he would boast, saying that he is God, but "showing" that he is God; i.e., claiming titles belonging exclusively to God, and assuming the power to do what can only be done by God. By calling himself and allowing others to call him "Holy Father," the Pope assumes a name descriptive of the divine attributes. He claims the power of forgiving sins, which Scripture and all Catholic testimony alike declares belongs to God alone. He claims the power of cursing, which is one of the most awful prerogatives of Jehovah, as "a great, mighty and terrible Lord God of gods" (Deut. x. 17). As God's residence was called "His
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2 Augustini Triumphi, Qu. ix., Art. 1 and 3.  
4 Blondus apud Wolvium.  
5 "All the editions, since the Paris edit. of 1612, omit the word "God;" but Gieseler states that it is found in the Lyons editions of 1504 and 1606; and also in the Paris editions of 1685, 1601, and 1612 (vol. iii., p. 47).  
holy hill," so an inherent holiness is claimed for the Holy See, which, it is alleged, either finds its occupant holy or makes him so; notwithstanding the notorious fact, affirmed by all Roman Catholic historians, that in the middle ages many of the Popes were the vilest monsters of vice which the world has ever seen. The Pope claims to be the Head of the Church on earth, a manifest usurpation of the prerogative of Christ. The Pope claims the power of dispensing that which is right, which is, speaking with all reverence, more than God can do. He claims the power to canonize dead men and women, and commands the living to worship them. He claims to have dominion over souls in what he calls "Purgatory," and to have power to release such whenever he pleases. Thus does the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, "show himself that he is God," according to the prophecy respecting the man of sin.

It must have been difficult for sincere Romanists at times to have known which was the genuine and infallible Pope, whom they were bound to recognise "as God upon earth," to whom the worship of Latria was due, seeing that at different periods there have been as many as twenty-one rivals and competitors for the Papal throne. In the ninth century there were no less than five Popes claiming allegiance at the same time from the puzzled adherents of the Papacy. And between the tenth century and the sixteenth, when the Reformation was accomplished, the rival Popes were more numerous still.

Having thus stated at some length the power claimed by the Popes, and the titles of honour and reverence ascribed to them by their benighted followers, we see how exactly they fulfil the apostolic prediction respecting "the man of sin" magnifying and exalting himself as God, and sitting on the altar of a Church professedly Christian, and showing himself as if he were God, thus fulfilling St. Augustine's explanation of St. Paul's prophecy, when he wrote—

"Antichrist shall not only sit in the Church of God, but also shall show himself in outward appearance, as if he himself were the Church itself."

Or, as Augustine's great contemporary Chrysostom expressed it—

"As long as the (Roman) empire shall stand, no one will submit himself to Antichrist; but after the dissolution of the empire, Antichrist will invade the vacant seat, and endeavour with all his might to draw unto himself the empire both of God and man."8

St. Paul, in the prophecy respecting "the man of sin," tells his readers that "the mystery of iniquity" was already silently at work within the Church, doing such fatal injury to those who listened to the syren's voice; but as the subject of "the
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8 Chrysostom, in 2 Epist. ab Thess., c. ii., Hom. iv., t. xi., p. 530; Paris, 1738. The expectation of both Augustine and Chrysostom respecting "Antichrist," who was unrevealed in their day, has been proved by subsequent history to be far nearer the truth than the speculative ideas of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, who preceded them by about a century, and who has written more at length on the subject than any other of the early doctors of the Christian Church. Whoever takes the trouble to read his treatise on Christ and Antichrist, will find that he treats the subject of Scripture prophecy in a threefold manner. When he explains the prophecies of Daniel respecting the four monarchies, he adopts the correct and ordinary interpretation of assigning them to the Babylonian, Persian, Grecian, and Roman monarchies, the last of which was ruling when Hippolytus wrote. When he attempts to interpret the prophecy of St. John concerning "Babylon the Great," he contents himself with merely quoting the apostle's words, without the slightest attempt to explain their meaning. But when he seeks to explain his views of Antichrist, he falls into the wildest system of interpretation, like the most speculative Futurist of the present day. Thus, to mention one or two specimens, he contends that his ideal individual Antichrist must arise from the Israelite tribe of Dan, because Dan is compared in the dying Jacob's prophecy to a "serpent biting the horse heels"! Isaiah's prophecy (ch. xviii.), which reads "woe (or ho!) to the land shadowing with wings," is interpreted to mean, "the Churches in the world"!! While Isaiah's prophecy (ch. xiv. 4—14) respecting "the King of Babylon," and which can only apply to Nebuchadnezzar, of whom Isaiah predicted between one and two centuries before he appeared, Hippolytus applies to "Antichrist," which is about as incorrect a speculation, as one of the prophets of the so-called "Anglo-Israelite" party in the present day, who interprets this same prophecy of the great statesman, Mr. Gladstone, because he takes exercise in felling trees, and the prophecy says (ver. 8) that "the cedars of Lebanon rejoice," because, "since thou art laid down, no feller is come up against us"!!!
THE MAN OF SIN.

mystery" will have to be more particularly considered in the next chapter, we may pass on to a brief consideration of the final mark mentioned by the apostle, when he says, after the removal of the restraining power, "Then shall the lawless one be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the manifestation of his coming." 9

The term which the apostle employs to mark the man of sin as emphatically the lawless one (ὁ ἀνομος) refers to the ancient term applied to the Roman emperor, Legibus solutus, "freed from all law;" which expression, Gibbon remarks, "was supposed to exalt the emperor above all human restraints, and to leave his conscience and reason as the sacred measure of his conduct." 1 In the same way it was said, Papa solutus est omni lege humana, "The Pope is exempt from all human law." 2 The sentence, "whom the Lord shall consume with the breath of his mouth," is taken from Isaiah xi. 4, "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked," which words are thus explained in the Chaldee Paraphrase, "The wicked, i.e., the Romans." 3

Mr. Gladstone in one of his admirable pamphlets, 4 when exposing the monstrous claims of the Papacy, after calling attention to the fact of "Dr. Newman being in flat contradiction to the official letter of Cardinal Antonelli," hints at a case which had previously been alluded to in the Times, and which, he says, "may possibly again become the object of public notice," as a specimen of the Papal claim to be "above all law" in England, and which is thus set forth in Macmillan's Magazine (February 1875): "Dr. Manning will not deny that within the last few years a marriage has been celebrated in an English Roman Catholic Church, one of the parties to which was already lawfully married according to British law, and whose
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9 2 Thess. ii. 8.  1 Gibbon's Decline and Fall, c. viii.
2 Extr. de Const. Licens. ix. Quest. 3, quoted by Bishop Jewel in his Comment. on 2 Epist. to the Thessalonians.
3 See Lightfoot, vol. xi., p. 296.
lawful wife (a Protestant) was and is still living; nor can he deny that this scandalous act is stated to have been performed in accordance with the advice of religious persons learned in the law of marriage, as recognised in the Roman Catholic Church."

It is an unquestioned historical fact that when the Patriarch John, Archbishop of Constantinople, first assumed the title of "Universal Bishop," it so excited the anger of his rival, Gregory I. (A.D. 590—604), the reigning Pope, and Archbishop of old Rome, that he wrote furiously to protest against any one assuming so illegal, so wicked, and so Antichristian a title, little foreseeing that within three years after his own death, it would be appropriated by his next successor but one, Pope Boniface III., and has remained the fatal and damning appendage of the Popes of Rome even since! Gregory, however, thundered forth against his haughty rival at Constantinople in the following way:—

"I confidently say, that whosoever calls himself Universal Bishop, or desires to be so called, in his pride, is the forerunner of Antichrist, because in his pride he prefers himself to the rest; and he is led into error by a similar pride; for as that Lawless one wishes to appear as a god above all men, so is he who, desiring to be called Universal Bishop, extols himself above all other bishops."5

"If any one in the Church assumes the name of Universal to himself, as in the opinion of all good men he (John, Patriarch of Constantinople) has done, then the whole Church falls when he who is called Universal falls. Let, then, that name of Blasphemy be absent from the hearts of Christians, by which, when it is madly assumed by one, the honour of the priests is taken away.... My fellow-priest John attempts to be called Universal Bishop. I am compelled to exclaim, Oh, times! Oh, manners! Priests seek to themselves names of vanity and glory in new and profane appellations."6

As some consider that the word rendered "bishop (sacerdos) which Gregory uses is not the true meaning of the term, we may refer to a note of the Benedictine editors of his works to this effect, "Per sacerdotes intelligendi fere semper episcopi." 7 So

5 Pope Gregory I. to Mauricius Augustus, Regist., lib. vii., Indict. 15, Epist. 33.
6 Idem, lib. iv., Epist. 20. 7 Epist. xli., lib. ii., Indict. x., Bened. edit.
likewise in the "forged" decree, commonly called "the Donation of Constantine" to the Church of Rome, the expression "Romani pontificis vel sacerdotes"\(^8\) sufficiently denotes how the word is to be understood and applied. We thus see how distinctly Pope Gregory applies the very term "the Lawless one" (ὁ ἄνωτος) to any one who should assume the title of "Universal Bishop," as his rival John, Patriarch of Constantinople, had done. By a remarkable judgment in the second year following the death of Gregory, which took place A.D. 604, Pope Boniface III, had this very title as the price of blood conferred upon him by the Emperor Phocas (one of the greatest monsters that ever disgraced a throne), who enacted a law, by which he prohibited the Bishop of Constantinople from retaining the title of Universal, declaring that it belonged to none but the Bishop of Ancient Rome, and which title the successors of Boniface have retained ever since. Cardinal Bellarmine, writing nearly a thousand years after the time of Boniface, sums up the titles of the Bishops of Rome as follows:

"Pope, Father of Fathers; Pontiff of Christians; High Priest; Prince of priests; Vicar of Christ; Head of the body, i.e., the Church; Foundation of the building of the Church; Father and Doctor of all the faithful; Ruler of the house of God; Keeper of God's Vineyard; Bridegroom of the Church; Ruler of the Apostolic See; THE UNIVERSAL BISHOP."\(^9\)

When it is remembered that Judas, a "son of perdition," was a chosen apostle, and not an open opposer of Christ, and that David spoke of him prophetically 1000 years before the Saviour came as "mine own familiar friend in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread,"\(^1\) we can understand the Scriptural meaning of the term "son of perdition;" or as in another Psalm, speaking of the same individual, it is written, "It was not an enemy that reproached me, then I could have borne it; neither was it he that hated me that did magnify himself against me, then I would have hid myself from
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\(^8\) Gratian, Distinct. xvi., 14.
\(^9\) Bellarmine's Treatise on the Roman Pontiffs, book ii., c. 31; Ingolstadt, 1590.
\(^1\) Psalm xli. 9.
him; but it was thou, a man mine equal, or of my rank (marg.), my guide and mine acquaintance. We took sweet counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in company.”

Hence St. Peter, immediately after the ascension, and previous to the choice of another apostle to supply the vacancy, spake of the fallen Judas in the following terms, “It is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishoprick let another take.”

Hence we naturally conclude that the terms “man of sin,” “son of perdition,” “the lawless one,” who would “magnify himself” against “all that is called God,” is to be looked for, not as some erroneously imagine, amongst avowed infidels, or the openly profane, but in a professing Christian bishop, who makes peculiar claims to obedience as a successor of the apostles. Yet the evidence which has been already adduced must be sufficient to convince every unprejudiced mind, that the succession of the Popes, or Bishops of Rome, is from Judas the apostate, and not from Peter the apostle. Hence the striking remark of a distinguished Roman Catholic historian, when drawing the portrait of the Bishops of Rome in the middle ages:

“Fifty Popes,” says Genebrard, “in one hundred and fifty years, from John VIII. till Leo IV. (A.D. 873—1048), entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical.”

Notwithstanding the overwhelming evidence of the application of St. Paul’s prophecy to none other than the Church of Rome, and the Popes as its recognised head, there are many in the present day, notably amongst the Futurists, who refuse to acknowledge what our three National Churches have authoritatively taught. And this need cause no surprise, as the Futurist school of prophetic interpreters have followed a scheme invented by a Jesuit priest of Salamanca, named Ribera, towards the
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2 Psalm lv. 12—14. 3 Acts i. 20.

4 Genebrard, c. iv. See also other Roman Catholic authorities, such as Platina, 128; and Du Piu, ii. 156; for the apostasy of the Popes during the middle ages, as will be shewn in chapter ix., “Babylon the Great.”

5 In Elliott’s great work on the Horæ Apocalypsuccia, vol. iv., pp. 480—3, fifth edit., there is a good account of Ribera’s Futurist scheme, which, strange to say, has bewitched so many Protestants in the present day.
close of the sixteenth century, whose evident object was to
whitewash Rome, if possible, from the overwhelming condemna-
tory evidence contained in the word of God against her. But,
as an eminent divine of the Church of England has remarked,
"The Papists see as little concerning Antichrist, as the Jews saw
concerning Christ; for as the latter still look for the Messiah,
who is already come, so the former expect an Antichrist, who
hath been for a long time revealed, and is reverenced by them
as a god... He who will not acknowledge the Papacy to be the
kingdom of Antichrist, hath great reason to suspect in his
heart that if he had lived with our Saviour, he would scarcely
have taken Him for the Messiah." 6

I am aware that a popular writer of the present day has
declared that "no man of competent education" can accept the
interpretation of the Church of England, that St. Paul's pro-
phecy respecting the man of sin is applicable to the Papacy,
and that if the great divines, like Jewel and Hooker and Andrews,
the members of the Convocation of 1606, and the translators
of the Authorized Version of 1611, had been alive now, they
would have changed their minds in this matter, and would have
modified their opinion "in accordance with the advance now
made in the interpretation of holy Scripture." 7 The challenge

6 Dean Jackson On the Creed, book iii., c. viii.
says Dr. Farrar, "of competent education in the present age, can accept the
above exposition (of the Church of England, in applying the term "the man
of sin" to the Papacy), which must henceforth be consigned to the limbo of
exploded expositions." The opposition to this important prophetic truth
reminds one of the Master's warning: "Let them alone: they be blind
leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into
the ditch" (Matt. xv. 14). Far sounder was the conclusion of the learned
author of the Horæ Apocalyptica, who said, after calling to mind the great
authorities who had supported the view which Dr. Farrar opposed, "I must
confess, when I think of the greatness of those names (Cranmer, Ridley,
feel amazed with which sometimes small critics nowadays, little acquainted
evidently with the subject, think to set aside the deliberate judgment of
such men by a few flippant remarks or a superficial critique" (Preface to
Elliott's Warburtonian Lectures, p. xii). Bishop Wordsworth has conclu-
thus boldly thrown out by Canon Farrar, has been taken up by
the present Bishop of Lincoln; and I do not think that I ever
recollect reading any controversy on any subject where the
challenger has been so decisively defeated. Bishop Wordsworth
has proved that so far from their being any reason to suppose the
great men referred to above would have altered their opinion
respecting the apostasy of the Church of Rome, there are addi-
tional reasons for being confident they would hold still more
firmly to the opinion that St. Paul's prophecy of "the man of
sin" is applicable to none other than the Papacy. To cite two
recent proofs of this, Bishop Wordsworth justly remarks:—

"Sitting in the temple of God, St. Peter's Church at Rome, the Roman
Pontiff promulgated, on the 8th of December, 1854, the novel dogma—the
unchatholic and anti-catholic, the unscriptural and anti-scriptural heresy—that
the blessed Virgin Mary was conceived without sin: and thus he
impeached the unique sinlessness of her divine Son, and he presumed to
affirm that no man can be saved, except he believes this dogma promulgated
by himself.

"Sitting in the temple of God, on the 18th of July, 1870, the Roman
Pontiff promulgated another novel dogma, and another anti-scriptural and
anti-catholic heresy, viz., that he himself is infallible in matters both of
faith and morals, and thus he claimed for himself the incommunicable attri-
bute of Almighty God, and by doing so, he contradicted what the Most High
has revealed of Himself, that He alone cannot err, and thus also in the
temple of God he exalted himself exceedingly against what is called
God, or is worshipped.

"Thus the Roman Pontiff incurred the anathema twice pronounced by St.
Paul, who thus speaks:—'If any man, or even an angel from heaven, preach
any thing beside what we have preached to you, and ye have received, let
him be accursed.'" 8

In proof that the Roman Church has become an idolatrous
Church in the estimation of some of her most eminent members
in this present age, passing by the fact that her funda-
mental doctrine of transubstantiation is authoritatively defined
by the Church of England as "idolatry to be abhorred

sively proved in his work on The Papacy Predicted by St. Paul, that such is
the teaching of the Church of England.

by all faithful Christians," the late Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur Sibour, wrote thus to Count Montalembert, Sept. 10, 1853:

"The new Ultramontane school is leading us to a double idolatry: idolatry of the temporal power of the Papacy, and idolatry of the spiritual. The Ultramontane bishops have driven every thing to extremes, and have outraged all liberties, both of the State and Church."

In a similar strain wrote that distinguished Roman Catholic layman, Count Montalembert, when dying in Paris, Feb. 28th, 1870, respecting the Ultramontane upholders of the Papacy, like the present Cardinal Manning, of "the idol they have set up in the Vatican:"

"Pour venir ensuite immoler la vérité et la justice, la raison et l'histoire, à l'idole qu'ils se sont érigée au Vatican."

How perfectly true is this very serious charge may be judged from a sermon preached about six weeks before Montalembert's words were written, and duly reported in the Times of July 1870. On the 19th of that month, in the Church of St. Andrea, Rome, M. Mermillod, Bishop of Hebron, and Suffragan Bishop of Geneva, preached as follows, respecting Pope Pius IX.:

"Our Saviour has gone through three incarnations: first He came down in the flesh; then, in His ineffable condescension, He chose the medium of bread and wine; and now he is once more on earth in the Vatican, in the person of an aged man."

Can blasphemy go further?—unless, indeed, in enforcing the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility, as Dr. Clifford, a Roman bishop in England, when promulgating this fearful heresy, told his clergy:

"In consequence of some doubts having been expressed on the subject, I take the occasion of reminding you all, in so far as it may be necessary, that the Apostolic Constitution, published in the Vatican Council, which declares

9 It is on this ground that the Church of Rome, and the Pope as its recognised head, stands convicted of claiming to be "above all that is called God," according to the prophecy respecting the "man of sin," as the Roman priests are enabled to boast how they create their Creator. Hence, says Gabriel Biel, on the Canon of the Mass, "He that has created me has given me leave to create Him" (Lecture iv). So in a Roman work, entitled Stella Clericorum, the priest is named the "creator of his Creator."
the successor of St. Peter to be by Divine assistance preserved from error, whenever he defines, *ex-cathedra*, doctrines concerning faith and morals, it is binding on all (Roman) Catholics. It is published on pain of anathema, and any person presuming to gainsay the same, thereby cuts himself off from the communion of the (Roman) Catholic Church."

Can we wonder at any one who knows even the elementary principles of the Gospel of Christ, protesting against such fearful blasphemy as the dogma of a poor old sinner, whose followers proclaim him to be the Saviour incarnate, and endowed with divine attributes? Yet when M. l'Abbé Laurens, a Roman Catholic priest, denied the doctrine of Papal infallibility, he was immediately suspended from the exercise of his ministry by the Archbishop of Albi. Just and faithful was his remonstrance against the action of apostate and fallen Rome, as he thus writes to the Archbishop:—

"There is no longer to be a Church among us such as God has constituted; no, there is to be nothing but the Pope, he is to be the Church; *he is a Vice-God*, nay, *he is something more than God on earth*; for God is become to us an abstract idea, and we see the Pope; it is he who speaks to us, and we must think, speak, and act as he bids us. *Never has the world seen such an idolatry as this*; and now we must accept it.¹

If the evidence which has been adduced in this chapter be not sufficient to prove the Church of Rome guilty of the foretold apostasy, and the Pope as the head, or as Justin Martyr says, "the man of the apostasy," to fulfil in "every iota St. Paul's prophetic description" of the man of sin, we should be driven to the alternative of accepting the cynical definition of the sceptic, who declared that "language was given in order to conceal the thought;" but believing with the Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning that "every word of God is pure,"² and must come true, so are we confident of the application of St. Paul's prophecy to the Church of Rome and its recognised head, whom in the appointed time "the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming."³

¹ Le Cas d'un Curé Gallican, par M. l'Abbé Laurens; Paris, 1879; quoted by Bishop Wordsworth in his *Papacy Predicted*, p. 33.
² Prov. xxx. 5.
³ 2 Thess. ii. 8.
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It should not be forgotten that the difference between those who see that the prophecies of Daniel, St. Paul and St. John have been fulfilled in the Church and Court of Rome, as past history so plainly declares, and those who have adopted the theory of the Jesuit Ribera (without the slightest intention of seeking to whitewash the Papacy), in relegating all the prophecies respecting "the little horn" and "the man of sin" to some future individual who is yet to appear as head of the revived Roman empire, with a ruling power extending from Scotland in the north to the Euphrates in the east, is as marked and as great as it is between those who make the word of God their supreme rule of faith, and the infidels of the present day, whether Pantheist, Positivists or Agnostics, who ignore Scripture in toto, and in the depth of the most reckless speculation which the world has ever seen, determine to bring every thing in revelation down to the low standard of their own finite and clouded reason.
CHAPTER IX.

BABYLON THE GREAT.

Four opinions have been put forth respecting the exact meaning of that awful power whose characteristic marks are so minutely detailed in the Apocalypse, under the term of Babylon the Great. The Papal advocates, such as Cardinals Baronius, Bellarmine, and Bishop Bossuet, have declared that these marks are to be found in Rome Pagan. The Futurists interpret it of a rebuilt Babylon beside the river Euphrates. The celebrated Dr. Chalmers thought it referred to London, as the greatest trading city in the world. While the great body of Protestants since the Reformation of the 16th century, have understood it to refer exclusively to Rome Papal.

There are certain reasons why it is impossible to apply the term to any one of these opinions, save the last, as I shall endeavour to prove.

1. Although Bishop Bossuet has laboured hard to show that the ancient Christian fathers identified Babylon the Great with the city of Rome in its Pagan state, he has forgotten the distinction between St. John, speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, and fallible men like ourselves endeavouring to interpret the divine oracles. The beloved disciple was a prophet, and thus enabled to foresee and foretell what the Church of Rome would become. The fathers were not prophets; they could not foresee that the Church of Rome, acting on the principle of Development, as Cardinal Newman has shown in his Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine, by adding so
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4 Baronius, Annal. ad a.d. 45, num. xvi.; Bellarmine, de Rom. Pont. 11. c. 2; Bossuet, Prêf. sur l'Apocalypse, § vii.
many fresh articles to the Nicene Creed, as the Council of Trent has decreed, would thereby depart from the Catholic faith so far as she has done, since the time when her faith was so pure as to be “spoken of throughout the whole world.” If, therefore, Bossuet’s allegation be true, that “there is not a single trace of the Church of Rome in the whole of the Apocalypse,” and that Babylon the Great is exclusively applicable to Rome Pagan, and the prediction of its having “fallen” refers to its capture in the fifth century by the Goths and Vandals, what is the consequence? St. John says that after Babylon the Great was “fallen,” it would become “the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.” And inasmuch as Rome Papal succeeded Rome Pagan, we see the dilemma in which the advocates of this opinion are placed, who contend that the marks of Babylon the Great are fulfilled in Rome Pagan.

2. The Futurist interpreters of prophecy apply the term Babylon the Great to the Babylon in which Nebuchadnezzar reigned between two and three thousand years ago; and which they believe will be rebuilt, and possibly reoccupied by Nebuchadnezzar restored from the dead. At least, such appears to be the meaning of the most recent production of the Futurist school, which originated with one Ribera, a Jesuit priest of Salamanca, in 1585, and which has culminated in a pamphlet published 300 years later, under the curious title of “Resurrected Nebuchadnezzar.” The late Mr. Edward Elliott, in his masterly and exhaustive work, has shown in his “Examination of the Futurists’ Apocalyptic Scheme,” the impossibility of their scheme in general; and so far from its giving any support to the theory entertained by Mr. B. W. Newton and other Futurists, that Babylon the Great means Babylon on the Euphrates, it will be sufficient to remember that Babylon the Great is said by St. John to be built upon “seven mountains,” or hills, whereas Babylon of old was built on “the plain of
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5 Rom. i. 8. 6 Rev. xviii. 2.
Dura."  

I know that Mr. Newton has endeavoured to meet this difficulty by supposing that as the number 7 is considered as the emblem of perfection, therefore the perfection of all wickedness will be found in the future Babylon to be rebuilt on the banks of the Euphrates, and thus the prophecy will be accomplished!!! It is needless to attempt to refute such reasoning; it refutes itself.

Not only physical difficulties, but the "sure word of prophecy" as well, prove in the most unmistakable manner the impossibility of Babylon in Chaldea ever being rebuilt. The prophet Jeremiah was inspired to declare that "when the (predicted) 70 years' captivity of the Jews in Babylon were accomplished, I, saith the Lord of hosts, will punish the King of Babylon and that nation for their iniquity, and the land of the Chaldeans, and will make it perpetual desolations" (xxv. 12). Every traveller in that part of the world, every historian who has made that subject his special study, like Keith or Rawlinson, naturally points to the "perpetual desolations" of Babylon as one of the strongest testimonies to the truth of God's prophetic word. Whereas regarding "Babylon the Great" of the seven hills in Italy, it is an interesting fact that an ancient tradition of the Rabbies supposes that the restoration of the tribes of Israel to the land of their fathers, and the destruction of Rome, the mystical Babylon of the Apocalypse, will synchronize, as one of their great doctors, Kimchi on Obadiah, observes—"This is the hope of the nation, when Rome shall be desolate, then shall be the redemption of Israel."

3. Dr. Chalmers thought that Babylon the Great pointed to London, as being the largest trading city in the world, which is true enough; only he omitted to notice one species of merchandise, which Scripture points out as the special merchandise of the power mentioned under that term, which does not belong to London, but does belong in a very remarkable way to the Roman Church. The merchandise of Babylon the Great is specified amongst other rich earthly treasures as consisting of
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5 Dan. iii. 1.
the "bodies and souls of men;" which, as we shall presently see, is applicable to the doomed and fallen Church of Rome, and to that alone.

Curious enough the Times' correspondent of March, 1878, remarks on the opening of the railway from the port to the city of Rome, that by such means "Rome will be brought into immediate connexion with the sea, and acquire great commercial importance, and thus a splendid future will be opened up for the former capital of the world."

4. The opinion which is entertained by Protestants generally, and which is the only one that will stand the test of a careful investigation, is that Babylon the Great means exclusively the Church of Rome. But we are not to suppose that this view is confined to Protestants since the Reformation of the 16th century; for no sooner did the Church of Rome begin to put forth her claims to universal supremacy at the beginning of the seventh century, than it was proclaimed by many witnesses that by so doing she was identifying herself with the Babylon of the Apocalypse.

We have already noticed (p. 152) that when John, Patriarch of Constantinople, assumed the title of "Universal Bishop" towards the close of the sixth century, it so excited the indignation of Gregory I., then Bishop of Rome, that he gave vent to his anger in a letter addressed to the Emperor Maurice, affirming with unconscious prophetic truth, though little foreseeing how condemnatory it would prove to his own apostate successors, that whoever assumed that title would prove himself "the forerunner of Antichrist." Gregory died A.D. 604, and was succeeded in 606 by Boniface III., when, to the surprise of the world, Boniface prevailed on the usurper Phocas (one of the greatest monsters of cruelty that ever existed, having murdered the Emperor Maurice with his wife and children, and then seized the empire), to grant him the title of "Universal Bishop," which Pope Gregory I. had only a few

*Rev. xviii. 10—13, and verse 24, shows clearly enough that the merchandize of the great sorceress has nothing to do with the commerce of London.
years before declared to be a sign and proof of the predicted Antichrist. Yet that said Antichristian title, together with others of a like profane nature, has been borne by all the Bishops of Rome from that time unto the present day.

Dating from the period when Boniface III. assumed the title of "Universal Bishop," we can trace a succession of Protestant witnesses who have testified against the Antichristian titles assumed by the Bishop of Rome. In that series we may enumerate Claude, Bishop of Turin, "the Protestant of the West;" Arnulf of Orleans; Gerbert, Archbishop of Rheims; Peter of Blois, the Waldenses, Joachim of Calabria, Pierre d'Olive, Waller Brute, with the illustrious names of Dante and Petrarch, and our great English divine of the 13th century, Grosstete, Bishop of Lincoln, whose letter to Pope Innocent IV., reported by Matthew Paris A.D. 1253, faithfully exposes the sins of the Papacy amid the darkness of the middle ages.1 "It is manifest, says the good bishop, with Christian boldness, "that those who introduce these evil slayers of the Reformation and deification amongst the sheep of Christ in the Church of God, are worse than the worst of slayers themselves, and are even nearer approaching to Lucifer and Antichrist. Therefore, my reverend lord, by virtue of the obedience and fidelity due from me to both fathers of the most holy Apostolic See, and out of regard for my union with it in the body of Christ, I refuse to obey the orders contained in your letters as contrary to the Catholic faith."

Although Bishop Bossuet misrepresents the interpretation which identifies the Church of Rome with Babylon the Great
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1 See the authorities recorded in Wolfii's *Lectiones Memorabiles*, ii., 839, 841; Gerhard's *Confessio Catholica*, p. 583; Usher's *de Christ. Eccl. Succes.*, ii., p. 36; Elliott's *Hor. Apoc.*, iv., 381—436. It will be sufficient if we quote one of these testimonies. Pierre d'Olive, a Franciscan monk of the 13th century, writes in his *Postile on the Apocalypse*, "By this seat of the beast is designated a carnal clergyman living in this fifth age, and presiding over the whole Church: whence I have thought that the mystical and peculiar Antichrist will be a false Pope, the head of the false prophets. The woman (of Revelation xvii.) stands for the Roman nation and empire, alike in its former state of Paganism and its subsequent profession of Christianity."
by calling it "a Protestant interpretation," meaning thereby a modern one since the Reformation of the sixteenth century, so far from this being the case, as Bishop Wordsworth in his admirable work, Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of Revelation? says, "that the interpretation which indentifies the Church of Rome with the Apocalyptic Babylon dates from the Reformation, the truth rather is that it did much to produce the Reformation" (p. 37).

For it is an undoubted historic fact, that in the seventh and following centuries the Church of Rome was united with the city of Rome by the junction of the temporal and spiritual powers in the persons of the Pope for the time being; and when the Papacy began to broach new doctrines, and to enforce them as necessary to salvation, then it was affirmed that she was fulfilling the Apocalyptic prophecies concerning Babylon the Great.

"Very early in the opening of the thirteenth century," says Mr. Elliott, "it had come to be a direct article of the Vaudois creed that the Papacy and Church of Rome were to be regarded as the Apocalyptic harlot and Babylon, and so continued unalterably ever afterwards." 2

In the year 1207, a public disputation was held at Montreal between the Vaudois on one side, headed by Arnold, and the Romanists on the other, headed by Dominic and the Bishop of Oxuma. One of the theses asserted and defended by Arnold was that Rome was Babylon, and the harlot of the Apocalypse. Three centuries and a half earlier, Claude, Bishop of Turin, 3 had wiinessed faithfully against the incipient false doctrines of the Papacy; just as three and a half centuries later our noble army of martyrs in England—bishops, clergy and laity—testified unto death against the sorceries of that doomed community which is termed by the Spirit, Mystery, Babylon the Great.

2 Hor. Apoc., ii., 371.
3 So embittered were the Papists against the saintly Claude, Bishop of Turin, that at his death his corpse, as a late Bishop of Pignerol exultingly asserted, was first thrown into one of the sinks of the episcopal palace, then taken out, and the process of degradation acted out on the dead body, as if it had been alive: then burnt, and the ashes scattered to the winds, amidst the acclamations of the Papal roughs. Charvaz, from Ambrose Cassin, p. 322,
BABYLON THE GREAT.

The Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth.
All this is confirmed by the general consent of the great divines of our Reformed Church, as to the Apocalyptic prophecies foretelling the doom of Papal Rome.

"There is a consensus of Anglican divines," wrote Dr. J. H. (now Cardinal) Newman many years ago, "stronger than for Baptismal Regeneration or Apostolical Succession, that Rome is strictly and literally an Anti-Christian power; and yet (he adds, speaking to some of the Tractarian party, who were craving after Rome without having the courage to join it) you put this consensus aside." 4

I have before quoted (see pp. 119, 120) from Dr. Newman's works to show how at the beginning of the Oxford movement, nearly half a century ago, he declared he was—

"Following almost a consensus of the divines of my Church (the Reformed Church of England). They have ever used the strongest language against Rome, even the most able and learned of them. I wish to throw myself into their system."

Let us now carefully examine the reason why we are to believe that the Spirit of God, when He inspired St. John in Patmos to speak of Babylon the Great, meant none other than the Church of Rome.

1. The name itself as written in the Old Testament is so distinctly different from that in the New, that we might have expected this alone would have prevented the confusion which necessarily ensues from the attempt to identify the two as one and the same city. The city over which Nebuchadnezzar reigned 600 B.C., is termed by the Hebrew prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Daniel, simply Babylon. The city which was reigning over the kings of the earth when St. John wrote the Apocalypse seven centuries later is named five times in the book of Revelation, and always as Βαβυλών ἤ μεγάλη, Babylon the Great. And the difference between these two names is as distinct and clear as that between the name of Charlemagne, and any of the other ten kings of the name of Charles who have during the last thousand years reigned over the kingdom of France. There were many reasons why

4 Newman's Anglican Difficulties, p. 132.
St. John should have used the name of Babylon the Great mystically in preference to Rome literally. We know that at the time when St. John wrote the Apocalypse he was a prisoner "in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ." He could not speak clearly respecting Rome by name and its predicted doom without unnecessarily exciting the heathen multitude, who boasted of their city being "eternal," against the Christians, whom they regarded "as the filth of the world, and the off-scouring of all things unto this day." Jerome explains the reserve of St. Paul under similar circumstances in his Epistle to the Thessalonians, when abstaining from mentioning the Roman empire by name as the restraining cause which prevented the development of the predicted "man of sin."

Thus we find Victorinus, Bishop of Petau, martyred in the third century, who wrote the earliest extant Commentary on the Apocalypse, speaks of Babylon the Great as Rome, the seven-hilled city as Rome; and the ten kings who receive their power simultaneously with the beast will eventually turn against the woman that reigneth over the kings of the earth. "These," he says, "shall have the harlot (i.e., the city), and shall burn her flesh with fire." (ch. xiii.) So Augustine, writing between one and two centuries after Victorinus, observes that "Abraham was born about the 1200th year before Rome was founded, which is, as it were, another Babylon in the west." Such is the very natural explanation of the name given by the Spirit to the "Eternal City," as its heathen inhabitants proudly boasted was its destiny; and coupled with the distinctive epithet of "the Mysterious" connected with the name and title as St. John records it, we can understand the meaning of his words—"And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth."

---

5 Rev. i. 9. 6 1 Cor. iv. 13.
7 See Jerome in Daniel vii. 8, ad Algas., Qu. xi., ad 2 Thess. ii. 7. Also Tertul. de Resurr. Carnis, c. 24; Chrysostom and Theophylact, on 2 Thess. ii.
8 Augustine, De Civitat Dei, lib. xvi., § 17.
According to the learned Scaliger, on the authority of an informant of the Duke of Montmorency when at Rome, as also of Francis de Moyne and Brocardus on oracular evidence, it appears that in the sixteenth century, previous to the Reformation, that identical title was engraven on the Pope's tiara, until removed by Julius III., who sat in the Papal chair A.D. 1550—55; just as Seneca and Juvenal mention was the custom with the Roman harlots, to have their names written on a label on their foreheads. And singular enough the Church of Rome, both by one of her creeds and the decrees of the Council of Trent, boastingly proclaims herself "the Mother and Mistress of all Churches," which is a striking comment upon the title given to her by the inspired writer, "Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth." It is scarcely necessary to point out how this Trinitarian decree, passed in the middle of the sixteenth century, contradicts the teaching of the first Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, which the Church of Rome acknowledges to be Ecumenical, and which declares in the synodical letter addressed by the Council to Damascus, Bishop of Rome, that "the Church of Jerusalem is the Mother of all Churches." Hence Bishop Bull justly remarks that to teach—

"The Roman Church is the Mother of all other Churches is a manifest falsehood in matter of fact; for everybody knows that the Church of Jerusalem was the first mother-Church, and is so called and acknowledged by the ancient fathers. Secondly, That the Church of Rome is the Mistress of all other Churches is another great untruth; a proposition which had it been advanced in the first ages of the Church, would have startled all Christendom."

We cannot forget that St. John, while he fixes the name of Mystery on the forehead of this harlot city, twice says, "Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of this book." Hence, observes Bishop Wordsworth:

---

1 See the 13th and 15th Articles of the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which denies salvation to all who do not receive it: also Council of Trent, Sess. vii., De Bapt., Can. iii.
3 Rev. i. 3; xxii. 7.
"Her title is Mystery. Heathen Rome doing the work of heathenism in persecuting the Church was no Mystery. But a Christian Church calling herself the Mother of Christendom, and yet drunken with the blood of saints, this is indeed a Mystery. A Christian Church boasting herself to be the Bride, and yet being the harlot; styling herself Sion, and being Babylon, this is indeed a Mystery. A Mystery indeed it is, that, when she says to all, 'Come unto me,' the voice from heaven should cry, 'Come out of her, My people.' A Mystery indeed it is, that she who boasts her sanctity, should become the habitation of devils: that she who claims to be infallible, should be said to corrupt the earth: that a self-named 'Mother of Churches' should be called by the Holy Spirit the 'Mother of Abominations:' that she who boasts to be Indefectible, should in one day be destroyed, and that apostles should rejoice at her fall: that she who holds, as she says, in her hands the keys of heaven, should be cast into the lake of fire by Him who has the keys of hell. All this, in truth, is a great and awful Mystery."  

2. The second mark by which we are enabled to learn what this Babylon the Great really means, is that its symbol, as represented in the 19th chapter of Revelation, is that of a woman seated upon a scarlet-coloured beast, having seven heads and ten horns, and arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations, and revealed to St. John as "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." Now there is but one city in the world that ever has fulfilled or could fulfil all the conditions of the problem respecting Babylon the Great. For although it may be true, as is stated, that two celebrated capitals of Europe, viz., Constantinople and Moscow, are both said to be built on seven hills, yet neither of them were reigning over the kings of the earth at the time St. John wrote the book of Revelation. In St. John's age there was but one city only in the world to whom this prophecy could apply in respect to power over the kings or kingdoms of the earth, and that was the most famous city of Rome, which was commonly known and spoken of by her great writers and poets as "the city of the seven hills." Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Martial, Claudian, and many others have alike testified to this well-

---

4 Bishop Wordsworth's Is the Church of Rome the Babylon of Revelation? (pp. 84, 85.)
5 Rev. xviii. 3—18.
known historic fact, that Rome, which was reigning when St. John wrote, was seated or built upon seven mountains, in accordance with the words of the prophecy; and the common epithets which were employed by the Latin poets of that age to denote her power were such as these: "the Great, the Mighty, the Royal Rome, the Queen of Nations, the Eternal City, the Mistress of the World."

Passing by all consideration of the last head of the beast as belonging more particularly to unfulfilled prophecy, we may revert to history to see how exactly it accords with that portion of the prediction which relates to the past. The term "kings" in the prophecy is used for different forms of government, as in Daniel, chapter vii., we find "kings" denote "kingdoms," and "the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth" (vers. 17, 23, 24). Thus the "eight heads" specified by St. John denote the eight successive forms of government in the city of Rome. Five of these had fallen when St. John wrote, and the sixth head, or form of government, was in existence at that time; which was destined to fall likewise. Now it is remarkable that two such eminent Roman historians as Livy and Tacitus, without the light of revelation from on high, should each have enumerated five different forms of government which held supreme power in Rome previous to the imperial power which was reigning in St. John's time, as follows:—1, Kings; 2, Consuls; 3, Dictators; 4, Decemvirs; 5, Military Tribunes. These had successively followed each other, and had fallen or passed away; and the sixth, or Imperial head, was then in being when St. John lived, and the capital of the Roman empire was "that great city which was reigning (at that time) over the kings of the earth."

3. The third mark of Babylon the Great is called not so much "a beast" as an "harlot," seated upon the beast with seven heads and ten horns. Now this proves that it denotes not

---

⁶ Livy, vi. 1; Tacitus, Annals i. 8. See also the famous tablet containing the Emperor Claudius,' speech (A.D. 41—54), found at Lyons in 1529, in which the five previous forms of government in Rome are defined in exactly the same way.
a temporal, but an ecclesiastical power, claiming to exercise authority over "the souls" of men. Babylon the Great is specially termed "the Mother of Harlots;" and it will be necessary for us to consider how she fulfils this condition of the prophetic problem. Christ graciously condescends to speak of His own faithful disciples, who constitute the true Catholic Church, under the term of marriage. "He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom." St. Paul writes to the Church of God at Corinth, "I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." And again, in writing to the Ephesians, he says, "The husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church." And St. John pointedly terms the faithful occupants of "that great city, the holy Jerusalem," the Bride, the Lamb's Wife." 7

The evident meaning of the word "harlot," as used in so symbolical a book as the Apocalypse, is a Church which has fallen away from its first love, and given to others the worship and honour which is due to God alone. In the same way the Hebrew prophets described "the Church in the wilderness," 8 when she had fallen away from Jehovah, and yielded to the abominations of the surrounding heathen nations, such as the worship of dead men and women, and notably, as Jeremiah shows, to that of "the Queen of Heaven." 9 Hence Isaiah exclaims concerning Jerusalem, "How is the faithful city become an harlot?" 1 And Jeremiah, "Go and cry in the ears of Jerusalem, saying, Thus saith the Lord; Thou hast played the harlot with many lovers." 2 And Ezekiel, "The word of the Lord came to me, saying, Son of man, cause Jerusalem to know her abominations...Thou wast decked with gold and silver; and thy raiment was of fine linen, and silk...Thou wast exceeding beautiful, and thou didst prosper into a kingdom...But thou didst trust in thine own beauty, and playedst the harlot because of thy renown, and pouredst out thy fornications on every one that passed by: his it was." 3 Just so was it foretold of the Church of Rome, which

---

7 John iii. 29; 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 23; Rev. xxi. 9, 10.
8 Acts vii. 38. 9 Jer. xlv. 17. 25. 1 Isa. i. 21. 2 Jer. ii. 20; iii. 1.
3 Ezek. xvi. 1, 2, 13, 15.
in the days of St. Paul was renowned on account of her faith being spoken of throughout the whole world,” 4 that she would depart from the faith, and would become the “Mother of Harlots,” and be arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication.” 5

Moreover, this ecclesiastical power named Babylon the Great is represented under the symbol of an harlot “sitting upon many waters, i.e., peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues.” 6 This is exactly what the Church of Rome claims, and what her members ascribe to her. Thus we find, selecting from the mass of historical evidence on the subject, the canon law of the Church of Rome affirms that “The Roman Church, by the appointment of our Lord, is the mother and mistress of all the faithful.” 7 Paulus Diaconus and Anastasius 8 alike testify that “Pope Boniface III. obtained a decree from the Emperor Phocas, ordering that the apostolical seat of St. Peter should be head of all Churches.” Pope Boniface VIII. (A.D. 1295—1303) decreed as follows: “We declare, say, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.” 9 This claim of universal supremacy is expressly confirmed by one of their General Councils, the fifth Lateran, under Leo X. (A.D. 1513—1522), as their decree reads: “We do renew and approve that holy constitution with approbation of the present holy council.” 1 The Council of Florence (A.D. 1430), had previously asserted that “the Pope of

---

4 Rom. i. 8. 5 Rev. xvii. 4, 5. 6 Ibid., xviii. 1, 15. 7 Corp. Jur. Can. Joan. Gib., t. ii., p. 8. 8 Anastasius, Annal. A.D. 607. 9 Corp. Jur. Can., t. ii. Extrav., lib. i., tit. viii., c. 1. So Cardinal Manning, the titular Archbishop of Westminster, profanely declares that the Church of Rome claims to speak with “the mouth of God,” that all who deny her claims reject “the only ark of salvation;” adding, “We are as much bound, under pain of eternal death, to bear witness, that without the (Roman) Church is no salvation, as that without the Name of Jesus there is no entrance into eternal life” (Manning’s England and Christendom, pp. 161, 183).

BABYLON THE GREAT.

Rome hath the supremacy over all the earth." 2 And in the following century the Council of Trent decreed that "the Pope of Rome is Christ's Vicar, and hath the supreme power over the whole Church, and without subjection to him as such, there is no salvation." 3

4. The fourth mark of Babylon the Great as presented to us in the Apocalypse is thus detailed: that "all the world worshipped the beast," with whom the kings of the earth have committed idolatry, and the inhabitants of the earth have been intoxicated with her sorceries and drugged wine. 4 The word here rendered "worshipped" literally signifies to adore by prostration and kissing, as is described in the account which the unfaithful Israelites once paid to the worship of Baal. "Yet I have left me 7000 in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." 5 The word rendered "worship" occurs 23 times in the Apocalypse. In ten of these instances it designates adoration paid to Almighty God; in nine others the same adoration claimed for the beast and his image; and twice as attempted to be paid, but prohibited, to man: so that we learn that the beast exacts from his followers what is due to God alone; and this is termed Blasphemy.

"I saw," says St. John, "a beast rise up out of the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his horns ten crowns, and upon his heads the name of blasphemy." 6

Now let us see how this worship and adoration of a creature is carried out in reference to the Pope and Bishop of Rome. Bearing in mind what God's prophets have taught of old on this subject,—e.g., "I am Jehovah: that is my name: and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." 7 "Son of man, say unto the Prince of Tyre, Thus saith the Lord God; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet, thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God." 8—"And as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met

2 Du Pin, Eccles. Hist., iii. 35. 3 Con. Trid., Sess vii., Decret de Reform.
4 Rev. xiii. 4; xvii. 2. 5 1 Kings xix. 18. 6 Rev. xiii. 1.
7 Isa. xlii. 8. 8 Ezek. xxviii. 2.
BABYLON THE GREAT.

him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up; I myself also am a man."—Notwithstanding such an example, it is clear that the Pope of Rome, who pretends to be Peter’s successor, and as such bears the title of Vicar of, or Vice-Christ (same as Antichrist), receives from his submissive followers the very adoration which is due only to God, and which consequently brands him with those awful titles ascribed to BABYLON THE GREAT, “the name of blasphemy,” “the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the earth.” I have already given an account of the Adoration paid to each Pope at his inauguration (see pp. 143, 144), so that it will only be necessary to call attention to the nature of this Adoration. It is performed by kneeling, and kissing the face, and hands, and feet; the very word used by St. John nine times to describe the homage paid to the mysterious rival of God. The place, moreover, where this Adoration is paid to a man is where the Pope is seated on what he calls the “altar” of the chief temple in Christendom, as he consider it to be. So that we can understand the horror which such “blasphemy” must excite in the mind of every pious Roman Catholic, as is so well expressed by priest Eustace, in his Tour through Italy, already quoted:—

“Why should the altar, the beauty of holiness, the throne of the Victim Lamb, the mercy seat of the temple of Christianity, be converted into the footstool of a mortal? The practice ought to be suppressed.”

5. The next mark of BABYLON THE GREAT is that the Mother of Harlots is represented as being “drunken with the blood of saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,” which made St. John wonder with exceeding great wonder. Now if by BABYLON THE GREAT nothing more was meant than heathen Rome, St. John, who had already witnessed the

---

* Acts x. 25, 26.

1 For a copy of an admirable painting, “published at Rome with license of the authorities,” of the Cardinals adoring and kissing the feet of the Pope, when seated upon the altar of St. Peter’s at Rome, together with a series of Roman coins to the same effect, see Elliott’s Hor. Apoc., iv., p. 185.

2 Rev. xvii. 6.
persecutions under which so many of his fellow-disciples suffered in the Neronian persecution, more than twenty years before, and who was then an exile "in tribulation for the word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ," would have had no cause for wonder; but that a Church which called herself "Mother, and Mistress of all Churches," and assumed exclusively to herself the title of "the Catholic Church," should be drunken with the blood of saints, might well cause the holy apostle to wonder with exceeding great wonder.

How has the Church of Rome fulfilled this prophecy? From the middle of the seventh century, when the Paulikian witnesses first appeared to testify against the growing heresies, false doctrines, and superstitious fables of the Church of Rome, down to the present time, wherever and whenever that guilty community has had the power, she must be truly credited with the Apocalyptic denunciation of being "drunken with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus," and for which she will have one day to give a most terrible account, as Revelation xix. 1—3 so clearly shows. 3 As the persecutions of Papal Rome have been of far longer duration than those of Pagan Rome, so have they far exceeded them in horror of every kind. As early as the end of the fourth century, in the reign of Theodosius I., laws were enacted by which the punishment of death was awarded for heresy, and the first person on record who was put to death for heresy, was one Priscillianus, the leader of a small body of Christians in Spain, who was condemned by a council held at Bordeaux, A.D. 385.

The spirit in which the Church of Rome has unceasingly

---

8 It is difficult to estimate the number of those "martyrs," counting from the seventh to the nineteenth century, of whose death the guilty Church of Rome will have one day to give account, but I believe a distinguished writer on prophecy is within bounds when he says:— "It has been calculated that the Popes of Rome have, directly or indirectly, slain on account of their faith fifty millions of martyrs; fifty millions of men and women who refused to be parties to Romish idolatries, who held to the Bible as the word of God, and who loved not their lives unto death, but resisted unto blood, striving against sin." See The Approaching End of the Age, by H. Grattan Guinness, second edit., p. 212.
carried on her unholy and Antichristian warfare against faithful Protestants, may be judged from the form or **Formula of the Major Excommunication** with which she anathematizes all who reject her claims and universal dominion over "the bodies and souls of men." Thus speaks the Church of Rome:

"In the name of Almighty God, &c., &c., we excommunicate and anathematize . . . in order that, condemned to everlasting torments, he may be engulfed with Korah, Dathan and Abiram . . . . May he be accursed by heaven and earth, and every thing holy that dwells therein, wherever he may be, whether in his house or in the field, &c., or in church, in his life, and in his death, eating or drinking, fasting, sleeping, or working, in every part of his body, both inside and outside, in his hair and in his brains. May not one single part of his body be sound from the apex of his head to the soul of his feet. May he be doomed to eternal damnation, unless he amend and repent. Amen." In this spirit the Roman doctors of approved orthodoxy, according to Papal ethics, have practised what they term "the Catholic faith." Thus Thomas Aquinas says: "Heretics are not to be tolerated, but to be put to death." And so Alphonsus à Castro taught that "The last punishment of the body of heretics is death, with which we will prove, by God's assistance, heretics ought to be punished. It is the ancient opinion of wise Christians that heretics ought to be burnt." Can there be a stronger proof of the application of **BABYLON THE GREAT** to the harlot Church of Rome than that she is "drunken with the blood of the saints and of the martyrs of Jesus: and when I saw her, I wondered with great wonder."

6. The sixth mark of **BABYLON THE GREAT** is the merchandise which is the chief object of her trading, and which is stated in the Apocalypse to be, besides the usual worldly traffic of "gold, silver and precious stones," "the bodies and souls of men." Æneas Silvius, subsequently Pope Pius II., A.D.

---

4 From the **Formula of the Major Excommunication**, which may be seen in the British Museum, in a work entitled *Textus, Roffensis e Codicibus MSS. descritpsit ediditque* Thos. Herne, Oxonii Sheldemiano, 1720. Bishop Nicholson, in his *Historical Library*, p. 134, mentions it as having been written by Bishop Ernulph, c. 1120, and containing the form of "cursing by bell, book and candle," and pronounces it the most venerable monument of antiquity belonging to Rochester Cathedral.


6 Alph. à Cast., de Hær. Pun., ch. xii., p. 123; Madrid, 1773.

7 Rev. xviii. 12, 13.
1458—64, is reported to have said before he ascended the Papal chair, that "nothing was to be obtained at Rome but by money." And the same venal system of traffic in souls has ruled in the Papal Church alike in the midst of the dark ages as in the light of the nineteenth century. It was not long ago that the Rev. Robert O'Keefe, Roman Catholic priest of Callan, in Ireland, stated in a pamphlet published in Dublin, 1872, that in a correspondence with Cardinal Cullen and Dr. Lynch of Carlow, he informed them of "the infamous life of traffic in sacraments and dispensations, which Dr. Walsh (the Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory) has led for the last forty years."

Perhaps the most striking exposure which has been made of this traffic in the souls of men, is the Rev. J. Mendham's investigation of the authorized works of the Church of Rome, entitled, Taxæ Cæncellariæ Apostoliciæ, and Taxæ Sacrae Penitentiariæ Apostoliciæ; of which no less than forty-five editions have been published, extending from the year 1471, when Sixtus IV. ascended the Pontifical chair, to the year 1820. With regard to the origin of these Taxæ Mr. Mendham remarks, "The power of absolving from sin in general, or from any particular sin, upon considerations deemed equivalent or satisfactory, comes under the general head of Indulgences,

8 The words of Eneas Silvius before he became "infallible" were "the Court of Rome bestows nothing without payment. For the ordination of priests and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are sold, and even the pardon of sins can only be obtained for money." (Æ. Silv., § 66, p. 549, Opera, Basil, 1571.)

9 Mr. Mendham's work is entitled The Spiritual Venality of Rome, the second edition of which is dated, London, 1836. The original of the Taxæ is in the Harleian MSS. of the British Museum, and is described in the catalogue as being in two vols., small folio, Nos. 1850, 1852, written on vellum, in the early part of the sixteenth century. These volumes were withdrawn from the archives of the Roman Chancery on the death of Innocent XII., by John Aymon, Apostolic Prothonotary, and bought of him in Holland, at a great price, by the Earl of Oxford, the collector of the Harleian MSS., now in the British Museum. Two copies of undated Penitentiary Tax-Books, formerly the property of Mr. Mendham, are now in the Lincoln's Inn Library, London.
which the later bishops of Rome claim the prerogative of dispensing, on grounds which they themselves have stated."

An English version of the *Table*, founded on the Parisian edition of 1520, was published by Dr William Crashaw, of London, in 1625. This was followed by the publication of another edition by Anthony Egane, B.D., in 1674. Agane had been for some years the Pope's Apostolical Penitentiary, or Confessor-General, in Ireland. On his conversion to the true Catholic faith of the Church of England, he published his work with the following title, *The Book of Rates now used in the Sin-Custom-House of the Church of Rome*. Several editions of this work were published between 1674 and 1715; and as the work became very scarce at the beginning of this century, Francis Maseres, Esq., one of the Barons of the Exchequer, thinking, as he says, "it can never be unseasonable to expose a religion so contrary to the main end and design of Christianity, and that persecutes with such unrelenting barbarity, where it can, those that have the courage to oppose its innovations," published another edition of Egane's work in the last volume of his *Occasional Essays*, p. 558, et seq.; London, 1809.

The most complete vindication of the genuineness of the *Table* is to be found in a work recently published, entitled, *The Taxes of the Apostolic Penitentiary, or the Prices of Sins in the Church of Rome*. Reprinted from the Roman edition of 1510, and the Persian edition of 1520, by Richard Gibbings, D.D., Vicar of Kilcock, and Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin. Dublin, McGee: 1872. Dr. Gibbings' work is well worth a careful study, as it forms a complete answer to the Roman Catholic Dr. Milner's statement that the Tax-Book was a Protestant composition, and that it contains nothing but "pretended prices." Dr. Milner has, however, been sufficiently answered by one of his own communion, when the Rev. T. L. Green, D.D., published his work in 1872, on *Indulgences, Sacramental Absolutions, and the Tax Tables of the Roman Chancery and Penitentiary considered, in reply to the charge of Venality*. Dr. Green commiserates those whose poverty excludes them from certain Papal
privileges; and he tells us that “the reason assigned in the tax table for not granting such dispensations to the poor is one that admits of no defence. It is a profane allusion to a passage of Scripture” (p. 175). It is satisfactory, however, to meet with two admissions on the part of Dr. Green. 1. That “there have been unquestionably Popes whose avarice and other vices have been a scandal to religion” (p. 123); and, 2, that the Roman editions of the Taxæ are “unquestionably genuine” (p. 162). 1

In Dr. Gibbings’ exhaustive and most masterly work we have an account of the discussion between six Roman Catholic priests and six Protestants in Ireland, A.D. 1828, when the Roman Catholic disputants obtained a temporary triumph by the Protestants having produced a Protestant edition of the

1 Cardinal Manning appears to dissent from this judgment of his co-religionist respecting vicious Popes, who have been a “scandal to religion;” as some years ago he published a pamphlet, in which he declared that “the worst which could be said respecting them was this, that in the time of 250 supreme Pontiffs, there have been a few who have descended to the level of temporal sovereigns.” (See The Temporal Power of the Vicar of Jesus Christ; by H. E. Manning, D.D.; second edition, with a preface; London, Burns and Co., 1862.) Other Roman Catholic authorities have told a different tale respecting the character of the Popes of the middle ages. According to such trustworthy historians as Cardinal Baronius, Platina, Petavius, Genebrard, Giannone, Luitprand, Labbe, Dupin and others, their lives displayed all the variations of impiety, malevolence, inhumanity, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, deism and atheism. Platina calls these Pontiffs “monsters.” Genebrard says, “In 150 years, from John VIII. to Leo IX., the Popes entirely degenerated from the sanctity of their ancestors, and were apostatical rather than apostolical.” Cardinal Baronius, in his Annals of the Tenth Century, seems unable to find language sufficiently strong to express the base degeneracy of the Popes, and the frightful wickedness which reigned in high places. The character of the Popes of the middle ages quite justifies the language which Bishop Luitprand uses in describing the Romans of the eighth century, when they were frantically mad in defence “of image worship,” which the wisest of the emperors endeavoured unsuccessfully to put down. “In the name Roman,” says the bishop, “we include whatever is base, and cowardly, and perfidious, the extremes of avarice and luxury, and every vice that can prostitute the dignity of human nature” (Luitprand, in Legat. Script. Ital., t. 11, pars. 1, p. 481).
Taxe in place of a genuine edition, such as the Roman edition of 1510, or the Persian edition of 1520, which is given in full by Dr. Gibbings as the Taxe Sacré Pénitentiarie Apostolice, and consists of 21 pages in the original Latin, with the prices annexed in the Roman coinage of the time, as the sums required by the Church of Rome to be paid by those willing and able for the commission of all sorts of crimes.

Dr. Gibbings has adduced triumphant and unanswerable proof of edition after edition, minutely described from the actual folios in his own possession, stamped with the authority of the Church of Rome. Copious evidence is heaped together in the preface, establishing beyond the shadow of a doubt, the authority and position assigned by Popes and Papal officials to the practices for which it lays down the rule, and the extent of the sanction still given, or at least never retracted, to such practices. Two instances may be mentioned. In the year 1567, there was printed in Paris, with the king's privilege for nine years, a Commentary on the Epistle to Titus, by the celebrated Claude D'Espence, a doctor of the Sorbonne, and Rector of the University of Paris, in which are given some account of the bishops of that age; in his comment on St. Paul's condemnation of a bishop who is given to "filthy lucre" (Titus i. 7), on which this eminent Roman Catholic doctor speaks as follows:

"Not only bishops, but also archdeacons and their wily officious vicars, when they go through dioceses to extort and squeeze money, both from the clergy and laity, under the name of procuration, not to say of fictitious jurisdiction. But what is most base, they also, for a fixed annual sum, permit them to live with concubines and harlots, and to have children so begotten . . . These instances of filthy lucre might be supposed to have been invented through hatred of the Roman Pontiff, if it were not for a book which is openly and publicly printed, and sold here (Paris) at the present day, as well as in former times; its title being, Taxa Cameræ, seu Cancellariæ, Apostolice. And in this work you may learn more of crimes than in all the summaries of all vices whatsoever. In it also is offered to very many indeed a licence, but to all who wish to purchase it an absolution. It is wonderful at this time, and during the continuance of the present schism, such a book has not been suppressed. Yet so far is it from being suppressed by the favourers of the Roman Church, that
licenses and impunities for the commission of such enormous crimes are in a great measure renewed and confirmed in the faculties of the legates, who come hither from Rome. Let Rome now feel ashamed; and cease to set up for sale such a barefaced catalogue of every sort of crime."

Indulgences do not appear to have been introduced until the time of the Jubilee of 1475, when the following notice was published by authority:—"To all them who devoutly say five Pater Nosters, five Aves, and a Creed, piteously beholding these arms of Christ's passion, are granted 30,750 years of pardon. Our holy Father Sixtus IV. granted to all who are in a state of grace, and say the following prayer, immediately after the elevation of the body of our Lord, clean remission of all their sins perpetually enduring. And likewise the Pope, at the request of the Queen of England, hath granted unto all them that devoutly say this prayer before the image of our Lord crucified, as many days of pardon as there were wounds in the body of our Lord, in the time of His bitter passion, viz., 5465." Enough now has been said to prove how exactly what the Apocalyptic seer saw concerning Babylon the Great, respecting her merchandize of "the bodies and souls of men," has been literally accomplished in the doomed and fallen Church of Rome.

7. As the final mark by which we are enabled to detect the true application of Babylon the Great, it is written that the ten kings or kingdoms which for a time agree to give their power to the Babylonian mother of harlots, shall all of a sudden turn against her, and thus help to destroy her.

"The ten horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the harlot, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh and burn her with fire. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil His will, and to agree and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled.""

From the time of the Emperor Phocas' decree in favour of the Papacy, at the beginning of the seventh century, confirmed much in the following century by the donations of Pepin, A.D. 755, Charlemagne in 755, and Louis in 817, unto the year 1870, the kings of the earth, as representing the ten kingdoms,

---

2 Gibbings, pp. cxxix.—cxxxii. 3 Rev. xvii. 16, 17.
have both committed spiritual fornication, which is idolatry, with the Babylonian harlot, and have also given her their power according to the prophecy quoted above. Perhaps, nothing more strikingly proves this to be the rightful interpretation of the prediction, than the contrast between the position of the Papacy at the commencement of the Reformation, and as she stands before the world in the present day.

The fifth Council of Lateran held at Rome was opened in person by Pope Julius II.; and after twelve sessions terminated its sittings March 17th, 1517. During that period Julius died, and was replaced by Pope Leo X., who, under God, was the main cause, by his infamous abuse of "indulgences," of bringing about the glorious Reformation. During the ninth session, on May 5th, 1514, the orator of the Council ascended the pulpit, and uttered that memorable exclamation of triumph, which had never been pronounced before, and has never been heard since, as subsequent events showed the impossibility of uttering such a glaring falsehood, *Jam nemo reclamat, nullus obsistit. Jam universum illius ecclesiae corpus uni capiti, hoc est tibi, subditum esse conspicitur*; i.e., "There is an end to all resistance to the Papal rule and religion: opposers exist no more. The whole body of Christendom is now seen to be subject to its head, even to thee (the Pope)."

Nowhere in the compass of the history of the Papacy has such a terrible mistake been committed by the overweening confidence of the Roman advocate, and the outburst of joy which flooded Christendom on that bright morn which, amid many difficulties, persecutions and sufferings, shortly after the separation of the Lateran Council, ushered in the great movement commenced by Martin Luther, and which culminated in the glorious Reformation. We may adduce the testimony of two witnesses, a Papist and a Protestant, to that effect.

"The fire ill-smothered," says the Popish annalist *Raynaldees*, "by Leo X. and his measures of repression, at the close of 1513 and of 1514, was blown up again by Luther's bellows, and spread the flames far and wide, more than ever before."  

---

4 Rynald. xii. 35.
So a Protestant writer in the *Encyclopedia Britannica* remarks of the same period—

"Every thing was quiet; every heretic exterminated; and the whole Christian world supinely acquiescing in the enormous absurdities insculpated on them (by the Roman Church), when, in 1517, the empire of superstition received its first attack (or as we might almost term it, its death blow) from Martin Luther."

Or as the late Mr. Cuninghame, an able expositor of the prophetic Scriptures, has still better put it—

"At the commencement of the sixteenth century, Europe reposed in the deep sleep of spiritual death, under the iron yoke of the Papacy. There was none that 'moved the wing, or opened the mouth, or peeped;' when suddenly, in one of the universities of Germany, the voice of an obscure monk was heard, the sound of which rapidly filled Saxony, Germany, and Europe itself; shaking the very foundations of the Papal power, and arousing men from the lethargy of ages."

And what has been the result of the Reformation? As far as statistics can be regarded as a test, in the course of three centuries, half the population of Western Christendom have fallen away from the Papacy, so that counting the Oriental Churches, which have never acknowledged the Pope, as one third, the Church of Rome as another third, and all the Protestant Churches as the final third, we may account for the whole body of nominal Christians in the world, equalling probably between three and four hundred millions, which now constitute Christendom. This may possibly explain the meaning of the symbolical earthquake mentioned in the Apocalypse—

"The seventh angel poured out his vial into the air . . . . and there was a great earthquake . . . and the great city was divided into three parts, and the cities of the nations fell: and BABYLON THE GREAT came in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath."

Let us now turn to consider the position of the Papacy at the present day. Every one of the kings of the earth which at one time gave their power to the beast have ceased to do so now. The consequence has been that when Pio Nono sent out his summons

---

to convene the Vatican Council of 1870, which resulted, happily for the peace of the world, in his total and perpetual deprivation of all temporal power, the Bull omitted the names of all the European sovereigns, who as on previous occasions had been summoned. Because, as a noted Ultramontane journalist of France, one M. Veuillot, frankly acknowledged, "there are now no longer (Roman) Catholic crowns in Christendom." This revolt against the doomed and decaying Papacy, which has been recently admitted alike by the Osservatore Romano, the official organ of the Vatican, as well as by a Roman Catholic archbishop in the far distant settlement of Sydney, must rejoice the heart of every true Catholic throughout the world, of the type as defined by Ignatius, the faithful martyr of Antioch, nearly 18 centuries ago, as proving that the time is drawing nigh when "Babylon the Great will come into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath;" and when the Almighty, according to His promise, will visit the thousand and one crimes of the Church of Rome, as He did of old "the cities of the plain," Sodom and Gomorrah, as the Apocalyptic seer was inspired to tell the Church of Christ—

"True and righteous are his judgments, for he hath judged the great harlot, which did corrupt the Church with her fornication, and hath avenged the blood of his servants at her hand. And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever." 9

Having now considered at length the seven marks specified in the Apocalypse, by which the Church of Christ has been enabled to learn what is meant by that awful power termed Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth; and bearing in mind the evidence which has been adduced already, we are compelled to see its literal fulfilment in none other than the doomed Church of Rome. No answer has ever been made, I believe, by the Papal party to either of these challenges put forth by Bishop Jewel in the 16th, or Bishop Wordsworth in the 19th century. They have

8 "Wheresoever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." (Ignatius, Epist ad Smyrn, c. viii.)
9 Rev. xix. 2, 3.
allowed Bishop Jewel's famous sermon preached at Paul's Cross, March 3, 1560, to remain for upwards of 300 years unanswered; and the natural conclusion of every faithful Catholic, who is true to his God and His word, by their allowing judgment to go by default, is that the Church of Rome will not, or dare not, or cannot present any reply.

I have before alluded (see p. 166) to the present Cardinal Newman's admission, in his Anglican Difficulties, of "the consensus of the Anglican divines that Rome is strictly and literally an Antichristian power;" which is more fully asserted in his Essay on Development, as I have also noticed at p. 160. It may be well, therefore, to show something of this consensus as it is found in the works of our great Anglican divines, as also in the sayings of other distinguished Englishmen. The three chief works which have probably done more than any other to establish the Church of England in the true primitive and Catholic faith, as contrasted with the so-called Roman Catholic faith professed by the Papacy, are—1. Bishop Jewel's celebrated Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae, together with his Commentary on St. Paul's two Epistles to the Thessalonians. 2. Archbishop Usher's equally celebrated Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland: Wherein the judgment of Antiquity in the Points questioned is truly delivered, and the Novelty of the now Romish Doctrine plainly discovered. 3. Dr. Isaac Barrow, the head of Trinity College, Cambridge, his Treatise on the Pope's Supremacy, in which he proves in the most complete manner the "novelties and heterodoxies of the new creed of Pius IV." (p. 473).

Besides the three above-named divines, there is scarcely an English writer of any celebrity during the last three centuries, whether cleric or layman, but who has borne testimony to one or other of the Antichristian pretensions of that doomed power, which has been well described as "A lamb in adversity, a foe in equality, and a lion in prosperity." Such the Papacy ever

1 In confirmation of this proverb, the Romish Bishop of St Louis, in the United States, admits that the Church of Rome is intolerant, which he accounts for from its claim to "Infallibility." The Roman Church, he contends, "alone has the right to be intolerant, for it alone has the truth!"
has been and ever will be, until in the appointed time Babylon the Great comes into remembrance before God, and she who now sits as "a Queen," and says in her pride, "I am no widow, and shall see no sorrow," will receive "the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath." For "her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her" (Rev. xvi. 19; xviii. 5—8).

Hooker and Bacon in the 16th century, as Macaulay and Dickens in the 19th century, have alike testified to one or other of the manifold shortcomings and pretensions of the Church of Rome. Besides these, we may quote the sayings of

The Church of Rome bears with 'heretics' where the force of circumstances obliges it so to do, but whenever the day comes that the Roman Catholics have the majority, which day will come sooner or later, then no more religious liberty. If we cannot now banish heretics, it is because we are at present too weak, and the attempt to burn them would do more harm than good to the Church" (Rock, July 22, 1881). So the Rev. Dr. Potter, Vicar of St. Luke's, Sheffield, wrote to the Rock, Feb. 1881, that the Universe, in advocating the rights of the Papacy to put opponents to death, frankly tells us what Rome will do when it has the power:—"As certainly as the sun is in the heavens, whenever the English people shall come out of their delirium of heresy, and recover their right mind, it shall be a bad time for those who shall stand convicted as the writer stands (i.e., Dr. Potter) of deeds which society, when sane and Christian, does not and cannot pardon." Thus Rome's motto, *Semper eadem*, will be fulfilled to the last. She has the will but not the power, happily for Christians in the present day. Thus her awful sins, and crimes, and blasphemies will remain till the last; "drunken with the blood of saints and martyrs of (or witnesses for) Jesus," i.e., Protestants. But the judgment of the great harlot is coming. "And again they said, Alleluia. And her smoke rose up for ever and ever" (Rev. xix. 3). In the symbol used in Revelation xvii., the "woman sitting upon a scarlet coloured beast," and termed "Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots," just as the Papacy claims to be "the mother and mistress of all churches," is represented as riding or directing the kings of the Roman earth, i.e., all the secular powers over which she claims to be supreme. In the same way, Jezebel (the symbol of a corrupt Church, Rev. ii. 20) used Ahab and his official seal, when she desired to murder Naboth, and to obtain possession of his coveted vineyard.
a few other English celebrities to the same effect. 1. Thus the seraphic Milton broadly denounced the Papal Church as "the worst of superstitions and the heaviest of all God's judgments."

2. The profoundly learned Bishop Butler, in his sermon on 1 Timothy ii. 1, 2, speaks of—

"Popery as the great corruption of Christianity, ever hard at work to bring us again under its yoke. Whoever will consider Popery as it is professed at Rome, may see that it is a manifest open usurpation of all human and divine authority."

3. In like manner that distinguished Nonconformist minister, Robert Hall, speaks of the Church of Rome in the following way:—

"From a settled persuasion that Popery is what it always has been, a detestable system of impiety, cruelty and imposture, fabricated by the father of lies, we feel thankful at witnessing any judicious attempt to expose its enormities and retard its progress. A heap of unmeaning ceremonies, adapted to fascinate the imagination and engage the senses—implicit faith in human authority, combined with utter neglect of divine teaching—ignorance the most profound joined to dogmatism the most presumptuous—a vigilant exclusion of biblical knowledge, together with a total extinction of free inquiry, present the spectacle of religion lying in state surrounded by the silent pomp of death."

4. Adam Smith describes Popery as—

"The most formidable combination that was ever formed against the authority and security of civil government, as well as against the liberty, reason, and happiness of mankind."

5. Finally, to come down to the testimony of men of our own day, I would adduce that of two distinguished Oxonians of very opposite schools of religious thought. "So far as Popery is priestcraft," wrote the great Dr. Arnold nearly half a century ago,—

"I do believe it to be the very mystery of iniquity . . . . . . The spirit of priestcraft, the root of anarchy, fraud and idolatry, is the mainspring of all Popery, whether Romish or Oxonian . . . . I see the Tractarians labouring to enthrone the very mystery of iniquity in that neglected and dishonoured temple, the Church of God. In Italy, it is just the old heathenism; and I should think a worse system of deceit—I do not know what name of abhorrence can be too strong for a religion which, holding the very bread of"
life in its hands, thus feeds the people with poison. Undoubtedly I think worse of Roman Catholicism in itself, than I did some years ago."

6. We may introduce into our brief catena the testimony of the late Rev. R. W. Sibthorp, who, however fluctuating in his opinions and principles, was in a better position than most men for judging of the condition of and doctrines taught by Rome in the present day, from the simple fact that after having long filled the office of a minister of the Church of England, and having been much admired as a Protestant preacher, he suddenly exchanged the true Catholic faith of his native land for the Roman Catholic faith of Italy. And what was the result? After a two years' trial of the Papacy, he thus expresses himself in a letter to his valued friend the late revered Edward Bickersteth, under date of October 5, 1843, in the following way:

"The conviction I am come to, after most painful deliberation, is that the Church of Rome is the harlot and Babylon in the Apocalypse. I believe her to be an adulteress, and idolatrous Church, especially as regards Mariolatry."

7. The last testimony respecting the religious character of the Papacy which I propose to adduce, is that of the late Bishop Blomfield of London. In his Charge of 1842, he speaks of—

"The Church of Rome as an idolatrous Church in a state of schism, if not apostasy, defiled with superstition and idolatry; and which has framed a system that deserves to be described as having embodied the very mystery of iniquity" (pp. 19, 59).

The well-known passage in Macaulay's History of England, in which that illustrious historian contrasts the decaying condition of every country which has suffered from contagion with Rome, and the blight which has befallen such under the withering influence of the Papacy, contrasted with the vigorous strides in life made by its Protestant rivals, must surely convey

---

2 These extracts from Dr. Arnold's letters range over a period of five years, the last of his life, from 1836 to 1841; and are printed in Elliott's Horse Apocalyptica, iv., pp. 678, 9.

an instructive lesson to those who believe in the overruling hand of Him who ordereth all things wisely and well, as well as confirming the truth of the ancient proverb—

"Popery means poverty—Protestantism means prosperity."

Hence, says the historian, with irresistible force—

"During the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been the chief object of the Church of Rome. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor; whilst Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what 400 years ago they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation, the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes in Germany from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilization. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada, who remain inert, while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise."  

Great as Macaulay unquestionably was as an historian, orator, statesman, poet, brilliant conversationalist, with a depth of kindly feeling towards those in distress, so that the Latin aphorism could be said of him with greater truth than of most men, _Nihil erat quod not tetigit : nihil quod tetigit non ornavit_, he was not a prophet; and therefore, when in one of his many brilliant essays he drew his picture of the Papacy, in which, judging from her long life in the past, he thought it possible

---

4 Lord Macaulay's *History of England from the Accession of James the Second*, chap. i.
she might have an equally long life in the future, as he says in that famous simile—

"She may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's,"—

he either forgot or did not understand the doom which awaits the Church of Rome according to the infallible word of truth, when "BABYLON THE GREAT comes into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath."

The historic evidence respecting the "little horn" of Daniel, the successor of the fourth monarchy, or Roman empire, which was overthrown in the fifth century by the Goths and Vandals; respecting the predicted apostasy which would be developed in the Christian Church, the usurping head of which was termed by Justin Martyr "the man of the apostasy;" respecting the appearance of "that man of sin," the seat of whose power, according to Augustine, was expected to be in the professing Church of God; and likewise respecting the characteristic marks of the Apocalyptic BABYLON THE GREAT, from which all the faithful are commanded to "come out of her, my people," proves that they are one and all as truly applicable to what is called "the Church and the Court of Rome," and to none else, as the predictions of the Hebrew prophets were to the Messiahship of the Lord Jesus Christ. And I confidently ask any unprejudiced reader to consider whether the evidence on these points adduced in the foregoing pages is not as conclusive and satisfactory as any other instance of FULFILLED PROPHECY in the whole range of Scripture, from Genesis to Revelation.

It is no less certain that the great gulf which now exists between the true Catholic Church of Christ and the Church of

---

6 The Authorized Version of Revelation xviii. 4, reads "come out;" the Douay, or Roman Catholic Version, translates the same words "go out," as a warning to the faithful. Both versions are very significant of the different teaching of the Churches of England and Rome.
Rome, may be traced back, first, to the painful amalgamation of Paganism and Christianity in the fourth century, when the Emperor Constantine united Church and State in one; and second, to the gradual adoption by the Church of Rome of many rites and ceremonies of exclusive heathen origin, so that the religion of the Church of Rome during the last thousand years may be truly described as Christianity paganized. The late Rev. T. Adam, in his \textit{Private Thoughts}, has justly remarked, "In Popery the appearance of Paganism vanishes, the reality remains; the appearance of Christianity remains, the reality is gone."

The proof of this would require far too large a space to be considered here, nor can it be said to belong to the subject of Fulfilled Prophecy: but if any of my readers desire to see this fully and ably proved by an overwhelming amount of evidence, I can cordially recommend such works as the following amongst many others with a like object in view:—Tertullian \textit{On Idolatry}, chapter xiv., who first gave a note of warning to the Church:—\textit{A Letter from Rome}; shewing an exact Conformity between Popery and Paganism, or the Religion of the present Romans to be derived entirely from that of their Heathen Ancestors," by Dr. Conyers Middleton: \textit{The Two Babylons; or the Papal Worship}, by the Rev. A. Hislop: \textit{Des Sciences Occultes}, by Eusebe Salverte: \textit{The Cross, Heathen and Christian}; a Fragmentary Notice of its early Pagan Existence and subsequent Christian Adoption," by Mourant Brock, M.A.

The faithful in the Church of Christ can never forget that Scripture plainly reveals the reason why God Almighty cast away the children of Israel out of that land which He had given to Abraham and to his seed as an "everlasting possession." It was because they "walked in the statutes of the heathen," and "did secretly those things which were not right," and "set up images," and "served idols whereof Jehovah had said unto them, Ye shall not do this thing.... Notwithstanding they would not hear, but hardened their necks against the Lord their God, and rejected his statutes and his covenant, and became vain, and went after the heathen round
about them." The great sin of the children of Israel, or "the Church in the wilderness," as it is termed in Acts vii. 38, in worshipping images and idols, notably "the Queen of Heaven," so solemnly condemned by God's faithful witness the prophet Jeremiah, has been exactly parodied by the Church of Rome in every particular, and for which tremendous sin, though only one of many others equally vain and wicked, "Babylon the Great is now coming into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of his wrath" (Rev. xvi. 19).

Let us briefly notice how far the Church of Rome is guilty of the same sin of "image worship," which brought down upon the guilty children of Israel the just punishment of Almighty God. The language of Isaiah (ch. xlv.) for force of argument exceeds anything ever written by uninspired men in condemnation; though Heathen, Jewish, and Christian writers have alike expressed themselves concerning its vanity and folly. To give a few examples.

The Roman poet Horace thus satirizes it:—

"Formerly I was the stump of a fig tree, a useless log; when the carpenter, after hesitating whether to make me a god or a stool, at last determined to make me a god. Thus I became a god, and a great terror to thieves and birds." (Sat., lib. i., 8.)

The celebrated Jewish Rabbi Kimchi, when commenting on the sin of image worship so sternly condemned by Isaiah, says—

"When the children of Israel found a beautiful polished stone in a brook or river, they paid divine adoration to it."

And the Jewish Apocrypha gives this good reason for condemning the adoration of images:—

"Seeing they be but wood, and overlaid with silver and gold, it shall be known hereafter that they are false: and it shall manifestly appear to all nations and kings that they are no gods, but the work of men's hands, and that there is no work of God in them. . . . Better, therefore, is the just man that hath no idols: he shall be far from reproach." (Baruch vi. 50, 1, 72.)

7 All this is fully set forth in 2 Kings xvii. 7, 15; Isa. xlv. 9, 20; Jer. xlv. 7, 23; Ezekiel viii. 1, 18.
BABYLON THE GREAT.

Compare also the admonition of "Jeremy the prophet," when he charged the children of Israel—

"Not to forget the commandments of the Lord, and that they should not err in their minds, when they see images of silver and gold with their ornaments." (2 Maccab. ii. 1, 3.)

To the early Christians, of course, "the worship of images," like the worship of dead men and women, and especially of the "Queen of Heaven," so extensively practised by the surrounding Pagans, was most abhorrent. It was considered heathenish, devilish, and essentially Antichristian. A few extracts will sufficiently prove this.

Thus Tertullian in the second century writes—

"When the devil introduced into the world manufactures of stone and images, and representations of every description, that rude business derived both its name and profit from idols. Hence every act which produces an idol, in whatever manner, becomes the head of idolatry. Consequently every form or diminutive image must be called an idol...... God prohibiting as much the making of an idol as the worshipping of it." (Tertul., de Idolatria, § 3 and § 4.)

Thus Origen in the third century says—

"Though some may argue that images are not gods, but only their representatives, even such persons fancying that imitations of the Deity can be made by the hands of some mean artizan, are not a whit less ignorant, and slavish, and uninstructed. From this foolish stupidity the very lowest and least informed of us Christians are exempt." (Origen, Contr. Celsum, vii. 44.)

Arnobius, the contemporary of Origen, writes thus—

"You, heathen, allege that you worship the gods through the medium of images. What then? What can be more injurious or wicked to have the knowledge of God, and yet to supplicate another thing?—to expect assistance from God, and yet to offer prayers to a senseless image?" (Arnob. Adv. Gentes, lib. v., c. 9.)

Lactantius in the fourth century, the distinguished tutor of the first Christian emperor, sums up his strong condemnation of the sin and folly of "image worship" in these words—

"Therefore an image is always useless."

In contrast to the teaching of Scripture and that of the early Christians, who spoke undoubtedly the voice of the Catholic Church, the Church of Rome, ever since A.D. 787, when the second Council of Nice opened the door for the introduction of
images, has sanctioned, adopted, and practised the great sin of "image worship." This Council only let in the thin edge of the wedge, by decreeing as follows:

"We offer to God alone the worship of Latria .... but as regards the venerable images, hoping to receive sanctification from them, we pay them an honorary adoration." (Council of Nice, ii., art. vi.)

This specious attempt to introduce image worship was so repugnant to the hearts of the faithful, that seven years later the Council of Frankfort-en-Maine was assembled under the authority of the Emperor Charlemagne, at which 800 bishops from Italy, France, Germany, and Britain attended, and one of their first acts was to oppose the heretical acts of the Council of Nice with respect to images, which Council was esteemed a mere cabal, and not a universal Council. Hence, observes Spanheim—

"Papal writers, and principally Baronius, have recourse to many subtleties, to relieve themselves from the dilemma into which they are thrown by two councils of their Church decreeing contradictory canons." (Span., Eccl. Annals, cent. viii., § ix.)

Nine centuries after the decree of the heretical Council of Nice II., the Church of Rome at the Council of Trent confirmed the Nicene decree by the following act:—

"Images of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained, particularly in churches, and due honour and veneration given them .... Through the images which we kiss, and before whom we uncover our heads and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, of whom they bear the likeness, the same as was sanctioned by the second Council of Nice against the opponents of images." (Council of Trent, Sess. xxv. De Invoc. Venerat. et Reliq. Sacra. et Sacra. Imag.)

Many of the most distinguished Roman doctors speak out still stronger on this subject. Thus Aquinas says—

"The same reverence is to be given to the image of Christ as to Christ Himself; consequently, since Christ is adored with the adoration of Latria, His image is to be adored with the worship of Latria." (Thomas Aquin. Summ., pars iii., qest. 25, art. 3.)

Another Roman doctor writes—

"It must not only be confessed that the faithful in the Church do adore before the image, as some perhaps would cautiously speak, but also adore the
image itself without any scruple." (Jacob Naclantus, Bishop of Clugium, in Epist. ad Rome, c. 1, vol. 42; Ven. edit., 1559.)

A third doctor declares that—

"Representations of God and Christ, of saints and angels, are not only painted in order that they may be shewn, but that they may be adored, as the frequent use of the Church doth testify." (Cardinal Cajetan, in pars. iii. Thomas Quest., xxv. 3.)

Many other passages might be given to the same effect, but sufficient has been said to prove that the sin of "image worship," for which the Almighty has so severely punished His chosen race the children of Israel, has been fully brought home to the door of the doomed and fallen Church of Rome. It is just with the Romanists of the present day as it was with the heathen nations, whom the kings of Assyria transplanted to Samaria, in order to replant the land with inhabitants, when the whole of the ten tribes of Israel were carried captive and placed "in the cities of the Medes," of whom the Scripture thus speaks—

"So these nations feared the Lord, and served their graven images, both their children and their children's children: as did their fathers, so do they unto this day." (2 Kings, xvii. 41.)

Before closing this portion of Fulfilled Prophecy respecting the application of Daniel's "little horn," St. Paul's portrait of "the apostasy" and "the man of sin," and St. John's description of "Babylon the Great" to the Church and Court of Rome, it may be well to show, on the testimony of Roman Catholic historians exclusively, how exactly the qualifications of those who became head of the Roman Church for several centuries corresponded with the minatory denunciations which prophecy foretold respecting these Antichristian kings.

We have already noticed (p. 149) the expectation of St. Augustine and Chrysostom that the predicted Antichrist would rule the professing Church of Christ, as well as Pope Gregory I.'s declaration (p. 152), when the Partriarch of Constantinople first assumed the title of "Universal Bishop," he was "the forerunner of Antichrist," which has been literally verified in the well-known fact, that that very same title, so abhorrent to Gregory when borne by a rival, has been assumed by Gregory's
successors, and borne by the Bishops or Popes of Rome during the last thirteen centuries ever since.

We have seen (p. 144) that the character of the Bishops of Rome by the tenth century had become so utterly disgraceful as to compel Arnulph of Orleans, at the Synod of Rheims, and Archbishop Gerbert, to proclaim that the prophecy respecting the man of sin was already fulfilled in the Papacy, since "the Bishop of Rome is seen as Antichrist sitting in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God."

The lives of the succeeding Popes for the next six centuries display all the variations of impiety, cruelty, ambition, debauchery, gluttony, sensuality, infidelity, and atheism, according to the declarations of councils, authorities, and Roman Catholic writers of repute. The flood-gates of moral pollution appear in the tenth century to have been set wide open, and torrents of vice poured on the Christian world through the channel of the Roman hierarchy. Awful, indeed, is the picture of the Papacy at this period of history, drawn as it has been by some of its warmest friends, such as Platina, Petavius, Bishop Luitprand, Genebrard, Cardinal Baronius, Binius, Giannone, Labbé, Du Pin, and many other Roman Catholic authorities. Cardinal Baronius, in his Annals of the tenth century, seems unable to find language sufficiently strong to express the base degeneracy of the Popes, who for a certain period were chosen by two noted harlots, Theodora and Marozia, mother and daughter, women distinguished for their beauty, their senatorial rank, and their open profligacy. These polluted females, according to their pleasure or caprice, elected Popes, collated bishops, disposed of dioceses, and assumed in a great measure the whole administration of the Church; so that the Roman See, according to Giannone (vii. 5, 6), became the prey of avarice and ambition, and was sold to the highest bidder.

It will be sufficient for our purpose if we give the portrait of a few of the Bishops of Rome between the tenth and sixteenth centuries, as they have been handed down by Roman Catholic historians, in order to show how closely they fulfilled the character of the predicted "man of sin," each one calling
himself the Vicar of Christ," while in reality an Antichrist, 8 claiming to rule over the Universal Church, thereby showing himself, according to the prophecy, that he was "as God."

1. Pope John XII. ascended the Papal throne A.D. 956, in the eighteenth year of his age.

"He surpassed all his predecessors," says Platina, "in debauchery. He was found guilty by a Roman Council of 'blasphemy, perjury, profanity, impiety, simony, sacrilege, adultery, incest, and murder.'"

In the wantonness of cruelty, he amputated the nose of one cardinal and the hand of another; he killed John, a sub-deacon, by emascula-tion, and Benedict by putting out his eyes. His crimes were so many and so notorious, that the Roman Council summoned by the Emperor Otho, deposed him from his office. He afterwards regained his See for a short time; but "being caught in the act of adultery with a married woman, was killed," says Luitprand, bishop of Cremona, "by the devil, or more probably by the injured husband." Hence, says Cardinal Bellarmine (ii. 20), "John was nearly the most wicked of the Popes."

2. Gregory VII., more commonly known as Hildebrand, "hell-fire," obtained the Papacy, says Du Pin (ii., 210), by "gross simony" in 1073. Cardinal Benno has sketched the character of this Pope in strong colours, accusing him of "simony, sacrilege, epicureanism, magic, sorcery, treason, impiety and murder." The Council of Worms, in 1076, found him guilty of "usurpation, apostasy, heresy, adultery, perjury," and many other crimes. And the Council of Brescia, in 1080, after finding him guilty of "bribery, simony, sacrilege, ferocity, ambition, impiety, necromancy, infidelity, assassination," and other vices already mentioned, decreed as follows:—

---

8 "Antichrist" may mean either a "vice-Christ," i.e., Christ's substitute, or an opponent of Christ, the word αντι in when compounded with a noun has this double meaning, of which Elliott, in his Hora Apocalyptica (vol. i., p. 65), has given so many examples. Greswell, in his work on The Parables, well observes that "Antichrist signifies neither more nor less than another Christ, a pro-Christ, a vice-Christ, a pretender to the name of Christ; who in every characteristic of personal distinction sets himself up as the counterpart of the true" (vol. i., p. 372).
"We therefore declare, by the authority of Almighty God, the said Hildebrand divested of the Pontifical dignity."

The Council then elected Guibert, Archbishop of Ravenna, in his place, who took the title of Pope Clement III. Bower, once Professor of History and Philosophy at Rome, and Counsellor of the Inquisition at Macerata, has drawn the character of this Pope, considering that he would have equally with either Gregory I. or Leo I. deserved the title of "Great," had he not misapplied his—

"Talents to the most wicked purposes, to the establishing of an uncontrolled tyranny over mankind, and of making himself the sole lord, spiritual and temporal, over the whole earth."

The maxims of Gregory VII., as set forth in the fifty-fifth letter of the second book of his Letters, show his designs on this head very clearly, as amongst other enormities he claims the following powers:—

"That the Bishop of Rome should alone be styled Universal (which constituted him Antichrist, according to Gregory I., five centuries before); that the Pope alone can depose bishops, alone can make new laws, and that it is lawful for him to depose emperors. All princes are to kiss his foot, and that there is no name in the world but his, i.e., he alone is to be styled Pope. His judgment no man can reverse, and he is to be judged by no man. The Roman Church never has erred, nor will she ever err, according to Scripture"! 9

3. Alexander III. succeeded the only English Pope, Adrian IV., A.D. 1159. He is said to have equalled all his predecessors in the number of his atrocious actions. His despotism commenced by a victory over four rival Popes. And his attempt

9 Hildebrand's infamous character is specially manifest in his conduct towards the Jews. When Ferdinand of Spain determined not to be outdone in his religious zeal by the Saracenic king in persecution, he let loose the sword against the hapless Jews in his own territories. To their honour, the clergy interfered and prevented the massacre, with the approval of Pope Alexander II. (1061—73), who highly commended their humanity. His successor in the Papacy, the violent Hildebrand, assumed a different tone. He rebuked King Alfonso VI. for having restored certain rights to the Jews, thereby submitting, as Gregory declared, "the Church to the Synagogue of Satan." (Gregory VII., Epistle in Baronius, under the year 1080.)
to show himself "as God" was seen when the poor old feeble Emperor Frederick prostrated himself before him, in setting his foot upon his neck, haughtily and profanely applying the language of the Psalmist to his own wicked self in place of Christ—

"Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder, the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under thy feet."

4. Innocent III., in the following century, proved himself a just claimant to the title of "the man of sin," as he boldly usurped the prerogatives of the Lord Jesus Christ, profanely declaring that—

"He was the bridegroom of the Church, which was his bride; that he was the vicar of the King of kings and Lord of lords."

He permitted others to say of him—

"We have received from his fulness; that he was a mediator between God and man; and that the Pontifical dignity was superior to the imperial authority."

His pride and arrogance were apparent in his letters to the Emperor of Constantinople, in which, speaking of the superiority of the Pope over temporal sovereigns, he compares himself to the sun, and the emperor to the moon. Matthew Paris asserts "that Pope Innocent had an insatiable thirst for money;" and his cruelty towards the peaceable Albigenses, together with his institution of the Inquisition, marks him as one of those bloodthirsty monsters of wickedness who are a disgrace to human nature, and who by his own personal acts fulfilled to the letter what Scripture foretold of the Babylonian harlot, as "drunken with the blood of the saints and the martyrs of Jesus."

5. Boniface VIII. ascended the Papal throne in 1294, and soon displayed such a vicious character, that when Philip, King of France, summoned a convention of the three estates of the realm, Boniface was accused of—

"Usurpation, simony, ambition, avarice, church robbery, extortion, tyranny, impiety, abomination, blasphemy, heresy, infidelity, murder, and the sin for which the cities of the plain were consumed."

Walsingham, in his Life of Edward, records a prophecy of
this Boniface, ascribed to Pope Celestine, his immediate predecessor, that “he would enter the Papacy like a fox, reign like a lion, and die like a dog,” which was verified to the letter by the acts of this “man of sin,” who with Antichristian audacity decreed that “it was necessary to salvation for every creature to be subjected to the Roman Pontiff.” (Corp. Jur. Can., t. ii., Extrav., lib. i., tit. 8, cap. 1.)

6. John XXIII. ascended the Papal throne a.d. 1410, and seems, if possible, to have exceeded all his predecessors in vice, as was ascertained and published by the general Council of Constance, after a tedious trial and the examination of many witnesses. “John,” says Labbé, “was convicted of forty crimes.” The Council of Constance found him guilty of the common Papal crimes, such as simony, robbery, murder, perjury, adultery, &c., &c., and characterized him as—

“The oppressor of the poor, the persecutor of the just, the pillar of iniquity, the column of simony, the slave of sensuality, the dregs of apostasy, the mirror of infamy, and an incarnated devil.”

His crimes are too horrible to be detailed; nevertheless, a subsequent Council, that of Florence, pronounced this intensely wicked Bishop of Rome to be “the Vicar-General of God, the head of the Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians”!!

7. Alexander VI. (1492—1503), better known by the name of Borgia, who lived to the verge of the Reformation of the Church in the sixteenth century, seems to have exhausted the list of the most intensely wicked set of rulers which ever cursed God’s earth and human nature. In the common opinion, this execrable Pope surpassed all his rivals in vice and villany, and proved himself in every species of miscreancy, as Sannazarius shows, a true rival to the greatest monsters among the Pagan emperors, Caligula, Nero and Heliogabalus.

“His debauchery,” says Daniel, “his perfidy, ambition, malice, inhumanity and irreligion, made him the execration of all Europe.”

Simony and assassination were as prominent in this Pope’s character as incest and adultery. He first purchased the Papacy, and afterwards, in order to satisfy his rapacity, he sold
BABYLON THE GREAT.  

its offices and preferments. He murdered the majority of the cardinals who raised him to the Papacy, and then seized their estates. He had a large family of illegitimate sons and daughters, and for their benefit he exposed to sale all things sacred and profane, and violated and outraged all the laws of God and man. His degraded and infamous life came to an end in consequence of an attempt to poison nine wealthy cardinals for the sake of their riches. This miscreant Pope and his fratricide son, Cæsar Borgia, invited these doomed cardinals to a sumptuous banquet in the gardens of the Belvedera. Poisoned wine was prepared for the unsuspecting guests, but the poisoned cup was handed by mistake to the Pope, who drank eagerly without knowing his danger, and thus perished by the poison which he had prepared for the murder of his friends.

Such was the character of the Popes during the middle ages, and although, as Cardinal Baronius rightly declares, the ruffians who were raised to the Papacy by the harlots Theodora and Marozia were "no Popes but monsters," and the Church was in consequence "without any earthly head," emphatically denouncing "Boniface as a thief, a miscreant and a murderer, who was not to be reckoned among the Popes, but among the notorious robbers of the age"—enough has been said to show how completely these Popes, calling themselves "Vicars of Christ," i.e., Antichrists, and profanely claiming the title of "Infallibility," thus usurping one of the prerogatives of the Almighty, have fulfilled what prophecy foretold respecting the "man of sin"—the apostasy of professing Christians, and the character of the doomed Church of Rome, under the title of "Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth" (Rev. xvii. 5).

If any thing further were required to prove the Antichristian nature of the Papacy, it may be seen in the infamous society known throughout the world by the hated name of "Jesuits." Within a few years after the death of that monster of wickedness, Pope Alexander VI., an ignorant fanatical Spanish soldier, called Inigo de Guipuscoa, more generally known as Ignatius Loyola, founded a society, A.D. 1540, profanely named
the "Order of Jesus," whose chief rule was "a solemn vow of unlimited submission and obedience to the Pope." Hence the zeal of the Jesuits in supporting the power of the Church of Rome, and the zeal of the Church in screening or vindicating Jesuitical enormities of every sort and kind, as their own writings declare.

To show how speedily their vices were detected, the following extract from a sermon by the Archbishop of Dublin, A.D. 1551, within 11 years after the founding of the order, plainly proves, and which indeed has been regarded as of the nature of prophecy:

"There is," says the archbishop, "a new fraternity of late sprung up, who call themselves Jesuits, which will deceive many, who are much after the Scribes and Pharisees' manner among the Jews. They shall strive to abolish the truth, and shall come very near to do it. For these sorts will turn themselves into several forms: with the Heathen a Heathenist, with the Atheists an Atheist, with the Jews a Jew, with the Reformers a Reformade, purposely to know your intentions, your minds, your hearts, and your inclinations, and thereby bring you at last to be like the fool that said in his heart, There is no God. These shall spread over the whole world, shall be admitted into the council of princes, and they never the wiser, charming of them, yea, making your princes reveal their hearts and the secrets therein, and yet they not perceive it; which will happen from falling from the law of God, and by winking at their sins; yea, in the end, to justify his law, shall suddenly cut off this society, even by the hands of those who have most succoured them, and made use of them; so that at the end they shall become odious to all nations. They shall be worse than Jews, having no resting-place on earth, and then shall a Jew have more favour than a Jesuit."

It is far too large a subject to consider here how accurately what the Archbishop of Dublin predicted of Jesuit principles and Jesuit teaching within 11 years after the formation of the order by the Papal Edict of 1540, has come to pass. But for those who wish to see this proved beyond all doubt or cavil, that Jesuitism is the true representative of the doomed and apostate Church of Rome, we may recommend, amongst a multitude of others, the following works as deserving of a most careful and attentive study:

1. The Registry of Rochester Cathedral, from 1555 to 1572.

The general detestation in which the Society of the Jesuits has been held by Roman Catholics, is seen in the fact that they were expelled from Venice in 1606, from Savoy in 1729, from Portugal in 1759, from France in 1764, from Spain and Sicily in 1767, from Malta and Parma in 1768. During the two centuries which the order existed they suffered 37 expulsions from various states on account of their flagitious principles, until they were suppressed by Pope Clement XIV. in 1773; who two years later paid the penalty of his courage by dying of slow poison.
CHAPTER X.

THE THREE WOES.

The three woes under which Christendom has suffered at various times and with different degrees of intensity are specified in the Apocalypse thus—"One woe is past; and behold, there come two woes more hereafter." This is stated to have occurred during the sounding of the "fifth angel;" and the three woes may be summarily described thus:

1. The first, or Saracenic woe.
2. The second, or Turkish woe.
3. The third woe, viz., that of the great French Revolution.

Such were the woes with which the Almighty has at different periods punished professing Christendom, just as of old He punished His chosen people of the tribes of Israel, with a view to recall them from the error of their ways, and in order that they might be warned by the past of the judgments to come in the future.

The first, or Saracen 1 woe is thus defined:

"And the fifth angel sounded, and I saw a star fall from heaven to the earth—and there came locusts upon the earth; and unto them was given power as the scorpions of the earth have power, not to hurt the grass of the earth, but only those men which have not the seal of God in their foreheads, not to kill them, but to torment them for five months. And the shapes of the locusts were like unto horses prepared for battle; and on their heads as it were crowns like gold, and their faces were as the faces of men. And

---

1 The name Saracen is derived from the Semitic word Sharx, signifying "the East," as expressive of the locality from whence the locust hordes sprang. See Niebuhr's Roman Hist. Lecture, vol. ii., 333. Gibbon (Decline and Fall, ch. i.) gives various speculations for the etymology of the word "Saracen" without success, one of them being from "Sarah, the wife of Abraham!!"
they had hair as the hair of women, and their teeth were as the teeth of lions; and they had as it were breast-plates of iron, and their sound as that of many horses running to battle; and their power was to hurt men five months."2

Scripture and history combine to show how literally these divine denunciations of woe have been fulfilled on certain parts of Christendom; first by the Saracens, then by the Turks, and, finally, by that great infidel sore of the French Revolution. We gather from history that at the commencement of the seventh century, when the predicted apostasy was beginning to develop itself both in the East and in the West, the Almighty thought fit to make use of Mohammed and the Saracen host as His instruments for inflicting punishment upon those Eastern Christians, who had departed from their "first love" like the Ephesians3 of an earlier age; as Jehovah had done in the Jewish Church, when Tiglath-pileser, Shalmenezar and Sargon, kings of Assyria, as also Nebuchadnezzar and other kings of Babylon, were God's instruments for punishing the guilty children of Israel.

In the ninth chapter of Revelation, we find in the symbolic locusts certain marks by which we may judge how far the predicted woe was fulfilled in the punishment which Mohammed and the Saracen host were permitted to inflict upon Christians residing in the eastern portion of the Roman empire. The locusts are represented as like unto many horses prepared for battle, with men's faces, and having long hair like women, with crowns of gold on their heads, and with the teeth of lions, with breast-plates of iron, and tails like unto scorpions having stings in their tails; and the duration of their judgment was limited to "five months," which in symbolic language represents a period of 150 years. A careful study of these symbols will show how clearly this prophecy appears to have been fulfilled in the rise and progress of Mohammedanism. The symbol of these "scorpion-tailed locusts"4 is peculiarly

2 Rev. ix. 1—10. 3 Rev. ii. 4.
4 Some Assyrian cylinders brought from the desert of Mas, near the Euphrates, and now in the British Museum, have carved representations
applicable to the locality from which the Arabs come. Volney remarks that "locusts come from the deserts of Arabia;" and in the great national poem of the Arabians, entitled Antar, the locust is introduced as the national emblem of the Ishmaelites; and, as a remarkable coincidence, Mohammedan tradition speaks of locusts having once dropped into the hands of Mohammed, bearing on their wings this inscription—"We are the army of the great God."5

The Apocalyptic locusts are said to be noted for three things—men's faces, women's hair, and with crowns on their heads. Pliny, the contemporary of St. John, describes the Arabs of his time, as wearing the turban with the hair long and uncut.6 And it is worthy of note that Ezekiel, when speaking of the Sabæans, i.e., the Arabian descendants of Abraham and Keturah, describes them as "the Sabæans from the wilderness which put... beautiful crowns upon their heads."7 Further, the Arabians had a proverb that God had bestowed upon them turbans in place of crowns. Hence the precept of Mohammed, according to the Mischat-ul-Masabih, "Make a point of wearing turbans, because it is the way of angels." And in reference to the "breast-plates of iron," all Mohammedan authorities agree in speaking of the Saracenic policy of wearing defensive armour. Their leader says in the Koran, "God hath given you coats of mail to defend you in your wars."8 And in the national poem of Antar, repeated mention is made of the Saracenic armies being "clothed in iron armour and brilliant cuirasses."

This judgment, by means of Mohammed and his Saracenic host upon the eastern portion of the Roman empire, was limited to a period of "five months," which, in the symbolic language of

---

5 Forster's Mohammedanism Unveiled, i. 227.
6 Pliny's Natural History, vi. 32. 7 Ezek. xxiii. 42.
8 Al Koran, ch. xxi. reads literally—"We taught him (David) the art of making coats of mail for you," &c. (Sale's Koran, p. 270.)
the Apocalypse, on the principle of interpreting "each day for a year," is supposed to represent a period of 150 years. This we believe to have been fulfilled between the years A.D. 612—762, as the following notices may show. The commencement of Mohammed's mission, when he withdrew to the cave of Hera, occurred A.D. 612. A few years later "the barbarous Saracens," as Eusebius termed them three centuries earlier, issued forth from the Arabian desert, under the command of Mohammed, and commenced that wonderful career of conquest, which in less than 100 years extended the Arabian empire from the confines of China to the shores of the Atlantic.

There was a predicted limit to their conquests. The prophecy shows that they were not to annihilate Christendom, but only "torment" the Christians for a period of 150 years. It is written that "their power was to hurt men five months." They were not to "hurt the grass of the earth, neither any green thing, neither any tree." The apparent paradox of this prohibition, so contrary to the desolation invariably caused by the natural locust, has been observed by several historians. Gibbon, in describing a repulse which Mohammed met with at Tayef, whose fertile lands produced the fruits of Syria, notwithstanding the aid he received from a friendly tribe, accounts for it by saying, "he violated his own laws by the extirpation of the fruit trees." This presents a striking contrast to the success which attended the Saracens on their first attempt at foreign conquest, when the caliph Abubekir wrote these remarkable words to Yezid Ebn Abi Sophijan, the commander of his army—"Destroy not the palm trees, cut down no fruit trees, nor burn any fields of corn."

Further, as the prophecy shows that the Eastern empire was
not to be destroyed during the Saracenic woe, it is an historic fact that when the Saracens twice attacked the vital part of Eastern Christendom by besieging Constantinople, first in a seven years siege, from A.D. 668—675; and second in 716—718, when Leo III., nicknamed "the Iconoclast" by unworthy Christians, because of his endeavour to put down the rampant idolatry which had so long defiled the nominal Church, was on the throne; on both occasions the Saracens were compelled to retire, humiliated and disgraced, as they had never been before; and it was reserved for the Turks, as the instruments in God's hands, for inflicting "the second woe" upon Christendom, upwards of seven centuries later, to avenge this double defeat.

Quickly recovering, however, from their humiliation before the walls of Constantinople, the Saracens proceeded on their way for the predicted period of 150 years, when there came a sudden decline in their conquests, occasioned by a change of dynasty, the Abbassides having supplanted the Ommiades in the caliphate. With this change a most important consequence followed. The Abbassidean caliph, dissatisfied with the former capital of Damascus, where his rivals had reigned, determined on transferring his capital to the right bank of the Tigris, where a canal with the waters from the river Euphrates joined it, a few miles beyond the old Roman frontier.

In the year 762, just 150 years after Mohammed first appeared as "the false prophet," Almansor commenced his new capital far away from Constantinople, the seat of Eastern Christendom, which era has been appropriately named by the commentator Daubuz as "the settlement of the locusts." The name which the caliph gave to his new capital, Medinat-al-Salem, "The city of Peace," was indicative of the peaceful character of the Saracens in Asia from that date. The new dynasty soon disdained the frugality of the earlier caliphs, and aspired to emulate the magnificence of the Persian kings; and

---

4 The foundation of the city of Bagdad, the new Saracenic capital, was laid in the year of the Hegira 143 = A.D. 762; and Motassem, the last of the Abbassides, was put to death by the Tartars, A.D. 1258, their kingdom having lasted nearly 500 years.
this luxury, as Gibbon says—"So useless to their private happiness, relaxed the nerves, and terminated the progress of the Arabian empire." And thus as our ablest commentator well expresses it:

"The caliphate was divided; the Mohammedan colossus broken; the scorpion locust carried away by a strong west wind to the Euphrates; and the intensity of the Saracenic woe was brought to an end."

Before closing our remarks on the Saracenic woe, the duration of which, as we have already pointed out, lasted from A.D. 612—762, it may be well to notice the apparent reason why the Saracens did not succeed, as the Turks, their immediate successors, did succeed, in imposing their yoke for so many ages upon so large a part of Christendom. In one word, the reason is we think to be found in this, that the Saracens were a Semitic race, and the Turks a Japhetic. And had the Saracens effected what the Turks eventually did, it would have conflicted with the prophecy of Noah, which has already been considered, in which it is stated, "God shall enlarge Japheth; and he shall dwell in the tents of Shem; and Canaan shall be his servant." As far as history reveals the descendants of Japheth have repeatedly defeated the descendants of Shem, and have "dwelt in their tents" for many ages, while the tide of conquest has never enabled the Semitic race to rule over the races sprung from Japheth. This is strikingly seen in the history of the Saracenic conquest in Asia over the Semitic races of that part of the world, and their great failure when attempting the same in Europe, then as now peopled by the descendants of Japheth. Gibbon, in speaking of the Mohammedan invasion of France, in the eighth century, says:—

"A victorious line of march had been prolonged above 1000 miles from the rock of Gibraltar to the banks of the Loire; the repetition of an equal space would have carried the Saracens to the confines of Poland and the Highlands of Scotland; the Rhine is not more impassable than the Nile or Euphrates, and the Arabian fleet might have sailed without a naval combat into the mouth of the Thames. Perhaps the interpretation of the Koran

6 Decline and Fall, c. 52.

P
would now be taught in the schools of Oxford, and her pulpits might demonstrate to a circumcised people the sanctity and truth of the revelation of Mohammed."

But the word of God had gone forth, and it was not to be. The great victory which Charles, the son of Pepin, commonly called Martel, or "the Hammer," obtained near Tours, between that city and Poictiers, A.D. 732, over the Saracenic host, for ever put an end to any possibility of the Saracens having any permanent sway over the descendants of Japheth. While in Africa, among the descendants of Ham, the scorpion sting was so severely felt, twenty years after the battle of Tours, that nearly the whole Christian population of the province were induced to desert the Christian religion and become Mohammedans. But a few years later, the power of the Saracens visibly declined; and before many centuries it had entirely passed away as completely as that of the ancient Assyrians.

2. Saith Scripture:—

"One woe (the Saracenic) is passed; and behold, there come two woes more hereafter. And the sixth angel sounded, and I heard a voice from the four horns of the golden altar before God, saying, Loose the four angels which are bound in the great river Euphrates. . . . And the four angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men. And the number of the army of the horsemen were two hundred thousand thousand: and I heard the number of them . . . . and the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions, and out of their mouths issued fire and smoke and brimstone. By these three was the third part of men killed . . . . And the rest of the men . . . . repented not of the work of their hands, that they should not worship demons, and idols of gold and stone, &c.; neither repented they of their murders, nor of their sorceries, nor of their fornications, nor thefts."*

Towards the close of the tenth century, one of the most distinguished of the Asiatic princes, who were in reality soldiers of Turkish extraction, appeared on the scene; and the greatest of these princes was Mahmoud, the Ganzevide, who reigned in the eastern provinces of Persia. On one occasion, when assistance had been sought from a Turkoman chief, the reply which he received conveys a good idea of the rising

* Decline and Fall, c. 52.  
8 Rev. ix. 12—21.
power of the Turks, as well as affording an instructive comment on Scripture prophecy. Mahmoud had inquired how many men could be furnished by his tribe for military service? "If you send," replied the Turkish chief, "one of these arrows into our camp, 50,000 will at once mount on horseback; and if that number should not be sufficient, the horde of Balik will find 50,000 more." "But," replied the monarch, dissembling his anxiety at such proofs of the growing power of the Turks, "if I should stand in need of the whole force of your tribe?" "Dispatch my bow," was the last reply of the Turk, "and as it circulates around the summons will be obeyed by 200,000 horse."

These pastoral warriors speedily grew from a band of robbers into an army of conquerors. Toghrul Beg was elected their first sovereign, and when the Turks embraced the Mohammedan religion, Toghrul became imbued with a lively reverence for the successor of the Prophet, which office was then disputed by two rival claimants, the caliphs of Bagdad and Egypt. After deciding in favour of the former, and rendering him the greatest assistance, Toghrul was appointed, in 1057, by the Caliph of Bagdad, lieutenant to the Commander of the Faithful; and by this act apparently was effected the reloosing of the Moslem power, which had been "bound in the great river Euphrates," according to the words of the prophecy, during the previous three centuries, and which was then about to be let loose again against Christendom.

Toghrul Beg was succeeded by his nephew, Alp Arslan, "the Valiant Lion," which seems to accord with the prophetic symbol, which specified that "the heads of the horses were as the heads of lions." Alp Arslan's career was cut short by an assassin; and he was succeeded by Malek Shah, the greater son of a great father, whose empire eventually extended from the Chinese frontier to the walls of Constantinople, when that famous city, for more than twelve centuries the metropolis of the Roman empire, fell into the hands of the Turks under Mohammed II., who called himself Hunkiar, i.e., "slayer of men," in accordance with the Apocalyptic prediction—
THE THREE WOES.

"The four angels bound in the great river Euphrates were loosed for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men." 9

Let us now observe how exactly the prophecy has been fulfilled respecting the duration of this second, or Turkish woe, which was to last for "an hour, a day, a month, and a year." Mr. Elliott has very ably, and with rigid attention to the laws of symbolical interpretation, shown that this prophetic period, on the year-day principle, amounts exactly to 396 solar years and 118 days. From the inauguration of Togrul Beg, as lieutenant of the Caliph of Bagdad, an event of the greatest importance in the estimation of Abulfeda and other Arabian historians, to the fall of Constantinople, is exactly the predicted period of 396 years and 118 days. The inauguration took place at Bagdad on the 10th of the month, Dzoulcad, A.H. 448, corresponding to January 18th, A.D. 1057. From this to May 29th, 1453, the day Constantinople was taken, is 396 years and 130 days, or twelve days more than the predicted Apocalyptic period of 118 days. But this is necessary to the right understanding of prophetic language; for the Scripture statement falls short of the whole historic interval by only twelve natural days, i.e., less than half one prophetic hour; so that had the statement been expressed as "two" hours, in place of as it is "one hour," it would have overlapped the real epoch of the fall of Constantinople by nearly three weeks. As a remarkable confirmation of this mode of computing time in the East, one of the chroniclers of the period, who gives the most complete account of the expedition of Richard I. to Palestine, mentions that after his great victory at Jaffa, and a truce was agreed upon, A.D. 1192, between the King of England and the Sultan Saladin, it was drawn up in the following way:—

"If it please King Richard, a truce shall be observed between the Christians and the Gentiles for the space of three years, three months, three weeks, three days, and three hours." 1

9Rev. ix. 15.

1 Chronicle of Richard of Devizes concerning the deeds of King of England, § 93. None of the other chroniclers, though all mention the three years' truce, specify its duration so exactly as Richard of Devizes, the monkish
Now what is the teaching of history respecting the fulfilment of this prophecy of the second, or Turkish woe, upon Eastern Christendom? It is not a little remarkable that after once the Turkman power had been let loose, which had been heretofore “bound in the great river Euphrates,” by the election of Togrul Beg as sovereign of the Turks, in the middle of the 11th century, the accomplishment of the work assigned to it in the counsels of the Almighty should have been so long protracted and delayed. Within less than half a century from Togrul’s inauguration, Constantinople and the Roman empire in the East were on the very verge of ruin by the Seljukian Turks; and nothing less than an almost miraculous intervention seemed capable of averting it. But the intervention took place. The Crusades from Western Europe, which altogether extended from the first Crusade, A.D. 1096, to the ninth Crusade, ending with the loss of Acre, A.D. 1291, however useless they ultimately proved in Syria, for the recovery of the land of Canaan to the Christian powers, yet so crippled the Turkish power that for upwards of two centuries they helped to uphold the Greek empire, and to delay its destined fall. After that the Moguls, under Tamerlane the Tartar, during the 14th century, further crippled and delayed the resuscitation of the Turkish power, which at that time was represented by the Ottomans, in consequence of the Seljukian dynasty having come to an end. Othman commenced his attack of the Roman empire by the invasion of the territory of Nicomedia, July 27, A.D. 1299; and the historian remarks that “the singular accuracy of the date seems to disclose some foresight of the rapid and destructive growth of the monster.”

But the time had not arrived for the destined fall of

chronicler of St. Swithin’s Priory, near Winchester; but his testimony is especially valuable, as being contemporary with the events which he relates.

2 Rev. ix. 14.

3 Orthogrul, a subject of Aladin, Sultan of Iconium, had established a camp of 400 families or tents, whom he governed for over half a century. He was the father of Thaman, or Athman, whose Turkish name, says Gibbon, “has been melted into the appellation of the Caliph Athman.”

4 Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. 64.
Constantinople, notwithstanding the remarkable resuscitation of the Turkish power under the Amuraths and the Bejazets of the new Othman dynasty. About half a century before the prophetic "hour" had arrived, Constantinople was on the verge of destruction; the victorious Sultan Bejazet I., after his crushing defeat of the Christians at the battle of Nicepolis, fought September 28th, 1396, thus addressed the Emperor Manuel II.:

"By the divine clemency our invincible cimeter has reduced to our obedience almost all Asia, with many and large countries in Europe, excepting only the city of Constantinople; for beyond the walls thou hast nothing left. Resign that city; stipulate thy reward; or tremble for thyself and thy unhappy people at the consequences of a rash refusal."

Nevertheless, the haughty pride of the Turk was doomed to a severe fall, and Constantinople was spared for fifty years longer before its predicted hour arrived, when God's judgment upon the faithless Christians of the East was as visibly manifest as His judgments had been shown nearly fourteen centuries before upon His own favoured city of Zion. And the interference of Tamerlane, by far the greatest conqueror of that age, with the projects of Bajezet, prevented the accomplishment of his furious design against the Queen of the East. The result of the battle of Angora between Tamerlane and Bejazet, fought July 28th, 1402, cut short the pride of the Turkish sultan, and the story of the iron cage to which the conqueror relegated his prey, though it has been the subject of some historic doubts, seems to be well established, and was undoubtedly a deserved punishment for the cruelties which have stained the name and fame of the haughty Turk. But, as Gibbon justly observes—

"The savage (Bejazet) would have devoured his prey (Constantinople), if in the fatal moment he had not been overthrown by another savage (Tamerlane) stronger than himself. By his victory the fall of Constantinople was delayed about fifty years."  

One of the many proofs of the truth of prophecy respecting the Turkish woe is seen in this, that while Tamerlane's vast empire, which extended right across Asia from China to the

---

5 *Decline and Fall*, ch. 64.
Mediterranean, came eventually to nothing; the Moslem empire, notwithstanding the decisive defeat of Bejazet at Angora, rapidly recovered itself; in the course of the two succeeding centuries it attained to its culminating point of strength, and exists to our own day; and though reduced almost to nothing in regard to earthly power, yet has proved a terrible "woe" to multitudes of professing Christians, even to the present time.

Thirty years after the battle of Angora, Mohammed II., the conqueror of Constantinople, was born. Great grandson of the hero of the iron cage, and son of Amurath II., by Irene, a Christian princess, by whom he is said to have been instructed in his infancy in the Christian faith, his subsequent life, stained by Moslem fanaticism and innumerable cruelties, proved that he never could have had the faintest perception of the religion of the Gospel; though there is this to be said on his behalf, that he was apparently as much a destined scourge for the punishment of unworthy Christians as Nebuchadnezzar had been 2000 years before of the then professing Church of God; and that the form of religion professed by the Christians of the East was almost as objectionable as that of the Church of Rome, and quite sufficient to deter any one who knew its principles from embracing its tenets.

Amurath II. expired at Adrianople in 1451, while his eldest son, Mohammed II., who had twice tasted of royalty during his father's lifetime, and twice returned to the obedience of a subject, after having put his younger brothers to death, ascended the throne at the early age of twenty. Gibbon portrays his character in one line with that happy felicity of expression peculiar to that great historian. Speaking of his building a strong fortress on the Bosphorus, as the commencement of his attack on Constantinople, which was erected in an incredibly short space of time, under the personal superintendence of the sultan, Gibbon says, "the diligence of the

---

6 See *The Mahometane, or Turkish Historie*, containing three bookes, by R. Carr, of the Middle Temple. Printed at London, by Thomas Este, dwelling in Aldersgate Street, 1600, p. 36.
workmen was quickened by the eye of a despot, whose smile was the hope of fortune, and whose frown was the messenger of death."

The Mohammedan doctors have always declared that no promise can bind the faithful against the interest and duty of their religion (the Papal casuists have said the same on behalf of their faith); and that the Sultan of Turkey, like the Pope of Rome, had power to abrogate his own as well as his predecessors' treaties, and dispense with any oaths when it was inconvenient to keep them. The justice of Amurath had scorned this immoral privilege; his cruel and unworthy son, though the proudest of men, could stoop to the basest arts of dissimulation and deceit. Peace was on his lips, while war was in his heart. He incessantly sighed for the possession of Constantinople; and the Greek ambassadors, by their own indiscretion, afforded the first pretence of the fatal rupture.

In the narrow pass of the Bosphorus, his grandfather, Mohammed I., had erected a small fortress on the Asiatic side of the strait. Mohammed II. now resolved to erect a far more formidable fortress on the European side, about five miles distant from Constantinople. The Greek ambassadors pointed out that this double fortification could only tend to annihilate the alliance of the nations, and subsistence of the city as well. To this the perfidious monarch replied, "I form no enterprise against the city; but the empire of Constantinople is measured by her walls. Have you the right or the power to control my actions on my own ground? For that ground is my own: as far as the shores of the Bosphorus, Asia is inhabited by the Turks, and Europe is deserted by the Romans. Return, and inform your king, that the present Ottoman is far different from his predecessors; that his resolutions surpass their wishes; and that he performs more than they could resolve. Return this time in safety; but the next who delivers a similar message may expect to be flayed alive."

The spring of 1453 saw the completion of this fortress, while the Greek emperor vainly strove by flattery and gifts to soften an implacable foe, who sought and secretly fomented the slightest occasion of a quarrel. Such an occasion soon presented
itself. The Greek Emperor Constantine had solicited a Turkish guard to protect the fields of his subjects. The guard was ordered to allow free pasture to the horses of the Turkish camp. The servants of one of the chiefs had left their horses to pass the night in the ripe corn; the insult was resented, and several on both sides fell in the conflict. Mohammed listened with joy to the complaint, and forty innocent reapers were massacred to the vengeance of the cruel Turk.

Until this incident, Constantinople had been open to the demands of commerce; on the first alarm the gates were shut; but the emperor still anxious for peace, released on the third day his Turkish captives, and expressed in a final message to his foe the resignation of a Christian and a soldier.

"Since," he wrote to Mohammed, "neither oaths, nor treaty, nor submission, can secure peace, pursue your impious warfare. My trust is in God alone; if it should please Him to soften your heart, I shall rejoice in the happy change; if He delivers the city into your hands, I submit without a murmur to His holy will. But until the Judge of the earth pronounce between us, it is my duty to live and die in defence of my people."

The sultan's answer was hostile; the fortress was completed; and a guard appointed to take toll from every vessel passing the straits. A Venetian vessel, refusing obedience to the new lords of the Bosphorus, was sunk by a single bullet. The master and thirty sailors escaped to shore; but they were dragged in chains before the Turkish monster; the chief was at once impaled alive; all the crew were beheaded; and the historian Ducas beheld at Demotica their bodies exposed to wild beasts and festering in the winds. During this fatal season, one of the brothers of the reigning emperor, Constantine Palæologus XIII., had a son born to him; "the last heir," says the historian Phranza, plaintively, "of the last spark of the Roman empire."

On the sixth of April, 1453, Mohammed planted his standard before the gate of St. Romanus, and commenced the siege of Constantinople. His army consisted of 120,000 soldiers; to meet this gigantic host, not 5000 could be gathered in defence
of the once famous capital of the Roman world. By the emperor's command, a particular inquiry had been made through the streets of the city, how many of the citizens, or even of the monks, were able and willing to bear arms for their country. The lists were entrusted to Phranza; and he was compelled to inform his sovereign, with grief and surprise, that the national defence of the city of Constantinople was reduced to 4970 Romans.  

The annals of the world have few passages equal to the fall of Constantinople for strange and effecting details, and above all for the most important results; and which have been so brilliantly recorded in the classic pages of Gibbon. It will be sufficient for us to notice that after a siege of fifty-three days, Constantinople, which from first to last had undergone upwards of a dozen sieges, which had defied the powers of Chosroes, the mighty King of Persia, and the Saracenic caliphs, was irretrievabley subdued by Mohammed II., the chief performer in the drama of the second, or Turkish woe. On the memorable twenty-ninth of May, the sultan passed in triumph through the gate of St. Romanus; at the principal door of the cathedral of St. Sophia he alighted from his horse, entered the dome, and gazed in wonder at the splendour of his prize. By his command the metropolis of the Eastern Church was transferred into a mosque; the crosses were thrown down; and the walls, covered with images, were washed and purified and restored to a condition very different from that which drew from Justinian, the founder of St. Sophia, nine centuries before, the unchristian boast, "I have outdone thee, O Solomon!" From St. Sophia the sultan proceeded to the desolate palace of an hundred successors of Constantine the Great. A melancholy reflection

7 Phranza, b. iii., c. 8.

8 This was one of the great sins of the Greek and Roman Churches, viz., "image worship," for which both have been in some measure punished, and of which neither have repented in accordance with the prophecy, which foretold that "the rest of the men yet repented not of the works of their hands, the idols of silver, and gold, and brass, and stone, and wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk" (Rev. ix. 20).
on the vicissitudes of human greatness forced itself on the mind of the conqueror; and he is said to have repeated, like Scipio at the sack of Carthage quoting Homer's prophecy, an elegant distich of Persian poetry—

"The spider has wove his web in the imperial palace;
And the owl has sung her watch-song on the towers of Afrasiab."

"Thus fell," says the historian Von Hammer, "the city of seven names, seven hills, and seven towers, taken from the seventh of the Palæologi by the seventh sultan of the Ottomans."

It must not be supposed that the severity of the Turkish woe ended with the fall of Constantinople in 1453, or with the death of Mohammed II., 28 years later, when the progress of the Mohammedan armies was such that after the siege and sack of Otranto by the Turks in 1481, the general consternation was so great in Italy, that Pope Sixtus IV. was preparing to fly beyond the Alps, when the storm was instantly dispelled by the death of the sultan in the summer of that year. The historian remarks concerning him that—

"His lofty genius aspired to the conquest of Italy, and the same reign might have been decorated with the trophies of the new and ancient Rome."  

But it was ordered otherwise, and the third, or infidel woe, which eventually fell upon Rome, was delayed for nearly two and a half centuries after the fall of Constantinople.

The language of prophecy speaks of the "drying up of the great river Euphrates," which almost all commentators refer to the cessation of the Turkish woe; and the gradually decay of the Ottoman empire, which was sufficiently evident to statesmen about 60 years ago as to make Lamertine exclaim, in the French chamber, "Turkey is drying up for want of Turks," seems to have set in strongly at the commencement of the Greek revolution, A.D. 1820. Tillinghast, a distinguished

---

9 The seven names are as follows:—1. Byzantium; 2. Antonina; 3. Roma Nova; 4. Constantinople; 5. Farruch, an Arabic word, signifying "the earth divider;" 6. Istamboul, or "the fulness of faith;" and 7. Ummeddünja, or "the mother of the world."  
1 Decline and Fall, ch. 68.
commentator, who wrote two centuries ago, thus expounds the Apocalyptic symbol of the drying up of the Euphrates:—

"By the river Euphrates," he says, "we are to understand the Ottoman, or Turkish empire. It is called the great river, because of the multitude of people and nations therein. The people who at this present time are of all others accounted the greatest, are the Turks, who, therefore, and no other, are here to be understood; especially as the Euphrates in the Apocalypse ix., by general consent of expositors, has reference to the Turkish power." 2

It is sickening to read of the innumerable cruelties which the Christian subjects of the Porte have had to suffer for centuries at the hands of the merciless Turk. One or two specimens will suffice to show how consistently the Ottoman race have kept up their character for inhumanity and cruelty to the last. M. Tricoupi, in his History of the Greek Revolution, relates the following respecting the sufferings of the Christians in Cyprus:—

"On the outbreak of the Greek revolution in 1821, permission was granted by the Porte to the Governor of Cyprus to kill all the Christians whom he considered worthy of death; and to strengthen his position, the Pasha of Acre was ordered to despatch troops to the island. 'After the troops had arrived, the governor invited the bishops and leading Christians to Nicosia, on the pretence that, in view of the insurrection of their co-religionists of Greece, it was necessary that they should make a declaration of loyalty. Having thus enticed the bishops and principal Christians of the island to Nicosia, he threw off the mask. Without the slightest provocation, on the 9th of July,

2 Quoted by the late Edward Bickersteth, in his Divine Warning, p 13. It is a curious fact, that at the time (the era of the English Commonwealth) when Tillinghast was describing the Turks "the greatest people of all others," a Turkish historian was returning the compliment respecting the proverbial truthfulness of the English. After describing Cromwell as "the mightiest of the kings of the Franks," on the occasion of his ambassador having been insulted and looked up in a stable on account of his firmness, the Turkish historian observes: "These cursed ambassadors, especially the English, are very stiff-necked; as the English in their business will not depart from their word, though it cost them their head, so this coarse rudeness is a necessity of their nature."
1821, he hung the Archbishop on a tree in front of the palace gate, and beheaded the three bishops, leaving their bodies exposed during several days." Similar scenes were witnessed at the capital at the same time. On Easter-day, the chief of the Greek festivals, Gregory, Patriarch of Constantinople, was executed at the door of his own Church; and as the greatest possible indignity which could be offered to it in the eyes of his countrymen, his body was delivered to Jews to be dragged through the streets; while other ecclesiastics of high rank were similarly treated, as well as Greeks of every class.

Half a century later the massacre perpetrated by Turkish soldiery at Batak, a flourishing town of Bulgaria, in May, 1876, displayed the ferocity with which the Moslem has ever treated the helpless Christian subjects of the Porte during its misrule of centuries.

Of all the mad and foolish things the Turks ever did, leaving the bodies rotting for months unburied to tell their own terrible tale is probably the maddest and most foolish. But Batak was in an out-of-the-way place, and they never suspected that Europe would become acquainted, through the commendable efforts of a brave correspondent of the Daily News, with the bloody facts which so horrified all England and the civilized world at their exposure, so they cynically said, "These Christians are not even worth burial; let the dogs eat them;" and though Mr. Disraeli, then Prime Minister, endeavoured to make light of it in the House of Commons, by declaring that the atrocities perpetrated on the Bulgarians by the Turks was nothing more than "mere coffee-house babble"—a very different view, however, of these Turkish misdeeds was taken by the more noble-minded Earl of Shaftesbury, when that eminent Christian philanthropist publicly declared at a meeting held in London, July 27, 1876, to express sympathy with the victims of Turkish cruelty—

"I confess, looking at the present state of things, I believe the future will be much more terrible than the present, and I am deeply convinced

---

*Out of a population which Batak previously possessed, amounting to upwards of 8000, only 1200 were left to bear mournful testimony to the horrors of Turkish rule.
that the Turkish government is beyond remedy and utterly incorrigible, and not in accord with the views of humanity. Looking to the interest of the commonwealth of mankind, I, for one, would rather see the Russians on the Bosphorus than the Turks in Europe."

In the same strain spoke that eminent statesman Edmund Burke a century ago, when some were for plunging England into a war with Russia on behalf of Turkey.

"Are we," he exclaimed, "to plunge ourselves into war for the disputed possession of a distant territory oppressed with the yoke of savages? Are we to lavish the lives of Englishmen in order that Christian nations should be brought back to the dominion of infidels, whose expulsion from Europe would be a blessing, as their empire is now a scourge to those quarters?"

Never were truer words spoken by any eminent English statesman; but the time had not then arrived in the over-ruling of Providence for the Turkish woe to cease.

Perhaps the strongest testimony against the brutalities which the merciless Turk has perpetrated upon the Christian subjects of the Porte is to be found in a letter which the Archbishop of Canterbury received from the Metropolitan of Servia five years ago, signed by the highest ecclesiastical dignitaries as representatives of the Christians of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and addressed to the people of England. The letter is dated June 14, 1876, and the following extracts will convey a true and terrible idea of the Turkish woe:

"It would only disgust you to be made acquainted with all the outrages which the Turks commit upon our persons. You would refuse to believe all the crimes of these savage hordes; but the Servian has had to bear the brunt of them for nearly five hundred years. What would you English do if your families were all attacked, if you had to keep guard night and day over wife and daughters, lest the Turk, impelled by the savage instinct which characterizes him, should seize upon them for the satisfaction of his vile passions? What, if for a whim, he forced you to eat the flesh of your own child, the sole consolation which God had seen fit to leave you in this life of suffering and bitterness? To eat the flesh of one's own child! To see it slowly roasting over a fire! Horror! It is with this barbarous game, which makes one's hair to stand on end, that the Turks from time to time amuse themselves. You are fathers; you can at least understand the full atrocity of these ferocious deeds, to bear which the Servian has been condemned for centuries past, and which civilized Europe, alas! tolerates and allows!"
"But this is not all. After having ravished your daughter or your wife, after having forced you to taste the flesh of your child, the Turk will amuse himself with slashing your arms and your legs, flaying you alive; and will finish by impaling you, so that you may breathe your last sigh in agony, such as only the Servian knows, and from which you in Europe are happily secure. The Servian mother shudders in her dreams for fear that she may never be permitted to bear her offspring as other mothers, knowing how the Turk, with a ferocious complacency, has forced the infant to the birth, in order to carry it about with triumph at the point of the sword with which he had already murdered the mother. You cannot, for their disgust, believe these savageries, can you? For all that, they go on daily throughout the breadth of the Ottoman empire. Ask your consuls; they would not hide the truth from you. Such is the life to which the Christians of Turkey are condemned. You English would not put up with it for an hour; but the Servian must bear it, because they are denied that which is dearest to man—they are refused liberty.

(Signed) "N. Douthith, Archimandrite de l’Herzégovine, &c., &c."

Such has been the normal treatment which the Christian subjects of the Porte have received at the hands of the savage Turks during more than four centuries of the most cruel and atrocious misgovernment which one race has ever inflicted upon another for so long a period since the world began. And why has this horrible treatment been permitted by the Almighty ruler of the world to be so long endured? We fear the only answer that can be given to this natural question is to be found in the language of the Apocalyptic prophecy, by which we learn that those who appear to be subjects of the second, or Turkish woe, and possibly of the third woe likewise, as we shall presently consider—

"Repented not of the works of their hands, that they should not worship the dead (πα τα αυτον), and idols of gold, and silver, and brass, and stone, and of wood, which neither can see, nor hear, nor walk."

Both the Authorized and the Revised Version render the Greek πα τα αυτον by the term “devils,” though the latter in its notes very properly renders the term “demons,” or daimons. We have already discussed the proper meaning of this term as used in Holy Scripture (see p. 125); so we need now only give one more passage in order to show how the term was understood by

4 Rev. ix. 20.
the early Christians. Clement of Alexandria, the most distinguished of the early Greek fathers, when writing in the second century in condemnation of the heathen for their worship of demons, says—

"The whole of Scripture is full of instances of God hearing and granting every request according to the prayers of the just. The heathen think it matters nothing whether we speak of these as gods or as angels, calling the spirits of such demons, and teaching that they should be worshipped by men."

Besides the worship of the dead, i.e., saint worship, as practised for so many centuries by both the Greek and the Roman Churches, there is also a distinct prohibition against making those "idols of gold, and silver, and wood, and stone, which may be all included under the term of that worship of pictures and images so common to Christendom, both in the East and the West. How contrary such doctrines were both to Scripture and to the practice of the early Christians we have ample testimony to prove. The following, however, will suffice as an instance of the way in which the Eastern Churches began gradually to drift into this heresy, in which they have been so fatally followed by the Church of Rome. When Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in the fourth century, was travelling in Palestine, he came to a village called Anablatha, and records what he saw there:—

"I found," he says, "a veil hanging before the doors of the church, on which was painted the image of Christ, or some saint, for I do not remember exactly which it was; but seeing the image of a man hanging in the church, against the authority of Scripture, I tore it to pieces, and advised the churchwardens to make a winding sheet of it, and to bury some poor man with it."

Two centuries later, we have a remarkable historical statement of the way in which the ancient British Church rejected the attempt of the monk Augustine and his co-emissaries from Rome, then fast lapsing into the predicted apostasy, to introduce the worship of pictures and images into this country, as an

---

*Clem. Alex., Stromata, v. § 1.
ancient MS. now in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, relates that—

"The Brytaynswould not after that, nether eate nor drinke with them, nor yet salute them, bycause they corrupted with superstitions, ymages, and ydolatrie the true religion of Christ."

It is worthy of note to observe the careful statements respecting the three woes, destined to fall on nominal and unrepenting Christendom. "One woe is past; and behold there come two woes more hereafter." The Saracenic woe passed away entirely at its destined time. Of the two remaining woes no time is marked for their termination; because the sufferers under these woes are said not to have "repented" of their evil deeds. And as we have already seen that the second, or Turkish woe, has proved such a terrible curse to the Churches of the East, even down to our day, just so has the third, or French Infidel woe, fallen with terrific swiftness and severity upon the Church of Rome in the West.

And as the first and second woes were ushered in by the sounding of the fifth and sixth angels, so the third appears to follow the sounding of the seventh angel, as it is written:—

"In the days of the seventh angel, when he shall begin to sound, the mystery of God should be finished. And the seventh angel poured out his vial into the air; and there was a great earthquake and Babylon the Great came into remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath." "The second woe is passed; and behold the third woe cometh quickly."

Let us now see how this has been accomplished historically. So far as the Turks were a woe to Christendom, apart from their oppressed Christian subjects, this may be said to have ceased after the great war which Turkey waged against Austria and Russia united, a war signalized by a series of victories on the part of the allied armies, and which terminated in 1790. The French Revolution followed immediately after. The King of France was beheaded in 1793, and the reign of terror set up.

This great convulsion in the political world, which produced a still greater woe upon Western Christendom than the Turkish
woe did upon the Eastern Churches, appears to have been anti-
cipated by two different classes of men in an exactly opposite
sense. The one class were a sect of infidel philosophers in France,
headed by Voltaire, who, as early as 1764, wrote thus of the
coming earthquake, in a letter to his friend M. de Chauvelier:—

"Everything is preparing the way for a great revolution. It will un-
doubtedly take place, though I shall not be so fortunate as to see it. The
French arrive at every thing slowly, but surely. Light has been for some
time gradually diffusing itself; and on the first opportunity the nation will
break out, and the uproar will be glorious. Happy those who are young,
for they will behold most extraordinary things."

Within less than thirty years from the date of this commu-
nication of the arch-priest of infidelity, his anticipations were
verified to the letter; though whether the French Revolution
was productive of more happiness than woe to Western Christen-
dom, let the following statistics respecting the loss of life on
the first outbreak declare.

The extent to which blood was shed during the first three
years of the French Revolution will hardly be credited by future
generations. Yet the Republican Prudhomme, the friend of
Danton, and the justifier of the massacres in the prisons of Paris,
Sept. 2nd, 1792, whose prepossessions led him to anything
rather than exaggeration of the horrors of the French Revolu-
tion has given the appalling number of 1,027,106, as the victims
who suffered during that short period from the Infidel woe.1

With truer prescience than Voltaire did the Christian philo-
sopher anticipate an outbreak—only not one of freedom and
happiness, but of wrath and judgment, as he contemplated the
iniquity and infidelity which abounded in professing Christen-
dom. As one of our own poets wrote—

"He heard the wheels of an avenging God
Groan heavily along the distant road."

The celebrated Edmund Burke, when foreseeing the destruc-
tion of the French monarchy and the overthrow of everything
connected with religion, wrote in the year 1790—

1 See Alison's History of Europe, oh. xv., § 86.
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"Already in many parts of Europe there is a hollow murmuring under ground; a confused murmuring is felt, that threatens a general earthquake in the political world." ²

And the historian, describing the abolition of the whole system of the long-established laws and customs of the French nation, decreed by the national legislature in a single night, on the memorable August 4th, 1789, uses the same Apocalyptic language in recording the Infidel woe:

"Nothing could be regarded as stable in society after such a shock...... The minds of men were shaken as by the yawning of the ground during the fury of an earthquake." ³

So a writer in Blackwood's Magazine, for 1839, says—

"The abuses of the old French government were such, that they could scarcely have been shaken to the ground by any thing short of the tremendous moral and political earthquake by which that country was visited.

"There was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake, and so great," ⁴ is the language in which the divine seer was inspired to predict to those who would hear the announcement of God's wrath, as manifested in the Infidel woe. Hence, the philosophic Sir James Mackintosh speaks of the reign of terror as—

"The only series of crimes, perhaps, in history, which, in spite of the common disposition to exaggerate extraordinary facts, has been beyond measure underrated in public opinion;" this Infidel woe being defined by him as "the most indefatigable, searching, multiform, and omnipresent tyranny that ever existed, which pervaded every class of society, which had ministers and victims in every village of France." ⁵

Contemporaneously with "the great earthquake," predicted in the Apocalypse, "Babylon the Great" is mentioned as "coming in remembrance before God, to give unto her the cup of wine of the fierceness of His wrath." Even before the outburst of the French Revolution, there are signs of the coming judgment upon the apostate Church of Rome. As early as the year 1737, the Venetian envoy wrote as follows:—

"There is something unnatural in the sight of all the Catholic governments, united in a body, in hostility to the Roman court... The kings of

⁴ Rev. xvi. 18. ⁵ Mackintosh's Works, vol. iii., p. 263.
Europe are making rapid progress in stripping the Roman See of all its temporal rights and privileges."

Half a century later this stripping of the Church of Rome was further carried on by the Emperor Joseph II. of Austria, in 1787, when he suppressed no less than 1300 out of the 2000 religious houses, which had gradually grown up in that priest-ridden country. But it was reserved for the Infidel woe of the French Revolution to administer a far heavier measure of God's wrath upon the Church of Rome. In consequence of the victories of Buonaparte in Italy in the campaign of 1797, Rome itself being laid open to his arms, and the French government having determined on the overthrow of the temporal power of the Papacy, it was only suspended for a time by the complete submission of the Pope and the treaty of Tolentino, in which the Papal government agreed to give up the legations of Ferrara, Bologna, and Romagna, together with the city of Ancona, the payment of a sum of one-and-a-half million sterling—a sum multiplied threefold by exactions and oppression—the surrender of military stores, and of a hundred of the finest statues and paintings in the Vatican. And so reduced was Rome by the rapacity of the French, that Cacult, the ambassador of the French Republic, wrote to Napoleon—

"The payments stipulated by the treaty of Tolentino, at the close of so many previous losses, has totally exhausted this old carcass. We are making it expire by a slow fire; it will soon crumble to the dust."

This is exactly in accordance with the figurative language of the Apocalypse as regards those who once sided with Babylon the Great, when they turn against her, who are described as "hating the harlot, and making her desolate, and eating her flesh, and burning her with fire." 

The treaty of Tolentino only delayed the fall of the temporal power of the Papacy for a short time, as in the year following, on pretence of an insult to the French ambassador in Rome, which had been purposely arranged beforehand, a French army, under Berthier, took possession of the seven-hilled city, and, amidst the shouts of the populace, the Pope's temporal reign

---

6 Ranke, vol. iii., p. 192.  
7 Rev. xvii. 16.
was declared at an end, and a Roman Republic, in complete fraternization with the French, set up in its stead. Then, in the Sistine Chapel of the Vatican, the ante-hall, which has a fresco, painted by order of Pope Gregory XIII., commemorative of the massacre of thousands of French Protestants in Paris on St. Bartholomew's Day, 1572 (the scene a just memento of God's retributive justice for unexampled wickedness and cruelty), there, while seated on his throne, and receiving the idolatrous adulation of his cardinals, he was arrested by the French soldiers; the ring of his marriage with the Roman Church was torn from his finger, his palaces of the Vatican and the Quirinal (which seventy-two years later, singular to say, were occupied by Pope Pius IX., as a prisoner in the one, and the King of Italy, as the joyfully-accepted ruler of a free and united people, in the other) rifled, and himself carried off a prisoner, and, after a brief detention in Tuscany, forced to traverse, often during the night, the Apennines and the Alps, in a rigorous season, until at length he reached Valence, in France, where after an illness of ten days, the poor aged prisoner, suffering like Louis XVI. for the crimes of his predecessors, expired, in the eighty-second year of his age, and the twenty-second of his pontificate. Mr. Elliott remarks on this event as follows:—

"The (fifth) vial had thus touched the throne of the Beast, just in Apocalyptic order, after the first and earlier sprinkling of each of the four preceding vials; and the confiscation of all territorial possessions of the Church and monasteries, and the pillage of the Pope's library, museum, furniture, jewels, and even sacerdotal robes, told before the world of its out-pouring."  

Without attempting in any way to dogmatize, I think it may be safely said that there is sufficient historical evidence to warrant the conclusion, that inasmuch as the first and second of the Apocalyptic woes pointed to the Saracen and Turkish judgments upon churches and peoples in Eastern Christendom, so the third woe, which is described in the sixteenth chapter of Revelation, under the symbol of "vials" poured out "upon the seat of the beast," is to be explained by the beginning of

---

8 *Her. Apoc.* iii., p. 401.
certain judgments on the Church of Rome, through the instrumentality of the infidel spirit of the great French Revolution, that tremendous outbreak of social and moral evil, of democratic fury and atheism, which characterized it at every turn—the ultimate source of which was the long and deep-seated corruption and irreligion of the nation; and whose results were the dissolution of society, morals, and religion, with acts of cruelty, horror, and atrocity, scarce paralleled in the history of the world—that which from France, as a centre, spread "like a noisome and grievous sore," or plague, to the other countries of Papal Christendom; and proved, wherever its poison was imbibed, to be as much the punishment as the symptom of the corruption within.
CHAPTER XI.

THE GROWTH OF CHRISTENDOM.

When the Pharisees and Sadducees desired that Christ would shew them a sign from heaven, He replied in these words— "O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky; but can ye not discern the signs of the times?" And although the last words, which our Lord addressed to the disciples, previous to His ascension to glory, were as follows— "It is not for you to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power,"— as He had before told them to "Watch, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of Man cometh;"— and St. Paul was inspired to warn the Thessalonian believers not to trouble themselves about the time— "For yourselves know perfectly that the Day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night"— nevertheless, there have ever been speculative Christians in the past, as there are in the present day, who seem absorbed with the idea that they have certainly discovered "the time of the end."

Towards the close of the eighth century, when 6000 years from the creation of Adam were supposed to have expired according to the chronology of the LXX. nine men began to speculate about "the time of the end;" just as they again did A.D. 1000; though the absence of any particular event seemed to prove both equally in error. It was a common tradition among the ancient Jews, called the tradition of the house of Elias, that the

---

9 The chronology of the LXX. gives the date for the creation of Adam, B.C. 5410. The Hebrew or Biblical chronology dates the same, according to Usher, B.C. 4004; and according to Clinton's Fasti Hellenici, B.C. 4134. Probably a mean between these two dates has the best evidence in its favour.
world would last 6000 years from the creation of Adam, which they thus compute—"2000 years empty (i.e., little being recorded of those first ages), 2000 years under the law, and 2000 years for the days of the Messiah." And so the writer of the Epistle of St. Barnabas expresses the tradition of the early Christians—"God made in six days all His works, and finished on the seventh day. The meaning of which is, \textit{that in 6000 years He will bring all things to an end. Therefore, in six days, i.e., 6000 years, all things shall be accomplished.}"

In the 13th century, similar predictions concerning the time of the end were much in vogue with the higher orders in England. According to the \textit{Annals of Waverly}, Henry III. and his court sat up all the night of Sept. 17, 1249, in expectation of the second advent of Christ. The same kind of speculation to determine the end of the age is going on at the present time, resting on a supposed prediction of an old woman named "Mother Shipton," who lived in Yorkshire three centuries ago. During the last 20 years the following distich has been floating about amongst our prophetic speculators of the present day:

\begin{quote}
"Chariots without horses shall go,
And accidents fill the world with woe—
Around the world thoughts shall fly
In the twinkling of an eye;
The world to an end will come
\textit{In eighteen hundred and eighty one!}"
\end{quote}

The above lines are in reality an ingenious hoax of Mr. Charles Hindley of Brighton, as may be seen in \textit{Notes and Queries}, where he confesses the same, says the editor, "having in a letter to us made a clean breast of having fabricated this prophecy in his reprint of a chap-book version, published in 1862."

Two very voluminous writers of the present day appear to be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Talmud, Tract. Sandhedr., cap. Halec.}
\item \textit{Epistle of Barnabas, § 15.} \ For an account of Barnabas' writings, see \textit{Archbishop Wake's Preliminary Discourse, &c., § 18;} and \textit{Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History, part ii., c. i.}
\item \textit{Notes and Queries, vol. xi., p. 353; 4th series.}
\end{itemize}
speculating in the same direction. A writer, who has assumed the name of "Philo-Israel," writes in *Life from the Dead* (a publication of Mr. E. Hine, the founder of the "Anglo-Israel" theory), that—

"In the year 1881, the next of our country's jubilees will occur, and the point for Christians to ponder is whether 1881 may not be the year in which will take place the Public manifestation of the sons of God. (Hos. i. 10; Rom. viii. 19.)" 4

The same writer, however, in another work, alters his date for the time of the end as follows:—

"The dispensation of grace in which we are now living will come to an abrupt and sudden close in May, 1882." 5

While, in the *Banner of Israel*, of which he is editor, he adopts a third speculation by writing—

"The true length of the grand gallery of the Great Pyramid, so wonderfully important now, as touching the approaching end of the age... fixes the epoch as not later than August 6th, 1882, for the terrible events we anticipate." 6

Moreover, he considers this calculation to be of such importance, that in a leaflet published by him, dated "Bristol, March, 1879," he thus explains the reasons for assuming that the age must take place in 1882:—

"The length of the grand gallery in the Great Pyramid, symbolizing the duration of the Christian dispensation, is exactly 1881-6 pyramid inches. Reckoning inches for years, we have the end of this dispensation indicated as destined to occur about July or August, 1882. The impending south wall of the grand gallery shows the suddenness of the Lord's coming, 'even as a thief in the night.'...The return of Israel with Judah to her land we believe will take place about the time of the Lord's return, to gather up some of His saints 'in the air.' Hosea gives us materials for calculating this date. The ten tribes were dead and buried B.C. 678. After two millennial days, each of one thousand years, Israel was revived in 'the isles of the West.' This brings us to A.D. 1322, about the era of Edward I. (who died 1307), by whom our British laws were founded, the fabric on which the British empire rests to-day. In 'the third day' of a thousand years, the very time wherein our

4 *Life from the Dead*, vol. ii., p. 242.
5 *Digest of Great Pyramid Teaching*, p 17.
6 *Banner of Israel*, April 7th, 1880.
own lot is cast, A.D. 1879 to 1882, 'the dead is alive again,' the 'lost' is found; the British nation is 'rising up,' asserting its Israelite origin, and 'we' British Israelites 'shall live in His sight.' Other calculations derived from the measurements of the Great Pyramid point also to A.D. 1882, as the close of the 6000 years of the world's history, and the beginning of the seventh thousand, or millennial reign of our Lord upon earth—only three and a half years (now only seven months) hence! . . . Let me ask you to dwell on the marvellous favour shown to us British, being Israel, in that we are thus enabled to calculate the date of our Lord's return!"

It is not necessary to refute this wild and fanciful speculation, which appears to be put forth in forgetfulness of our Lord's prohibition against His disciples endeavouring to calculate "the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power;" and the present Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol spoke the voice of Christendom, when he wrote to one of his clergy, that "no professed scholar or ethnologist entertained the Anglo-Israel theory even for a single moment."

The origin of these unlawful attempts to "calculate the date of our Lord's return," or the end of the present Christian dispensation, commonly termed the "end of the world," may be traced by an Italian writer of the 14th century, one Leonardo Aretino, the Pope's secretary, who says in his work—The world's Destruction, which he predicted would occur in the last fortnight of November, 1881, declaring that on November 21st "all human beings would be stricken dumb;" and on Sunday, the 27th, "the demise of the whole human race would take place;" and by the 30th, "heaven and earth would be consumed by fire, and the general resurrection would be an accomplished fact!"

But as none of these Papal speculations about the end of the world came true in November, 1881, so we may conclude that the equally rash Protestant speculation about the time of our Lord's return, happening either in August, or any other month in this year of grace, 1882, because the gallery in the interior of the Great Pyramid of Gizeh is a fraction over 1881 inches in length, is equally futile and vain.

Other speculators in the regions of prophecy have adopted a different line of argument, and have come to a different conclusion

7 This was written in March, 1882.
The Christian Herald, the chief advocate, I believe, of the Futurist school in the present day, takes an entirely different view respecting the prospects of the British empire from that of the Anglo-Israelites, and considers that the end of the age must be postponed from 1882 to 1890, for the following reasons. In its issue of August 4, 1880, it argues that—

"As 70 years marked the length of Israel's waiting time for the redemption from Babylon; and 70 weeks of years the time of its further waiting for its primary redemption by the first advent of Christ; so 70 jubilees may define the mystical period of Israel's whole existence as a people, from the exodus to the epoch of both the natural and the spiritual, Israel's perfect redemption at the second advent of Christ. Hence, these 3500 years of 70 jubilees (each jubilee being 50 years), commencing with the epoch of the exodus, B.C. 1610, will terminate A.D. 1890, because 1610 + 1890 = 3500."

The Christian Herald further teaches that two other supposed prophetic periods of 2520 and 2500 years alike terminate in A.D. 1890, when it contends—

"We may expect, at the personal descent of the King of Israel upon the Mount of Olives, the great jubilee-trumpet to be blown, all fetters to be broken, the Christian Church in the Jewish nation to enter upon their promised inheritance, and an era of universal freedom and happiness to be ushered in."

It is such wild speculations as these, which has done so much injury to what St. Peter terms the "sure word of prophecy"—by preventing men, otherwise well-disposed, to remember the blessing attached to the study of prophecy, as in Revelation i.3, from striving to "do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." Nevertheless, it behoves those who wish to be what Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, terms "faithful and orthodox in all things," not to neglect the serious study of that portion of the infallible word of life, which is able not only to "make men wise unto salvation," but also to "comfort" us with the knowledge that in God's own appointed time the Saviour will return to "make up His jewels," and to take His people to Himself; and that we are exhorted to "watch," to
"wait," to "hope for," to "look for," and to "love" the doctrine of His second coming, and in so doing we are said, according to the literal rendering of 2 Pet. iii. 12, to "hasten" the event itself.

Passing from the consideration of these unwise speculations respecting the time of the end, and "the date" of the Master's return, as being alike forbidden ground, and very unprofitable for the humble-minded believer, I propose to notice the following subjects as being the most prominent of the many signs of the times, which may profitably engage the attention of those who bear in mind the apostolic injunction alluded to above, respecting that "more sure word of prophecy (which) we have; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts." 9

1. The Condition of the Children of Israel at the present time, as contrasted with their sufferings during the past Twenty-six Centuries.

2. The Growth of Christendom, especially since the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century.

3. The Development of certain predicted "Spirits of Error," which Scripture foretold would appear in the world amid the perilous times of the last days."

1. We have discussed in chapter iii. the prolonged sufferings of the race of Israel in the past; it behoves us to now to call attention to their condition in the present day, as it seems to indicate that the term of their banishment from the land of their fathers, and their being scattered in all parts of the world, and made a proverb and a by-word, and a scorn and reproach by Christians and heathen alike, as well as having been the subject

8 The author having on one occasion asked a leader among these prophetic speculators, who had written much on the subject, and frequently varying his calculations for the time of the end according to the supposed theory about the Great Pyramid, "What he should do when August, 1882, arrived, without the stupendous event of the Christian dispensation having come to an end?" received the following satisfactory reply—"Then I shall give it up altogether."

9 2 Pet. i. 19.
of persecutions and sufferings in almost every corner of the globe, unequalled in duration and severity, is drawing to a close.

Viewing the subject in its political aspect, it may be said that the declaration of independence by the United States, and the great French Revolution were the first steps towards the altered condition of the Jew, as he now appears in the estimation of Christendom. It is worthy of remembrance to note the treatment which the once favoured children of Israel have received at the hands of the most enlightened Gentile nation on earth, before they were permitted to attain to that degree of rational freedom and immunity from persecution, which they at present enjoy under the ægis of the wide-spreading British oak. We have already seen what dreadful sufferings the Jews underwent in this country from kings, princes, and peoples alike, then under the ecclesiastical dominion of that cruel power, which is represented in Scripture as "drunken with the blood of the martyrs," until driven out of the country, A.D. 1290, during the reign of the "greatest of the Plantaganets," and not allowed to return until after an interval of 365 years. The wise policy of another of England's greatest rulers, the Protector Oliver Cromwell, gave them permission to resettle in England. Yet the spirit of bigotry and intolerance, which occasionally appears almost as strong among Puritan divines as it is among Popish priests, was so potent in the time of the Commonwealth, that when the Jews on the Continent presented a petition to the government to be allowed to return to England, permission was sternly refused by the commission of merchants and divines, to whom the Protector referred it for consideration. But the refusal was quietly set aside by the wisdom and clemency of Cromwell, and his

1 A modern historian has justly remarked that "no share in the enormities which accompanied the expulsion of the Jews can fall upon Edward I., for he not only suffered the fugitives to take their wealth with them, but punished with the halter those who plundered them at sea. But the expulsion was none the less a crime, and a crime for which punishment was quick to follow." (Green's History of the English People, ch. v., § 5.)
connivance in the settlement of a small body of Israelites, both in London and Oxford, was so well understood by the nation that no one ventured to interfere.

A century, however, elapsed before any legal recognition of the Jews was permitted in England. Persecuted in every other part of Christendom save in Holland, they had enjoyed a quiet toleration which no one had attempted to disturb. In the reign of Queen Anne, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, we meet with an historical incident, which proves how successfully the returned exiles had improved their opportunities during the half century which intervened between the times of Cromwell and Queen Anne. The Jews were enabled to offer the sum of half a million sterling, with the promise of doubling it if required, to Lord Godolphin, then at the head of the government, if they might purchase the town of Brentford, near London, with full privileges of trade, &c. Godolphin was strongly inclined to accept the offer, but was compelled at length to give it up, because “he foresaw that it would provoke two of the most powerful bodies in the nation—the clergy and the merchants”—the very same parties who had endeavoured to deter Cromwell from his work of justice and mercy. Who could have foreseen that about one and a half century after the reign of Anne, a true-blooded Israelite, in the person of Lord Beaconsfield, who to his credit had struggled from a clerk’s stool in an attorney’s office to be prime minister of England, when the occasion required it, borrowed many millions sterling from an English member of parliament, and the richest Jew in the world, in order to complete the purchase of the shares in the Suez Canal, for the benefit of the British nation!

Forty years after the death of Anne, Mr. Pelham, as prime minister, brought in a bill for permitting the naturalization of foreign Jews, which was easily passed in the Lords without any opposition, even from the bench of bishops, who in those days were far more enlightened and liberal than the inferior clergy. But when the bill reached the Commons, it encountered the most formidable opposition. Members noted for anything
but religion, or a knowledge of Scripture, began the fight, under the pretended banner of prophecy, proclaiming that to give the Jews a settlement anywhere would be an impious attempt to oppose the will of God, who had predicted the eternal dispersion, as they ignorantly asserted, of the accursed race. The prime minister replied, that he could not believe the Church of England would be in any danger from passing so moderate a measure of relief, as the naturalization of the few children of Israel who might desire to live in England. Such a fair argument prevailed, and the bill was carried by 95 to 55. Nevertheless, the storm was raised throughout the country to such a height, egged on, as an historian writes, by "the little curates and country clergy preaching against the bill, and making the common people believe that England would be made to partake in the curses pronounced by prophecy on Jerusalem and the Holy Land," that in the next session of parliament the government was forced to repeal this very act which granted so small a measure of justice to the outcast and persecuted Jew. And it required a struggle of a quarter of a century, from the time when Mr. Grant, in 1833, brought in a bill to relieve the Jews from all civil disabilities, before outcast Israel was permitted to share in all the blessings and privileges of British freedom. And now we see their altered condition in this country by the fact of many Jews elected to seats in parliament, and one, a distinguished wrangler at Cambridge, deservedly promoted to the judicial bench, which he so well adorns, as "Master of the Rolls."

It is a remarkable historical fact, as proving the great change which has come over Christendom in relation to the Jew, that so many of the house of Israel have attained to the high office of being chief ruler of the states and kingdoms to which they respectively belonged. Thus Mendizabel, prime minister of Spain half a century ago, Pio Nono in Rome, Louis Napoleon in France, Bismarck in Germany, Gortschikoff in Russia, and Benjamin Disraeli in England, tell the same tale of the altered condition of those who have been so long trodden under foot by the Christian oppressors of the Hebrew race.
The most remarkable change of all is seen in the altered position of the Jew in Turkey at the present time. A recent writer has pointed out the extent of this change as it is witnessed in that portion of the Turkish empire which once belonged to the seed of Abraham. Half a century ago, Jerusalem could not be entered save in eastern costume, the Jews were confined to their own unwholesome quarters, and it would have been death to attempt to live among the Turks. A Jew, however great his wealth or high his position, when walking through the bazaars of Jerusalem, was liable to the grossest insults, for which there could be no redress. A Turk, for example, would take off his shoe, throw it at the Israelite, and hailing him as a dog, bid him instantly fetch it, an indignity to which he was bound to submit. Now the change which has come over the rulers and their Jewish subjects is one of the most striking Signs of the Times which this age has witnessed.

The same writer observes that another of the prominent Signs of the Times connected with the land of Israel, is the recent settlement of a number of piously disposed colonies from Germany, who have come out from the fatherland to settle as colonists, principally at Jerusalem and Jaffa, and who have formed themselves into a community known as "The Society of the Temple." They believe that in thus coming they are fulfilling prophecy. God's future revealed purpose for Palestine is, according to their interpretation, that it should be colonized by Christians from out of all nations, who will finally build a temple at Jerusalem.²

Certainly it is no insignificant sign that in the year 1881 permission was given by the sultan (just as Cyrus, King of Persia, twenty-four centuries ago, gave the Jews leave to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem), to take steps with a similar object in view. The Daily Telegraph of October 15, 1881, contains the startling intelligence that Reuf Pasha, the Turkish Governor

of Jerusalem, has recently received imperative orders from Sultan Abdul Hamid to resume the work of restoring Solomon’s Temple, commenced under the reign of Abdul Aziz, but discontinued some five years ago. The governor has been ordered to clear the great square fronting the Temple of all the rubbish with which it is now encumbered. In this square stands the famous Mosque of Omar, which possessed an annual revenue of £15,000 sterling, derived from the contributions of the pilgrims and others. Hitherto the greatest portion of this sum has found its way to Constantinople, and been seized by the official harpies of the effete and decaying Turkish empire. The sultan has now determined that this voluntary tax, instead of being so recklessly squandered, shall be applied to defraying the expenses of the works alluded to above; and two officials, viz., Serid and Raif Effendim, have already been sent to Jerusalem, with instructions to take immediate measures for enforcing the imperial decree.

Whether this attempt to rebuild a temple at Jerusalem, to be occupied by non-Christian Israelites, is in accordance with the Divine mind, time alone will show. Scripture appears to mention only seven temples as recognized by Him, who ordereth all thing wisely and well, which may be specified in the following order:—

1. Moses’ Tabernacle, called “the Temple” (1 Sam. i. 9), which lasted nearly 600 years.
2. Solomon’s Temple (1 Kings iv. 1), which lasted 400 years, and was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar.
3. Zerubbabel’s Temple (Ezra vi. 1) about 500 years, and was profaned by Antiochus Epiphanus.
4. Herod’s Temple (John ii. 19), about 80 years, and was destroyed by the Romans.
5. The Temple of God (2 Thessalonians ii. 4), or professing Church of Christ, which has now lasted more than eighteen centuries, ever since the day of Pentecost, A.D. 29.
6. The Millennial Temple, mentioned in the closing chapters of Ezekiel.
7. The Heavenly Temple or Tabernacle (Revelation xxi. 24).
3—23), which will be eternal; "for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof."

In respect to the number seven, Jews, heathen, and Christians have alike regarded it in some mysterious manner. Philo and Josephus relate that the Essenes, one of the Jewish sects, held the number seven to be sacred, "because it results from the sides of a square added to those of a triangle." The Pythagoreans pronounced the triangle to be the emblem of wisdom, as it is considered of three parts: 1. Experience of the past; 2. Attention to the present; 3. Judgment of the future. Cicero calls the number seven "the knot and cement of all things, as being that by which the natural and spiritual world are comprehended in one idea." Victorinus, Bishop of Pettaw in the third century, tells us in his Commentary of the Apocalypse, "that in the whole world are seven churches, which are called one Catholic Church; and Paul wrote seven epistles to seven churches; subsequently writing to particular persons, in order that he might not exceed the measure of seven churches."

It is remarkable that there are seven different sorts of idolatry specified in Scripture, of which the Israelites were guilty previous to their captivity in Babylon, mentioned in the following way:

1. Exodus xxxii. 4, the Golden Calf at Sinai.
2. 1 Kings xviii. 18, Baalim.
3. 2 Kings xviii. 4, the Brazen Serpent.
4. Jeremiah xliv. 17, the Queen of Heaven.
5. Ezekiel viii. 5, 6, the Image of Jealousy, "Great Abomination."
6. Ezekiel viii. 13, 14, Tammuz, "Greater Abomination."
7. Ezekiel viii. 15, 16, the Sun, "the Greatest Abomination."

It is a sad reflection upon the idolatrous tendency of man's fallen nature, to find that the same species of sin, which was manifested by "the Church in the wilderness," so soon after the children of Israel were delivered from their Egyptian bondage, was so rapidly developed in the professing Christian Church, immediately after the appearance of the predicted

---

3 Cicero, Tuscul. Disp., i. 10.
"man of sin" at the beginning of the seventh century, the
different forms of which idolatry has been manifested, and may
be specified under the following heads:—

1. The consecrated wafer, the worship of which the Church
of England has faithfully described "as idolatry, to be abhorred
by all faithful Christians."

2. Mary, the mother of Jesus, whom "all generations call
blessed," is worshipped by Roman Catholics, like the heathen
worshipped Juno, as the Queen of Heaven.

3. Dead men, whom the Church of Rome has canonized as
saints.

4. Dead women, ditto, ditto.

5. The crucifix, containing the forbidden image of Him who
is in heaven, seated at the right hand of God the Father.

6. The Pope, the worship of whom at his coronation has been
fully detailed at p. 143.

7. The cross of the Papal Legate, to whom all Papists are
commanded to render the homage of Latria.

To return, however, to the consideration of the Jerusalem
Temple, whether this recent act of the Sultan of Turkey, the
chief of the Mohammedan power, which has now held possession
of Jerusalem, with the brief interval of the Crusades, since its
capture by the Saracens, A.D. 673, has any reference to the
Almighty's designs towards the once favoured race, propheti-
cally alluded to by David,—"Thou shalt arise, and have mercy
upon Zion; for the time to favour her, yea, the set time is
come," as I have already said, time alone can disclose. It may
be interesting to remember the previous instance of a heathen
sovereign of Jerusalem, the Emperor Julian, commonly known
as "the Apostate," fifteen centuries ago, having given a similar
permission, not because of any special fondness for the Jews,
but in order to show his contempt and hatred of the Christian
religion which he once professed; but his failure on the occasion
manifestly proved that the time had not yet come to show
favour to Zion. The emperor's vain attempt to rebuild a
Jewish temple on Mount Moriah, which might eclipse the
splendour of the Christian Church of the Resurrection on the
adjacent hill of Calvary, was speedily brought to naught, as Gibbon is constrained to admit, by “an earthquake, a whirlwind, and a fiery eruption, which overturned and scattered the new foundations of the Temple.” Though this historical fact is attested by contemporary writers, such as Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzea, the last of whom declares that “the preternatural event, which caused the suspension of the enterprise, was not disputed by infidels,” it is melancholy to observe the intense scepticism of the historian with regard to any statement made by Christian writers unless confirmed by a heathen, as Gibbon reflects on Gregory’s testimony by remarking that his assertion, “strange as it may seem, is confirmed by the unexceptionable testimony of Ammianus Marcellinus.”

A curious circumstance connected with the Emperor Julian’s unsuccessful attempt to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem is related by an ecclesiastical contemporary historian, which is worthy of being remembered. Philostorgus states that when “the workmen were clearing the foundation, a stone was taken up that covered the mouth of a cave, cut out in the rock, into which one of the workmen being let down by a long rope, found it full of water to the middle of the leg. Having carefully viewed the cave on every side, he found it to be four-square. This was the report he then made. On being let down a second time, he observed a pillar reaching a little above the water, whereon lay a book, wrapped up in clean and fine linen. Being drawn up, the linen was seen to be fresh and fair; and on the front of the book was found written in capital letters, to the great surprise of all, but especially of Jews and Gentiles, the following sentence—‘In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.’”

The truth of this story will be duly estimated by knowing that Philostorgus was born within five years after the event had occurred, and that he became an Arian. He certainly would not have brought forward such a remarkable testimony to the Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ, and such a contradiction of
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4 Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxiii.

the doctrine of Arius, unless it had been a well-known and well-attested fact.

Whatever be the result of this present move on the part of the Sultan of Turkey to rebuild, or to permit any of his subjects to rebuild, a temple in Jerusalem, which was once the scene of Solomon's glory, our Saviour's sufferings, and the punishment, disgrace, and shame of the seed of Abraham, the friend of God and father of the faithful, it is undeniable that a marvellous alteration in the condition of the Jewish race, and in the feelings entertained towards them by Christendom at large, has taken place at this present time, as contrasted with the treatment they have received for so many ages.

Regarding this altered condition of the children of Israel as a very important sign of the times in the present day, we may pass on to consider as another such sign—

The growth of Christendom, especially since the Reformation of the 16th century.

The growth of Christendom may be regarded, so far as numbers are a factor in the case, as the fulfilment of the parable, in which our Saviour likens the kingdom of heaven to a "grain of mustard seed, which is the least of all seeds; but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof." We learn from Scripture that previous to our Lord's ascension, "He was seen of 500 brethren at once," which may be intended to represent the whole Church of Christ as the result of our Master's teaching, and that of His apostles, before the Holy Ghost was given. On the day of Pentecost, when that promised event had taken place, the result of one sermon, preached by a converted Jew, Simon Peter, on the occasion, was to "add about three thousand souls" to the infant Church of Christ.

Since that period the growth of Christendom has been in the following ratio. During the days of the apostles, in the first century of the Christian era, the Gospel was promulgated as far as Scythia in the North, to India in the East, to
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6 Matt. xiii. 31, 32.  
7 1 Cor. xv. 6,  
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Ethiopia in the South, and to Britain in the West. The following statistical account has been drawn up by Dr. Dorchester of Boston, after many years spent in carefully investigating the growth and present status of the Christian populations of the world, by which will be seen the march of Christendom during the past centuries.

The number of Christians was supposed to have reached—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Number of Christians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>30,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>50,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1300</td>
<td>75,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1400</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>100,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1600</td>
<td>125,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>155,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>200,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>440,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of population under Christian governments—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Number of population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>155,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>388,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>685,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus nearly half the population of the globe, which Dr. Dorchester reckons at 1,440,000,000, are now living under Christian governments.

Another estimate of Dr. Dorchester may be regarded with interest by all faithful Protestants, whose religion has been so well summed up in the saying of the illustrious Chillingworth—"The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants," which accords with the command of the Saviour to "search the Scriptures"⁹—with the commendation bestowed on the "more noble Bereans," because they tested the preaching of Paul and Silas by the Scriptures,¹—and with the apostolic declaration

⁹ John v. 39. ¹ Acts xvii. 11.
that "the holy Scriptures are able to make (men) wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 2 As also with the authorized teaching of the Church of England, which declares that—

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." 3

Dr. Dorchester estimates the growth of the Protestant Churches, who make the Holy Scripture their sole rule of faith, as did the primitive Christians, in the following order. Assuming that at the beginning of the 16th century there was not a single Protestant in existence, according to the boast of the Papacy at the fifth council of the Lateran (A.D. 1512—1517), that "all resistance to the Papal religion was extinct, and that the whole body of Christendom was subject to the Pope," thus quietly ignoring the millions of the Greek Church, which had never been in subjection to the mystical "man of sin," Dr. Dorchester estimates the growth of Protestantism in the following ratio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.D.</th>
<th>Protestants</th>
<th>Greek Churches</th>
<th>The Papacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500</td>
<td>With those under Christian governments</td>
<td>20,000,000</td>
<td>80,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700</td>
<td>32,000,000</td>
<td>33,000,000</td>
<td>90,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>194,000,000</td>
<td>60,000,000</td>
<td>134,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>408,000,000</td>
<td>96,000,000</td>
<td>181,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the gain of those living under Protestant governments over those living under Roman and Greek rule in 1876 was 131,000,000, or above 47 per cent. Of those speaking the English tongue in the same year, the total is set down at 95,000,000 in England, America and the Colonies, thus divided—Protestants 70,000,000, Roman Catholics 15,000,000. Those who profess to be without any religion 10,000,000.

Another estimate of Dr. Dorchester will be read with great interest by those who make the Holy Scriptures their sole rule of faith. When the Authorized Version was published in the

2 Tim. iii. 15. Article vi.
reign of King James I., A.D. 1611, it went forth to a population of only 5,000,000 capable of understanding the English tongue, and but few of those were capable of reading those Scriptures, "which are able to make men wise unto salvation," we need not say. In the year (1881) of the publication of the Revised Version, it went forth to an English speaking population of 100,000,000, every one of whom may be able in his childhood to read the wonderful works of God—"every man in our own tongue wherein we were born." 4

Benjamin Franklin is said to have remarked that there are times when an artist can scarcely distinguish between a rising and a setting sun. Dr. Dorchester is quite justified in pronouncing with confidence that Christianity, notwithstanding the abounding infidelity in our own time, is a rising sun. About a century ago it was a frequent boast of the atheists of the day that in two generations Christianity would be blotted out. Two generations have passed, and the Gospel is making a deeper inroad on heathenism, both at home and abroad, than in any previous age since the days of the apostles, notwithstanding all the efforts of infidels to counteract the work.

The present century has seen the healthiest sign of the times in the increased efforts of the Christian Church to make known the glad tidings of the Gospel in all parts of the world, and more especially to the teeming masses in India, which now forms so large a portion of the British empire. And it is satisfactory to know that there are upwards of 36 Protestant missionary societies who are engaged in the holy rivalry of seeing how they can most promote the glory of God and the good of man, by declaring the unsearchable riches of Christ to our heathen fellow-subjects of Hindostan.

The testimony of the late Lord Lawrence—one of the greatest viceroy's that ever ruled our Indian empire, whose judicious conduct during the Sepoy rebellion elicited from the Times the just remark at the time of his death, that "we owe it in great part to Lord Lawrence that we have an Indian empire to concern ourselves with."—respecting the success of Protestant

4 Acts iv. 8.
missions in India, is most valuable. At a public meeting held
in 1870 he expressed his opinion respecting missionary work
there in these memorable words:

"I believe, notwithstanding all that the English people have done to
benefit that country, that the missionaries have done more than all the other
agencies combined. They have arduous and uphill work, often receiving no
encouragement and sometimes a great deal of discouragement, from their
own countrymen, and have to bear the taunts and obloquy of those who
despised and disliked their preaching; but I have no doubt whatever that
in spite of the great masses of the people being intensely opposed to their
doctrine, they are, as a body, remarkably popular in the country. I have a
great reverence and regard for them, both personally and for the sake of the
great cause for which they are engaged; and I feel it to be a pleasure and a
privilege to do anything I can in the last years of my life to further the
great work for which they have done so much."

The testimony of one of the leading papers, The Friend of
India, by no means fanatically disposed towards Christian
missions, may afford a suitable confirmation to that of Lord
Lawrence, with reference to the progress of the Gospel in
Hindostan. On the eve of the great mutiny of 1857, it
admitted the slow but sure progress of the Gospel as seen in
the decay of Hinduism, and the probability of its being in
time supplanted by genuine Christianity—

"There is now more wisdom shown in the selection of men for the purpose
of preaching the Gospel of Christ. Special missions are about to be organized
in the half-educated class which calls itself, and perhaps is, the hope of
Bengal.... But the greatest hope of all remains in this: our schools and
colleges, among the thousands they turn out, may yet produce a native
apostle. He will ring the knell of Hinduism. We chatter about caste and
prejudice, as if Chaitongo had not flung caste to the winds, and died with
8,000,000 followers. A Christian Chaitongo, with the clear brain of a
Bengalee, the knowledge of the West, and faith tending to asceticism,
would have thousands round his feet. We have ourselves seen 2000 natives
losing all their apathy, jumping, screaming, gesticulating at a song. The
power of preaching among such a race has yet to be understood."

Although we may learn from our Master's own words that all
we can expect from the preaching of the Gospel in this present
dispensation is that it should be preached "as a witness unto all
nations," in order that God might "take out of the Gentiles a
people for His name," it is surely a very significant sign of

THE TIMES to see how successfully, and more extensively than in any other age since the days of the apostles, the faithful followers of Christ are now endeavouring to carry out their noble work and labour of love, in humble obedience and dependence on the Divine favour, to the utmost boundaries of the earth.

Another sign of the times may be seen in the wonderful inventions, discoveries, and increase of science in all its branches, which are so marked a feature of the present day.

The words of the Hebrew prophet are frequently quoted in support of this allegation. "Thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased." But it is doubtful whether the words will quite bear the interpretation put on them, of railway travelling, and the inventions of the present day. The Hebrew word for "shall run to and fro" literally means to "spread out like water," referring possibly to the extension of missionary operations and commerce; while the "increase of knowledge" may refer in the primary sense to the knowledge of the true God, as conveyed by the Gospel; and in a secondary sense to science in general. And certainly the application of steam as a locomotive power, both by land and sea, possibly to be superseded before the end of this century by electricity, the discoveries and inventions of the telegram, the telephone, the phonograph, the microphone, the megaphone, the storage of daylight, the telegraphic writing machine, &c., &c., all show the wonderful advance in science in our own time, of which our ancestors had not the faintest conception.

6 Daniel xii. 4.
7 The telephone appears to have been introduced into England about six years ago (1876—1882). It is certain, however, that it was foreseen before that date. The author purchased a work some years ago, printed in London in 1871, entitled "Anno Domino 2071, translated from the Dutch original, by D. Alex. Bikkers," in which there is account of the telephone, as employed in conveying the notes of a celebrated cantatrice from America to the future Londinia, as it is supposed it will be two centuries hence! The telephone is therein stated to have been invented by a person of the name of Reis in the year 1861.
Of all the signs of the times which seem to be the most important to watch, and to do what may lie in our power to counteract, is the prevalence of false doctrines which are promulgated with such assiduity in the present day by those who either oppose or ignore, or who have such mistaken notions about that Book of books, which alone contains infallible truth.

The development of these various false doctrines, which are so marked a feature of the present age, and which may be all included under the apostolic term, "the spirit of error," appears to be defined more particularly by St. John in the Apocalypse, where he says—"I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of daimons (daemoniūn) working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty."

Acknowledging the very grave difficulty in attempting to define these "three unclean spirits like frogs," which are represented in the Apocalypse as a sign of the times for the present day, in the varied antagonists of Christ and His Gospel, the author may be permitted to quote the testimony of a much-valued friend, an elderly clergyman of the Church of England, and formerly a fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, who has favoured me with an exegesis of the above passage in the Apocalypse of St. John. He writes to me as follows:

"In order to recognize the offspring of the spirits that proceed from three distinct parents, it is necessary that we should clearly ascertain what the three parents are. They are three 'beasts,' mentioned already in the
Revelation. The first is 'the great red dragon' of the 12th chapter, or PAGAN ROME, i.e., heathenism. The second is, emphatically, 'The blasphemous beast' of the 13th chapter, or the PAPACY. The third is the 'two-horned beast,' mentioned in the latter part of the 13th chapter, forcing the world to worship, not himself, but the great beast before him, an adjutant-general to the Papacy, or the Court of the Inquisition, worked by the two orders of monks instituted for the purpose, the Dominicans and Franciscans, identical with the FALSE PROPHET, as he is afterwards called (ch. xix. 20), the latter being identified with the two-horned beast by his position, office, and work; the JESUITS, who succeeded the Dominicans and Franciscans in the working of the Inquisition, having then received the name of the FALSE PROPHET. When the Jesuits were restored by the Pope at the Papal jubilee in 1825, they were designated, not as an order, but as public educators of the people, or teachers, or prophets, or 'false prophets;' as the Bible calls them. They entered Protestant pulpits in Germany, and introduced RATIONALISM into German schools and German universities, to undermine the inspiration and authority of Scripture, when they could not exclude it. Rationalism is the spawn of the Jesuits. The three 'unclean spirits,' therefore, are the offspring of these three parents, or the spirits of these three parent beasts.

1st. "The spirit out of the mouth of the dragon is the spirit of heathenism, or the spirit of INFIDELITY. 2nd. The spirit out of the mouth of the beast is the spirit of POPERY, or Romanism and Ritualism. 3rd. The spirit out of the mouth of the false prophet is the spirit of the false teaching of the JESUITS, calling black white and white black, or Rationalism and Neology. They are quite distinct, while they combine and co-operate. They are distinguished by their adding to the Bible, or taking away from it, or rejecting it altogether. The second spirit, or Romanism and Ritualism, adds to the Bible. The third spirit, or Rationalism, takes away from the Bible. The first spirit, or infidelity, rejects the Bible altogether. I feel persuaded that the three 'unclean spirits' are INFIDELITY, ROMANISM, and RATIONALISM. You find these everywhere, wherever you go."8

If this be not an exact definition of the "three unclean spirits," as seen in the Apocalyptic vision, it is, probably, as near an approach to it as any which the Church of Christ has yet seen. The late revered Edward Bickersteth, for want of some more distinctive designation, called the third unclean

8 Some are inclined to understand by the "three unclean spirits"—1st. The spirit of infidelity. 2nd. The spirit of priestcraft, not confined to the Church of Rome exclusively. 3rd. The spirit of Mohammedanism, referring the Apocalyptic term of "false prophet" to Mohammed, as the great enemy of the Christian religion.
spirit Lawlessness. But this spirit, like the other two, is something positive, and not a mere negation; besides, lawlessness is not the characteristic of one of the spirits only, but of all the three; being seen in the Communism of the French infidels, Socialism of the Germans, the Nihilism of the Russians. In the Papacy the Spirit of God has specially marked the head of that corrupt Church as emphatically the predicted "lawless one" (ανομος); while the Romanizing party in the Church of England at the present time have displayed the spirit of lawlessness in a more extreme form than has ever been witnessed amongst professing members of the Church of Christ. Nor can we shut our eyes to the action of Bishop Colenso and his Rationalistic allies as developing the spirit of lawlessness in another direction.

The most recent phase of the Rationalistic school is seen in Professor Robertson Smith, of the Free Kirk of Scotland—his vain attempt to make the Pentateuch a forgery, after the manner of Bishop Colenso and his destructive infidel allies. It is not necessary to enter into any details of Professor Smith's criticisms, whose pretensions have been ably exposed by Mr. Cave, in a valuable article in the October number (1880) of the British and Foreign Evangelical Review. It will be sufficient to note that Mr. Smith's objections to the truth of Scripture are only the echo of what has been said a hundred times by German professors, from Astruc or Eichorn downwards. Mr. Smith's theory is, that the only part of the Pentateuch written by Moses are the Ten Commandments; while Exodus xx.—xxiii. was written about eight centuries later, before the time of Isaiah; while the book of Deuteronomy was written about a century later still. If such "nonsense," as we must consider it, can satisfy the infidel critics of the present day, it is satisfactory to feel that it has not in the slightest degree affected the Christian Church, or shaken the faith of a single human being worthy the name of Christian. All argument, all discoveries in the science of archaeology, tend to confirm the belief of the Jewish and Christian Churches during the last 3500 years, that the first five books of the Bible were written
by the great law-giver of the Jewish people; and the recently
deciphered monuments of Egypt help to prove that it was so in
a very remarkable manner. The solemn words of warning,
which our Divine Master delivered to the unbelieving Jews
18 centuries ago, are equally required for unbelieving Christians
in the present day:—

"If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded,
though one rose from the dead" (Luke xvi. 31).

Accepting the interpretation given above of "Infidelity," "Romanism," and "Rationalism," as fulfilling the predicted
prophecy respecting the three unclean spirits, which appear
increasingly powerful at the present time; and bearing in mind
that it is not so much the thing itself as it is the spirit of each
with which we have to do, let us proceed to consider some of
the marks belonging to each of these "spirits" in the present
day.

Infidelity appears to the world under a very different guise
from what it did ninety years ago, at the commencement of the
French Revolution. Then Christendom witnessed a scene which
can never be forgotten as long as the history of the world lasts.
On the 7th of November, 1792, M. Gobet, Archbishop of Paris,
appeared before the National Assembly of France, accompanied
by some of his clergy, and then and there, in the most formal
manner, abjured the Christian Faith, declaring that "no other
national religion was now required save that of liberty, equality,
and morality." Three days later a band of laymen appeared at
the bar of the Assembly, and declared that "God did not exist,
and that the worship of Reason was to be substituted in his stead."
A veiled female, Madame Maillard of the opera, arrayed in blue
drapery, was brought into the Assembly, when Chaumette,
taking her by the hand, exclaimed, "Mortals, cease to tremble
before the powerless thunders of a God whom your fears have
created. Henceforth acknowledge no divinity but Reason. If
you must have idols, sacrifice only to such as this." The
Goddess of Reason, after having been embraced by the Presi-
dent, was mounted on a magnificent car, and conducted amidst
an immense crowd to the cathedral of Notre Dame, where she
was elevated on the "high altar," and received the adoration of all present; while a numerous band of *figurantes* of the opera—her attendants—retired into the chapels adjoining the choir, where every species of licentiousness was carried on, and the saturnalia of vice reigned supreme. The climax of blasphemy was reached, when a comedian of the name of Monvel carried impiety to its utmost length, by exclaiming, in the church of St. Roch—

"God, if you exist, avenge your injured name. I bid you defiance; you remain silent; you dare not launch your thunders. Who after this will believe in your existence?"

Marriage, which Mademoiselle Arnout, a notorious actress, termed "the sacrament of adultery," was declared a civil contract—

"Binding only during the pleasure of the contracting parties. Divorce became immediately general; and so indiscriminate did concubinage become, that by a decree of the National Assembly bastards were declared entitled to an equal share of the succession with legitimate children."

Such were the fruits of the first French Revolution. For "the overflowing of wickedness," as the Revised Version of James i. 1 reads—for vice of unparalleled enormity, for irreligion of the most blasphemous nature, and for bloodthirsty cruelty of the vastest proportions, it presents a page of history which has never been approached for horror since the Gospel was first preached to civilized men.

The infidelity of the present day is different both in spirit and action from what it was when the saturnalia of vice reigned unchecked at the commencement of the French Revolution. Within a generation after the Jacobins had all perished by their mutual slaughter of each other, Robert Hall describes, in his own powerful language, the difference between the fierce atheism of the French revolutionists and the cultured infidelity which is so much in vogue with sceptical savants of the present day. After mentioning that Hume, Bolingbroke, and Gibbon, addressed themselves exclusively to the higher classes, he adds:

"Infidelity has lately grown condescending; bred in the speculations of
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a daring philosophy, immured at first in the cloisters of the learned, and afterwards nursed in the lap of voluptuousness and of courts; having at length reached its full maturity, it boldly ventures to challenge the suffrages of the people, and solicits the acquaintance of peasants and mechanics, and seeks to draw whole nations to its standard. But infidelity is an evil of short duration. It has no individual subsistence given it in the system of prophecy. It is not a Beast, but a mere putrid excrescence of the Papal beast, an excrescence which, though it may diffuse death through every vein of the body on which it grew, yet shall die along with it. Its enormities will hasten its overthrow. It is in no shape formed for perpetuity.

The prophecy of the "three unclean spirits" can scarcely refer to "beasts" in the common acceptation of the term, whether Infidel, Papal or Rationalistic, as much as to the spirit of Infidelity, the spirit of Popery, and the spirit of Rationalism, every one of which has had an extraordinary development in our own day. The spirit of Popery, whether considered as it now rules at Rome, or in England amongst its feeble and lawless imitators, such as Dr. F. G. Lee of Lambeth (who is endeavouring to move heaven and earth to effect a corporate union with the Church of Rome, about which he has the same probability of success as he would have if he were to attempt to make Niagara flow backwards), has been so fully considered in the preceding chapters, that we need say no more on that head; and the spirit of Infidelity and the spirit of Rationalism appear to be so nearly allied that it is difficult to separate them, though we may profitably consider them under the various classes of Rationalists, Pantheists, Positivists, Agnostics or any other name which men have appropriated to themselves, and attempted to dignify their claims to be heard with the much-abused name of philosophy. As a distinguished geologist of our own time has justly remarked, "Never yet was there a fancy so wild and extravagant, but there have been men bold enough to dignify it with the name of philosophy, and ingenious enough to find reasons for the propriety of the name."

1 Mr. Gladstone, in his admirable pamphlet on the Vatican Decrees, speaks of a "handful of the clergy" as "engaged in an utterly hopeless and visionary effort to Romanise the Church and people of England."

2 Hugh Miller's Old Red Sandstone, ch. iii.
The Rationalistic school of the present day has avoided shocking men's common sense, by promulgating the bold Atheism of Tom Paine and the leaders of the French Revolution. Nor when looking abroad upon "the heavens, the work of thy fingers, and the moon and stars which thou hast ordained," do they venture to say these all made themselves. They are willing to admit as much as what Plato discovered unaided by a revelation from on high, that some Divine Being may have put all these things in motion; but having admitted so much, they appear resolved to go no further. And just as Volney in the last century affirmed that the existence of Jesus Christ was no better proved than that of Osiris or Hercules, so some of the Rationalists go so far as to deny the existence of Moses, and reduce all the positive statements in the Bible relative to creation to the character of a myth. Nachtigall, a German sceptic, followed by Professor Robertson Smith, ventures to declare that the only existing remnant of the Mosaic age is the Decalogue, and even that so changed in language and expanded in form as to be anything but Mosaic, for the language, he contends, belongs to the age of David, and not to that of the great lawgiver of the Jews, five centuries before.\(^3\)

Dr. Rückert, in his *Der Rationalismus*, has endeavoured to defend his Rationalistic friends, on the grounds of etymology, dividing the word Rationalism in two parts—ratio, as signifying "what is conformable to reason," and the termination *ismus* as employed in reproach. Hence, he says, "Rationalism is a term of contempt, and means not one who is really reasonable, but who would like to pass for such." The reasoning of Volney and Nachtigall has been well exposed by the late Dr. McCaul, in his definition of Rationalism thus expressed—

"This doctrine plainly denies the existence and the possibility of a supernatural and immediate revelation from the Almighty; and maintains, that

\(^3\) We have a practical contradiction of such irrational reasoning in the publication of the Revised New Testament, the English of which is precisely the same as that of the Authorized Version published nearly three centuries ago.
to claim supreme authority for any supposed supernatural religion, is degrading to the dignity and the nature of man. It enters into direct conflict with the statements of the Old Testament writers, who clearly and unmistakably assert the existence of a Divine communication, which is called 'The Law of the Lord.'"

In the early stages of Rationalism, the philosophy of its advocates, such as Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibnitz, was employed on the side of revealed religion. It sought to prove the reasonableness of Christianity. It then sought to show that supernatural religion might be proved by human reason. Applying itself thus to the interpretation of Scripture, it proclaimed itself sent into the world to shed new light upon the Bible. It scrutinized the miracles recorded in Holy Writ; and wearied itself with subtle ingenuity to explain away all that is supernatural in Scripture, and to reduce miracles to the level of physical phenomena. Thus Paulus, in his *Kritische Commentar über das Neue Testament*, explains the miracle of feeding 5000 with a few loaves and fishes as follows:

"In Eastern travel there were always large caravans at hand, well supplied with meat and drink. All that Jesus meant by saying that the people were without food, was that they had not a regular meal; and so He collected them, and set those who had food the example of giving to those who had none, by doing so Himself with the small portion which He had. As long as eating was going on, Christ made the apostles go about with their baskets and give what they had to all who wished it. Jesus, pleased to have done so much with so little, desired them to collect what there was in the different baskets into one!"

So Schleiermacher, one of the leaders of this school, says in his essay, *Ueber seine Glaubenslehre an Dr. Lucke*—

"I will not speak of the six days' work, but the very idea of creation as it is usually construed. How long will it be able to maintain itself against the view of the world, resulting from scientific combinations which none can escape. How long will the New Testament miracles maintain their place against far mightier objections than those advanced by the French Encyclopedists? The old idea of a miracle must be given up."

There is, however, a difference of opinion respecting miracles amongst leading Rationalists which we must not forget. Thus,
while Strauss, on the one hand, in the Introduction to his *Leben Jesu*, says—

"We may summarily reject all miracles as simply impossible;"

Renan, on the other hand, in his *Vie de Jesus*, declares—

"We do not affirm that miracles are impossible; we only affirm that none have been proved."

Amongst the more recent productions of the same school, Professor Haekstra of Amsterdam, in his *Hope of Immortality*, denies the reality of Christ's resurrection; and Professor Shotten of Leyden, in his *Essay* on the historical value of the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, adopts the following axiom, that no miracles are possible, and therefore every record containing them must be untrue, and of posterior date to the received view of the Church since the first century! Far truer and far more rational was the conclusion of the late Professor Archer Butler on this same subject, when he says—

"Men may deny the story of miracles, but can they destroy the miracle of the story? They may discredit this volume of miracles—for the Spirit of God does not now descend to silence its gainsayers; but can they unm miracle the obstinate fact of the volume itself."

The labours of the Tübingen school in general, and of Strauss, its most prominent teacher, in particular, are all parts of the same effort to destroy the divine foundation of the Christian faith. They wrote and taught unceasingly against those departments of truth which it is necessary to preserve if the Gospel is to be esoteric,—a vital power of the soul, and an aggressive principle in the world. Conscious of this, the German Rationalists proceeded from bad to worse, and their writings gradually assumed a more Pantheistic and subsequently a more Atheistic form. Hence a learned American author was constrained to declare—

"We challenge Deism, and even Atheism itself, to furnish proof of a more malignant antipathy to some of the cardinal doctrines of the common faith of Christendom, than Rationalism has produced in some of its exponents."4

Strauss' most important work, entitled *System of Doctrine*, was more adapted than his previous works to undermine the foundations of the Christian faith. It was the embodiment of all the worst features of the Hegelian philosophy, which considers—

"God as existing only in being thought of and in thinking."

It was frank and bold in its statements. In it the fundamental doctrines of our religion are held to be natural developments from the seeds of error, just as Mariolatry has been developed in the Church of Rome, or as man has been developed by the Darwinian school from the larvae of an ascidian tadpole! Faith and science were considered as irreconcilable foes, the former being regarded as the perversion, the latter the development of human nature. The personality of God is set aside; and the Pantheism of Spinoza was to be regarded as the best solution of God's existence, "for," as Strauss asserted—

"God is not the personal, but the infinite personifying of Himself."

How just the reply of one of Germany's most illustrious scholars to this mournful proof of the enormous gulf between the religion of Rationalism and Christianity, as Niebuhr wrote not many years ago—

"Christianity after the fashion of the modern philosophers and Pantheists, without a personal God, without immortality, without human individuality, without historical faith, is no Christianity at all to me, though it may be a very intellectual, very ingenious philosophy. I have often said, I do not know what to do with a metaphysical God, and that I will have none but the God of the Bible, who is heart to heart with us.

"In my opinion he is not a Protestant Christian, who does not receive the historical facts of Christ's early life in their literal acceptance, with all their miracles, as equally authentic with any event recorded in history, and whose belief in them is not as firm and tranquil as his belief in the latter; who does not consider every doctrine and every precept of the New Testament as undoubted divine revelation, in the sense of the Christians of the first century, who knew nothing of "Theopneustia."

Contrast the language of German and English Rationalists with the above testimony of the illustrious Niebuhr—

---

5 Niebuhr's *Life and Letters*, vol. ii., p. 123.
"No one," says Strauss, "believes any longer in any of the New Testament miracles, to say nothing of those of the Old. Why, then, should we not confess to one another that we can no longer recognise in the Bible anything more than a mixture of poetry and fact."

In the same way speaks the chief organ of the Ritualistic party in England, by the *Westminster Review*:

"It must never be forgotten that the most grotesque of Christian miracles, and the most inhuman of Christian dogmas, find their prototype in the books of the Old and New Testament—that medley of documents, which, with much that is true, pathetic and sublime, contains not a little that is false, inhuman, and immoral."

The Rationalism of England is presented to us in rather a different light from that of their precursors in Germany. It is appropriately termed in *Essays and Reviews* "the free handling of Scripture," and very free their handling seems to be. Thus, e.g., on the question of the author of the Pentateuch, which the Jewish and the Christian Church for 3500 years have alike acknowledged to be the work of Moses, the following schedule will enable us to see at a glance how much these Rationalists, from Astruc, the originator of this theory, down to Bishop Colenso, its most recent developer, differ from each other:

1. Astruc taught that the Pentateuch was composed by twelve different authors, viz.: an Elohist, a Jehovist, and ten other documents.
2. Eichorn reduces the number to three, an Elohist, a Jehovist, and one compiler.
3. Ilgen names two Elohists, a Jehovist, with three authors and seventeen documents.
4. Knobel, an Elohist, a Jehovist, and three other authors.
5. Ewald, originally accepted unity in authorship; and subsequently, a great number of authors.
6. Delitzsch named an Elohist, a Jehovist, and other documents.

---

8. This list is taken partly from Dr. McCaul's very able paper in *Aids to Faith*, on the "Mosaic Record of Creation," p. 191.
7. **De Witte**, Elohistic documents throughout Genesis and part of Exodus; the rest, Jehovahistic documents.

8. **Von Bohlen** believes in the Elohistic documents, but denies Jehovahistic.

9. **Davidson** names two Elohists, a Jehovahist, and a redactor.

10. **Bishop Colenso**, Elohistic and Jehovahistic documents, and several compilers.

Thus the differences among the Rationalists respecting the authorship of the Pentateuch alone are so numerous, as to deprive their testimony of the slightest value. For if, as Bishop Wordsworth remarks in his work on the **Inspiration of the Bible**—

"They were agreed among themselves, we might suppose them to be safe guides. But they are like the builders of Babel, distracted by a strife of tongues, and uttering a harsh jargon of discordant sounds. They bite and devour one another."

Never was the truth of the Baconinan maxim, "A little philosophy inclineth man's mind to Atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth about to religion," more clearly manifested than in the contrast between the intellectual power of the giants of the past with the dwarfs of the present day—between such men as Bacon, Newton, Locke, Butler, or Chalmers, and the Rationalists of this age, whose glory seems to consists in seeking to make the word and the works of God contradict each other. But, as the late Sydney Smith has well said—

"Descartes has perished, Leibnitz is falling away; while Bacon and Locke and Newton remain, as the Alps remain; the learned examine them, and the ignorant who forget the lesser streams and humbler hills, remember them as the glories and prominences of the world."

It is just eighty years ago that the late Stanley Faber delivered his masterly **Bampton Lectures** before the University of Oxford, on the "Credibility of the Pentateuch." In his preface he justly remarks that—

"The books of Moses constitute a part of divine revelation, against which infidelity has of late years directed her principal attack. Difficulties have been industriously started; the language of profane ridicule has been sedulously adopted; and plausible objections have been urged in the shape of argument, or insinuated under the mask of an affected liberality."

---

2 Sydney Smith's *Elementary Sketches of Moral Philosophy*, p. 130.
Every vehicle of knowledge is seized upon; and while the bowels of the earth are ransacked to convince the world of the erroneousness of the Mosaic chronology, history and travels, satire and tragedy—nay, even romances and novels, are employed to disseminate the poison among other classes of readers. Such are the labours of modern infidelity; and thus, through the medium of Judaism, is a blow aimed at the vitals of Christianity.  

Although during the last eighty years, since Faber's defence of the credibility of the Pentateuch, the attacks of the Rationalistic party have increased in number, in violence, and in blunders, aided as well by the unseemly presence of Dr. Colenso, professing to be a bishop of the Church of Christ, and incurring thereby the contempt of his infidel allies, yet the defence has more than counterbalanced the malignity of the onslaught. Hence the discoveries during this present century in every branch of science, whether in Geology, Anthropology, or Archæology, have been sufficient to convince the humble-minded Biblical student that not a single fact of science fully ascertained, has ever yet been proved to be in opposition to a single statement of Scripture rightly understood.

And if Bishop Colenso is content to expose his hostility to Scripture, by declaring that "multitudes have already broken loose from the restraints of that traditional religious teaching, which they know to be contradicted by some of the most familiar results of modern science," and boasting with unbecoming pride that "the Bible and Science are opposite to each other;" 2 we must lament the infidelity which has seared the conscience of that unhappy man, who declared that Christ knew no more about "the age and authorship of the Pentateuch" than any other contemporary Jew; and justified his treason to his divine Master on these unworthy grounds—

"At the time we were admitted into the ministry of the National Church, we heartily believed what we then professed to believe, and we gave our assent and consent to every part of her liturgy. But we did not bind ourselves to believe thus always to the end of our lives." 3

1 Horæ Mosaïca, by G. S. Faber, vol. i., p. x., 2nd edit.
2 Pentateuch Critically Examined, by Bishop Colenso, part ii., pp. 18, 40.
Such is the lax morality of a professed minister of Christ in the nineteenth century, who is tainted with the "unclean spirit" of Rationalistic infidelity. Far better, far more honourable would it have been for Bishop Colenso to have resigned his See than to have made such an avowal, which has lowered him so in the estimation even of his sceptical allies. Still better if he could have realized the force of the reasoning of that famous master in Israel, the saintly Augustine, who thus confesses his own shortcomings:—

"When I was young," he says, "I came to the study of the Bible with shrewdness of disputing, and not with meekness of inquiry; and thus by my own perverseness I fastened the door of Scripture against myself. And why? Because I sought with pride what can only be found with humility."

Contrast this teaching with that of the Bishop of Natal, in reply to one who had insisted on the harmony between revelation and science, that "it was a slavish subjection to the mere letter of Scripture"! Surely Bishop Colenso cannot know the meaning of the phrase "the mere letter of Scripture," any more than he appears to know of its spirit, especially in all that relates to either "humility" or "wisdom." Ignorance the most profound in some things, joined to dogmatism the most presumptuous in other things, as the learned in both science and Scripture well know, is the chief characteristic of the Rationalist's cheerless creed. Dr. Colenso, however, does not appear to have much confidence in his speculations, for no sooner were they made public than he was invited by Dr. Baylee, then the Principal of St. Aidan's College, and others, to defend his bold assertion of the contradiction between Scripture and science; but this fair challenge he declined upon the plea that he had not time! Notwithstanding that he had previously put forth this statement that—

"All the details of the story of the Exodus, as recorded in the Pentateuch, again and again assent to propositions as monstrous and absurd as the statement in arithmetic would be that 2 and 2 make 5. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the first writer of the story in the Pentateuch ever professed to be recording infallible truth, or even actual historical truth. He wrote certainly a narrative. But what indications are
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there that he published it at large, even to the people of his own time, as a record of matter of fact, veracious history."

This very bold conclusion has been practically contradicted by the recent discoveries in Egyptology, and theoretically by Ewald, one of the masters of Biblical criticism, and whose leanings are rather towards the Rationalistic school than otherwise; yet he says in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, without the shadow of a doubt, that "the historical existence of Moses is indubitably proved."

Independent of the great simplicity of the style of the Pentateuch, and the use of archaic expressions peculiar to the land of Ham, sufficient to prove its high antiquity, they afford conclusive evidence that it was written by a man like Moses, born and educated in Egypt. It would take too long a time to enter upon a full discussion of the evidence which the science of Egyptology affords in support of this view, much of which has been well brought out by Canon Cook in his two essays, at the end of the "Speaker's Commentary" on the book of Exodus, but it will be sufficient if we give one instance as a specimen. In the account of Pharaoh's dream, the writer of Genesis, or the first volume of the Pentateuch, records it as follows:—"Pharaoh dreamed: and behold, there came up out of the river seven well-favoured kine and fat-fleshed; and they fed in a meadow."

Now the word rendered here, and again in verse 18, by the term "meadow," is not a Hebrew word, but essentially an Egyptian word, *ahu*, and would be literally rendered "in the reed grass," in which cattle coming up out of the river Nile would naturally feed as affording the first pasturage at hand. The word occurs only once again in Scripture—Job viii. 11, which tends to support the theory that the book of Job was written in Egypt, possibly as early as the

---

5 Gen. xli. 1, 2, 18.
6 Job iii. 13, 14, speaks of "desolate places" רֹאשׁ, as the burial-place of "kings." Ewald considers the word a Semitic version of the Egyptian word, which he renders as "Pyramids." Now Pyramids, of which about sixty ruins of these royal mausoleums have been discovered in Egypt,
time of Abraham. But when a Hebrew writer has to express the term "meadows" after the Israelites were settled in Canaan, he naturally uses a Hebrew word, such as occurs in Judges xx. 33, when speaking of "the meadows of Gibeah." Had the author of Genesis not been educated in Egypt, as the Rationalists affirm, he would have naturally used a Hebrew word to express "meadows," in place of the Egyptian word he does use, which, though not a common word, is found in a papyrus of an early date, as akh, signifying "green." Jerome, of the fourth century, in his commentary on Isaiah xix. 7, says—

"When he enquired of the learned what the word meant, he was told by the Egyptians that in their tongue everything green that grows in marshes is called by this name."

In the passage before us it may be understood as the reed grass by the side of the river, on which the seven fat-fleshed kine fed, as they were seen by Pharaoh in his dream coming up out of the Nile.

In the bold attempt of the Rationalistic school to deny the harmony between the word and the works of God, is seen the wide gulf which separates the Church of Christ from the infidelity of the present day. Thus the leading organ of this school declares that—

"In the matter of doctrine, three articles of faith have more than any other prevented the cordial and grateful reception of ecclesiastical Christianity by the most pure and honest minds, viz., vicarious punishment, salvation by faith, and eternal damnation. Of these doctrines, as now promulgated or maintained, three things may, in our judgment, be confidently asserted—that they were undreamed of by Christ (?); that they can never be otherwise that revolting and inadmissible to all those whose intuitive moral sense has not been warped by a regular course of ecclesiastical sophistry (?); and that no Christian or sensible divine would teach them (?), were it not held that every text of Scripture is authentic, authoritative, and indisputably true, and in some sense or other inspired and divine."  

were once the tombs of kings. They ceased to be so used before the rise of Manetho's twelfth dynasty, circa 2000 B.C., at the time of Abraham's visit to the land of Ham.

7 Westminster Review for April, 1863, pp. 510, 511. A gifted infidel, recently deceased, speaks in the same way when he says, "There are three
So intense is the opposition of some of the party to the fundamental verities of our holy religion, which is based solely on the infallible word of God, and is therefore the essence of truth itself, that certain Rationalists at Groningen, in Holland, seek to insult the Christian faith by terming our recognition of Scripture infallibility "Bibliotry," and the inspiration of the New Testament "Apostle deification"! The Rationalists of the present day are very much like the Gnostics of old, who pretended that their human knowledge enabled them to ignore Scripture, or to interpret it according to their own notions; "free handling," as it is now termed; thus virtually inventing a god of their own. Hence, the apostolic warning, which though primarily intended for the speculative Gnostics of the first century, is no less applicable to the pseudo-scientists of the nineteenth—"O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science (the knowledge, R.V.,) falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith." 8

Dr. Hurst, in his History of Rationalism, affirms that—

"The Westminster Review opposes orthodoxy and the Church with an arrogance equal to that of the Universal German Library, whose editor, Nicolai, is reported to have said, 'My object is merely to hold up to the laughter and contempt of the public the orthodox and hypocritical clergy of the Protestant Church, and to show that they make their own bad cause the cause of their office and of religion, or rather that of Almighty God Himself,—to show that when they make an outcry about prevailing errors, infidelity, and blasphemy, they are only speaking of their own ignorance, hypocrisy, and love of persecution, of the wickedness of their own hearts, concealed under the mantle of piety.' The Westminster Review studiously opposes the orthodox view of inspiration, miracles, the atonement, and the Biblical age of the world and of man. It endorses the sentiment of the doctrines which find very wide acceptance among our countrymen at the present day: the doctrines of original sin, of a vicarious sacrifice, and of eternal punishments... These are simply magnified copies of what bad men do. If God holds all mankind guilty for the sin of Adam, if He has visited upon the innocent the punishment of the guilty, if He is to torture any single soul for ever, then it is wrong to worship Him." (Professor Clifford on "The Ethics of Religion."—Lectures and Essays, ii. 224.)

8 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.
Tübingen school, and holds with Bauer that if we would know the truth of
the early Church, its entire apostolic history must be reconstructed." (386.)

Some persons suppose that the time will come when there
will be an amalgamation between the Jesuits, representing the
ultramontanes of the Church of Rome, and the infidels of
the nineteenth century, in order to turn their fierce animosity
and their bitter hatred of what St. Paul calls "the truth as it
is in Jesus" against the faithful followers of Christ. However
unlikely such a union may appear, it is not impossible, as the
following specimen of Positivism seems to show. Mr. Frederick
Harrison, one of the leading infidels of the day, has expressed
his ideas of religion in the Nineteenth Century Review of October
and November, 1880, by an article entitled, "Creeds Old and
New;" the special object of the writer being apparently to
exalt Popery at the expense of what the coronation oath terms
"The Protestant Reformed Religion established by law." Hence,
Mr. Harrison gives utterance to the following dogmatic
assertions:

"Protestantism has now nothing that (Roman) Catholicism has not got
in far larger measure, and it has deliberately rejected very much of value
that (Roman) Catholicism has. Protestantism is nothing but the servile
worship of a book, which, when read like any other book, becomes nothing
but a shapeless pile of commentaries on the Hebrew literature. Protestant-
ism is a dividing, anti-social, dehumanizing influence. Its triumphs are
toward personal lawlessness and industrial selfishness."

We may congratulate the Papists on their new infidel ally,
while we may naturally feel pity for the Positivist sciolist, who
can expose his ignorance in the way Mr. Frederick Harrison
has done in his comparison between the Protestant and Papal
religions. It may please them, and certainly it cannot hurt
us. For the attempt to reduce the religion of English
Protestants below the level of that degraded and paganized
form of Christianity, 9 miscalled "Roman Catholicism," can

9 Coleridge in his fifth essay, entitled The Friend, when speaking of the
Christians of the fourth century, justly observes that—"The pastors of the
Church had gradually changed the life and light of the Gospel into the
very superstitions they were commissioned to disperse; and thus paganized
Christianity in order to christen paganism."
only recoil on the head of him who has written such nonsense. If there were a particle of truth in his allegation that Protestants worship a book in place of Him who has condescended to reveal Himself in that book, which, and according to one of England's greatest philosophers, has "God for its author, truth without any mixture for its matter, and salvation for its end," then a simple reference to its doctrines would be amply sufficient to refute his ludicrous misrepresentations. Mr. Harrison evidently belongs to that class of persons, of whom St. Paul spake, when he uttered a warning to the faithful—"This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be false accusers, despisers of those that are good...Men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be manifest unto all men" (2 Timothy iii. 1—9). But we need not forget the alternative advice given by the wise King of Israel, in our dealings with such enemies of the truth—"Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him. Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own conceit" (Proverbs xxvi. 4, 5).
CHAPTER XIII.

THE PROGRESS OF INFIDELITY.

Dr. Hurst affirms that the parentage of Rationalism in England is directly attributable to the recently deceased Thomas Carlyle, whose theory subsequently developed into "unmixed Pantheism," which is now known to the world under the various and conflicting terms assumed by its adherents, either as Positivism, Evolutionism, or Agnosticism.

Pantheism has been well described as "that speculative system, which by absolutely identifying the subject and object of thought, reduces all existence, mental and material, to phenomenal modifications of one eternal and self-existent substance, which is called by the name of God."¹ The Pantheists are thus defined by one of themselves:—

"The Christian teacher," says the American Emerson in one of his essays, "saw that God incarnates Himself in man, and evermore goes forth anew to take possession of the world. He said in this jubilee of sublime emotion, 'I am divine; through me God acts; through me He speaks. Would you see God, see me; or see thee, when thou thinkest as I now think.'"

This definition of Pantheism by a nominal Christian closely resembles the idea of Deity entertained by the Hindus:—

"I was once arguing," says the Rev. Mr. Leipolt, of the Church Missionary Society, in his Recollections of an Indian Missionary, "with a Fakeer, a worshipper of Shiva, and I asked him, 'Whom do you worship?' He replied, 'God.' And 'who is God?' said I. He arose from his seat, laid his left hand upon his breast, pointed with his right hand to heaven, and lifting up his eyes, said, 'I worship God, the Eternal, the Infinite, Omnipotent, Omniscient, and Omnipresent, the holy, just, and righteous, the Creator of heaven and earth, the Supreme Ruler of all things. He it is whom I worship.' I rejoiced at this sublime declaration, and wishing to hear these beautiful words once more, I repeated my question and said, 'Who is that adorable Being whom you worship?' The Fakeer pointed to himself and

replied, 'I am He, He that speaks in me; I am that Being, I am a part of Him; I am He.'"

Such Pantheism, whether proceeding from a Hindu Fakeer, or an American Rationalist, was not uncommon in the early ages of Christianity. Hence we see Athenagoras, one of the Christian Apologists of the second century, declaring in opposition to such a creed that he adored the glorious Being, who harmonized the strains and led the melody, and not the instrument which he plays:—

"What umpire," he asks, "at the games, omitting to crown the minstrel, places the garland upon his lyre?"

If we turn to another class of theorists, we find that their creed seems to be contained in the loud-sounding term of "Force," while they assume to themselves the appropriate term of Positivists, as descriptive of the dogmas which they would fain enforce upon the world; the value of which may be judged by Mr. Frederick Harrison's description of Positivism, which has been already given in the last chapter, and which fully justifies the stern condemnation which a critic in the Contempora\ry Review has passed on that form of infidelity, in an article entitled, "The Arrogance of Modern Scepticism." More honest, if more openly atheistic, was the saying of Lichtenburg:—

"The time will come when the belief in God will be a machine; the ether, a gas; and God will be a Force!"

To show the lengths which the Positivists of the present

---

2 Athenagoras' *Plea for the Christians*, ch. xvi.
3 Mr. Mortimer Collins, in his *British Birds* by the Ghosts of Aristophanes, has accurately and very wittily described the Positivists in the following lines:—

"Life and the Universe show spontaneity:
Down with ridiculous notions of Deity!
Churches and creeds are all lost in the mists:
Truth must be sought with the Positivists.
If you are pious (mild form of insanity),
Bow down and worship the mass of humanity.
Other religions are buried in mists,
We're our own gods, say the Positivists."
time are prepared to go in fulfilling the words of the Psalmist—
"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God"—let us
listen for a moment to the jargon of a pseudo-scientific institution of the United States, entitled, The first Positivist Society
of New York, whose principles are defined in these glowing
terms:—

"Scientific religion; the dynamic theory of the universe; time and
space explained. Force and its changes to account for all phenomena, and
a new system of morals."

Thus these would-be regenerators of humanity have adopted
a creed with forty articles, which they affirm, when "taken
together, covers the whole system of human activity, thought,
and emotion, and places life, progress, and reform upon a
solid basis." They start their Positivist Society by positively
declaring that—

"It is no longer possible for an honest enquirer to accept as true any of
the prevailing religions. Therefore, the great need of the age is a thorough
and entire change of human thoughts, feelings, hopes, and interests, from
theological subjective and illusory suppositions of Hebrew and Christian
mythology, to the modern, objective, practical, and positive conclusions,
perversions, and rewards of science."

There was an Ape in the days that were earlier;
Centuries passed, and his hair became curlier;
Centuries more gave a thumb to his wrist—
Then he was Man, and a Positivist."

4 It is satisfactory to the humble-minded believer in revelation to know
that the tendency of the most eminent men of science in the present day is
to find themselves more and more in accordance with the teaching of
Scripture. The dying testimony of Frank Buckland, quite as distinguished
a naturalist as the late Mr. Charles Darwin, and a far sounder reasoner than
that over-praised scientist, is thus delivered in the preface to his last work
on the Natural History of British Fishes, written only two days before
he died. "Of late years the doctrines of so-called "Evolution" and
"Development" have seemingly gained ground amongst those interested in
natural history; but I have too much faith in the good sense and natural
acumen of my fellow-countrymen to think that these tenets will be very
long-lived. To put matters very straight, I steadfastly believe that the
great Creator, as indeed we are directly told, made all things perfect and
very "good" from the beginning; perfect and very good every created
thing is now found to be, and will so continue to the end of time."
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The Archbishop of York has drawn a picture of Positivism, in his address to the Church Congress at Newcastle, in 1881, as those who refuse to “accept as true any of the prevailing religions,” under the phase of Secularism, which he thus defined:—

“The principles of Secularism are according to its most representative interpreter, 'Atheistic, Republican, Malthusian,' the practical rendering of which would be—'No God, no king, and as few people as possible.'.... Secularism aims at the overthrow of all belief in God, and in a future state. It adopts, in some measure, the doctrine of Evolution.... I notice a peculiarity in the logic of this party which affects the very heart of their scheme. The instinct of religion must either have some supernatural source, or else it is in the inborn production of nature herself: man either learnt it from above, or evolved it from within. The secularist has settled that matter for himself: there is no God, therefore none can have inspired religion into man.”

The doctrine which the American Positivists have so grandly announced, and for which they have invented the name of “Osmosis,” is very much the same as Professor Huxley’s theory of Protoplasm—the grand principle of both being that all facts and phenomena are reduced to the operations of a blind physical something called “Force;” of which hypothesis Kent was the acknowledged founder:—

“In his Natural History,” says Professor Huxley, “Kent expounds a complete cosmogony or theory of the causes which lead to the development of the universe from diffused atoms of matter, endowed with simple attractive and repulsive forces, saying, 'Give me Matter and I will build the world.'”

With due consistency in support of his ideal god, Professor Huxley runs full tilt at the Mosaic cosmogony, affirming that—

“In this nineteenth century, the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew is the incubus of the philosopher and the opprobrium of the orthodox.... Extinguished theologians lie about the cradle of every science as the strangled snakes beneath Hercules; and history records that whenever science and orthodoxy have been fairly opposed, the latter has been forced to retire from the lists, bleeding and crushed, if not annihilated; scotched, if not slain! But orthodoxy is the Bourbon of the world of thought. It learns not, neither can it forget, and though at present bewildered and afraid to move, it is as willing as ever to insist that the first chapter of Genesis contains the beginning and thread of sound science; and
to visit with such petty thunderbolts, as its half-paralyzed hands can hurl at those who refuse to degrade nature to the level of primitive Judaism."

If Professor Huxley had been acquainted with Hebrew, he would not have committed the mistake of affirming that science and Scripture, or "orthodoxy" as he terms it, are opposed to each other; or in supposing that when our English Bible reads—"In six days the Lord made heaven and earth," that it refers to the original act of creation, as described in the first sentence of Moses—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The fact of two different Hebrew words being employed in these two texts would have prevented any one acquainted with Hebrew from confounding them in the way which the cynical professor has done. Very just is the way in which a deeply-learned man, who is a Christian as well, has rebuked Professor Huxley on this occasion—

"Notwithstanding the assertions of certain writers," observes Archdeacon Pratt, "nothing has been produced and established which is really contradictory to the statements of Holy Scripture. Guesses and crude speculations have been substituted for facts, and what has in these instances been called Science is not worthy of the name. Deeply conscious of the goodness and truth of our cause, we can afford to smile at and forgive such rough and unpolished shafts aimed at us, who maintain the integrity of God's Holy Word:—'Extinguished theologians,' &c. (the passage already quoted).

"We pity from our hearts the men who regard what they call 'the cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew,' as 'the incubus of the philosopher and the opprobrium of the orthodox;' for they deeply injure their own minds by holding such views, and cut themselves off from enjoyments, intellectual and spiritual, of which we would see them participate as well as ourselves."*

It would be a happy thing for themselves, to say nothing of others, if those who delight to ignore Scripture, and to exhibit their contempt for its teaching, would attend to what some of the really great men of science have taught on such subjects in the present day:

"We need not," wrote the late Radcliffe Observer at Oxford, in his  

---

5 Huxley's _Lay Sermons_, pp. 304, 5.  
6 Exodus, xx. 11.  
7 Gen. i. 1.  
8 Scripture and Science not at Variance, by Archdeacon Pratt, 6th edit., p. 9.
Religious History of Man, "in accepting the Biblical narrative of man's creation, repudiate one fact accurately deduced from modern scientific research."

"The language of Scripture," says Professor Challis Plumian, Professor of Astronomy at Cambridge, "neither is nor can be contrary to the language of science."

"The book of nature and the book of revelation," says Professor Stokes, Secretary of the Royal Society, "come alike from God, and consequently there can be no real discrepancy between the two, if rightly interpreted."

"Not a single fact of science," writes Professor Porter of Belfast, "fully ascertained, has ever yet been proved in opposition to a single statement of Scripture rightly understood."

To the opinions of these eminent men, I would venture to add one of my own, that nothing is more surprising than the poverty of argument displayed, and the illogical train of reasoning adopted, by those who virtually deny alike the God of revelation and the God of nature.

Thus, Professor Huxley, in his address to the clergy at Sion College, November 21st, 1867, boasted that he was par excellence "the minister of Science," and that his views were "held by the best of men, as Christian in motive and practice as you;" and in the Fortnightly Review, when denying the Scriptural account of the creation of man, he writes:

"Five-sixths of the public are taught this Adamic monotheism—of all mankind having descended from a single pair—as if it were an established truth, and believe it. I do not; and I am not acquainted with any man of science who does."

Such is the teaching of the chief apostle of infidelity in this country at the present time.

Another branch of the prevailing infidelity of the present day is to be found in what is termed Agnosticism, and which, like its twin sister Positivism, is in reality Atheism, thinly disguised. We have not space to examine this form of error at any length. It will be sufficient, however, if we quote the words of one of its leading exponents, who says, that this school of sceptics includes "all those to whose mind God is identified with the unknowable," and affirms that "theology is a collection of meaningless words about unintelligible chimeras."

In
support of this species of atheism, Mr. Leslie Stephens, in the *Fortnightly Review* for August, 1880, assures us that—

"He can state, without fear of contradiction, that the majority of the House of Commons are either infidel or sublimely tolerant of infidelity." And as a specimen of this toleration among our present members of parliament, he quotes the opinion of "one most intelligent gentleman," who when asked by him what he thought of the great question of theology, replied that "he had never been able to bring his mind to take the slightest interest in the subject."

Such is the indifference which men of the world, though professing a nominal Christianity, have for the revelation which God has been pleased to make to His creatures; while others, under the various names of Pantheists, Positivists, or Agnostics, virtually deny His existence altogether; affirming that the doctrine of Evolution is sufficient to account for every thing being carried on and maintained without an original Creator or the direction of an overruling God, content with the dogmatic assertion—

"Nature has in herself a reason for all that is,  
And God is an unscientific needless hypothesis."

The intolerant dogmatism which some of these sceptics display may be judged from the language which the leaders adopt towards those who reject their crude speculations about God and man. Haeckel divides mankind into two classes, "the thoughtful and the thoughtless;" the former, who accept his doctrines; the latter, who do not; while he affirms that those who do not believe his version of the doctrine of Evolution are "for the most part either ignorant or superannuated;" though in support of these wild charges there is not the slightest vestige of proof, or demonstration of any kind offered. Huxley pronounces his opponents to be—

"Persons who not only have not attempted to go through the discipline necessary to enable them to be judges, but who have not even reached that stage of emergence from ignorance in which the knowledge that such a discipline is necessary, dawns upon the mind."  

---

9 *Natürliche Schöpfungsgeschichte*, pp. 577, 638.
1 Huxley's *American Addresses*, p. 148. For an able reply to Huxley's style of reasoning, see a pamphlet entitled *Difficulties of Darwinism*, read
Bückner, with more than ordinary coarseness of language, calls those who refuse to submit to his atheistic follies—

"Mental slaves," "speculative idiots," "yelping ours," while he prematurely boasts of his own "enlightenment and the forthcoming deliverance of his fellow-men from obsolete and pernicious prejudices."

How truly has Sir James Simpson remarked, that—"Every few years some reformer or another has sprung up, and all past as well as all present experience further shows, that the greater degree of dogmatism and effrontery with which any such pretender proclaims his doctrine, the greater in all probability will be his success in gaining patrons amongst the credulous public."

The Contemporary Review of April, 1881, in a paper entitled "The Arrogance of Modern Scepticism: a Layman's Protest," calls attention to the boundless arrogance displayed in these bitter sayings. It would be difficult to find any instance of theological bigotry in the darkest ages of Popery surpassing, or perhaps equalling, such utterances as those quoted above. A very accomplished infidel, to whom I shall presently allude, has given another instance of this arrogance in the way in which one of the most beautiful specimens of the handy work of the Creator is viewed by those who banish God from "all their thoughts." "The eye," says the late Professor Clifford, "regarded as an optical instrument of human manufacture, was thus described by Helmholtz. He said, 'If an optician sent me that as an instrument, I would send it back to him, with grave reproaches for the carelessness of his work, and demand the return of my money.'"

Though quite unnecessary for the Christian to make any reply to the wild speculations of German or English infidels on the evolution theory, it is an interesting fact that a satis-
factory contradiction has been given by a scientist of the very highest rank to the bold assumptions of Haeckel and Huxley, the former of whom declares that he has discovered one of Darwin's missing links in the "sand eel," as an instance of transition from invertebrates to vertebrates; and the latter, in despite of the teaching of his master, pronounces _ex cathedra_ with marked inconsistency that "evolution is no longer an hypothesis, but a _fact_"!

Dr. Virchow, Professor of Pathology in the University of Berlin, and by general consent one of the highest ornaments of the science he professes, delivered a brilliant address at the Munich Conference of German Naturalists in September, 1878, which was subsequently published at Berlin, under the following title, _The Freedom of Science in the Modern State_. This address forms a remarkable exception to the bold assumption, that the world has settled down to the belief that mankind has come to the front through almost endless changes of promotion from lower to higher forms of life. Professor Virchow's address is a most impressive protest, in the name and interests of true science, against that _pseudo-scientific dogmatism, which first propounds unverified speculations as the conclusions of science, and then reiterates them in the circle of admiring disciples as infallibly true_, till their universal acceptance is boldly assumed, and all who doubt or question their assumptions are branded as old-fashioned fools of the "pre-scientific ages;" and which ends by demanding that its dogmas should form a part of universal primary education in the present day.

In reply to Haeckel's demand of this nature, Dr. Virchow observes with commendable severity—

"When Herr Haeckel says it, that it is a question for the educator whether the theory of human evolution should be at once laid down as the basis of education, and the 'protoplasmic soul' be assumed as the foundation of all ideas concerning spiritual being; and whether the teacher is to trace back the origin of the human race to the lowest classes of the organic kingdom—nay, still further, _to spontaneous generation_, this is in my opinion _a perversion of the teacher's office_. If the evolution theory be as certain as Herr Haeckel assumes it to be, then we must demand, then it is a necessary claim, that it should be introduced into the schools."
Further, in reply to the infidel theory that the human soul was nothing but "Carbon," with a flavour of phosphorus, and that, as Haeckel explained the development of all existing organisms from a single organic cell, which said cell was said to consist of stuff called Protoplasm, composed chiefly of carbon, with an admixture of hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and sulphur, or, as some term it, "the vapour of amyl," which expresses the evolution theory carried to its utmost lengths, Dr. Virchow, while admitting the possibility of the long-sought-for missing link between men and beast being discovered, "if not with the apes, yet perhaps, as Herr Vogt now supposes, at some other point," quietly adds—

"I freely acknowledge that this is a desideratum in science. I should not be surprised if such a proof were produced; but it has not been done as yet. You are aware that I am now specially engaged in the study of Anthropology, but I am bound to declare that every positive advance which we have made in the province of pre-historic anthropology has actually removed us further from the proof of such a connexion. As a matter of fact, we must positively recognise that as yet there always exists a sharp line of demarcation between man and the ape. We cannot teach, we cannot pronounce it to be a conquest of science, that man descends from the ape or any other animal. We can only indicate it as an hypothesis. From the repeated experience of the past we ought to take a signal warning, lest we should unnecessarily impose on ourselves the obligation, or succumb to the temptation to draw conclusions at a time when we are not justified in so doing."

And he adds this just remark, which might well induce caution to all sceptics, even to those who have gone the mad lengths of Haeckel or Huxley—

"Whosoever speaks or writes for the public is bound to examine with double care how much of that which he knows and says is objectively true. With perfect truth Bacon declared, 'Knowledge is power,' but he also defined that knowledge, which meant not speculative nor unproved theories, but what was objective, and actual, and true."

It is difficult to realize the depth of profanity to which the infidels of the present day have descended in their crafty and subtle hostility to the God of Revelation. The following specimen, which has been published by an American periodical of "The Bible of the Future," will enable us to judge the lengths
which some of the party are prepared to go in their unwearied endeavours to supplant the infallible word of truth. Thus they suppose themselves capable of writing a far more perfect Bible, than that which has stood the test of 3500 years; and which has now been proved over and over again by every discovery of modern days to contain, respecting man's happiness hereafter, the truth, and nothing but the truth. And yet our present infidels think to supplant the Mosaic record of creation by a cosmogony of their own invention, such as the following:—

"Genesis—Chapter I.

"1. Primarily the Unknowable moved upon cosmos, and evolved protoplasm.

"2. And protoplasm was inorganic and undifferentiated, containing all things in potential energy; and a spirit of evolution moved upon the fluid mass.

"3. The Unknowable said, Let atoms attract; and their contact begat light and heat.

"5. And there went out a spirit of evolution from the unconditioned, and working in protoplasm, by accretion and absorption, produced the organic cell.

"6. And cell by nutrition evolved primordial germ, and germ developed protogene, and protogene begat eozoon and eozoon begat monad, and monad begat animalcule....

"9. And animalcule in the water evolved fins; and in the air wings: and on the land they sprouted such organs as were necessary.....

"11. Now in the cosmic period the Unknowable evoluted the bipedal mammalia,

"12. And every man of the earth, while he was yet a monkey, and the horse while he was yet an hipparian, and the hipparian before he was an oredon.

"13. Out of ascidian came the amphibian, and begat the pentadactyle, which produced the hylabote, from which are the simiade in all their tribes.

"14. And out of the simiade the lemur prevailed above his fellows, and produced the platyrhine monkey.

"15. And the monkey begat the unthropoid ape, and the ape begat the longimanous orang, and the orang begat the chimpanze, and the chimpanze evoluted the what is it?

"16. And the what is it? went into the land of Nod, and took him a wife of the longimanous gibbons.

"17. And in process of the cosmic period were born unto them and their children.....the generations of primeval man.....

"20. And by inheritance and natural selection primeval man progressed
from the stable and homogeneous to the complex and heterogeneous, for the weakest died, and the strongest grew and multiplied. . . .

"24. And the earth was filled with violence: for man strove with man, and tribe with tribe, whereby they killed off the weak and foolish, and secured the survival of the fittest." 4

Such is virtually the teaching of the present race of infidels respecting creation as contrasted with the Mosaic record; and we confidently appeal to any unprejudiced person blessed with the smallest modicum of common sense to say whether he thinks it possible that this "Bible of the Future" is likely to supplant the Bible of the past, the only book which contains the revealed will of God to fallen man.

This inspired book every one deserving the name of Christian well knows to be the only remedy for the infidelity of the present day, whether Rationalism, Materialism, or Neologianism, or by whatever name its advocates choose to call that "spirit of error," which causes them to deny or ignore God, or to make to themselves some ideal god entirely different from that beneficent Creator who has revealed Himself to man in those sacred oracles, which are "able to make us wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus." 5 For they alone can convince without controversy, can convert without excitement, and build up the spiritual temple in the soul of the awakened sinner without the noise of human instrumentality. As Bishop Heber describes the material Temple of Mount Zion in his beautiful ode on Palestine:

"Then tower'd the palace, then in awful state,  
The Temple rear'd its everlasting gate:  
No workman's steel, no ponderous axes rung!  
Like some tall palm the noiseless fabric sprung.  
Majestic silence!"

Powerful, indeed, is the very silence of Holy Scripture. Simple in all its grandeur, and grand in all its simplicity. And surely it is becoming our Christian profession to be satisfied

---

4 This is taken from an American work, and quoted by Dr. John Arnold in his excellent work on Genesis and Science, or First Leaves of the Bible; pp. 98, 100.

5 2 Tim. iii. 15.
with observing the power and the wisdom of God in the works
of creation: and when we have learned all within our ken, to
confess that what we know is little, and what we know not is
immense, in the spirit of the Christian philosopher, Sir Isaac
Newton, whose humility and genius were alike conspicuous in
his memorable avowal—

"I do not know what I may appear to the world, but to myself I seem to
have been only like a boy playing on the sea shore, and diverting myself in
now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell than ordinary,
whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me." 6

There are lengths, and breadths, and depths and heights, both
in the word and the works of God, which will require an eter-
nity to fathom; and it is a melancholy sign of the Progress of
INFIDELITY in the nineteenth century, when we find a few of
those who claim to be ministers of Christ, and even one like
Bishop Colenso, whose office presupposes him, as the apostle says,
"worthy of double honour," passing over to the ranks of Christ's
enemies, in place of "earnestly contending for the faith which
was once for all delivered to the saints" (Jude, ver. 3).

Those who have studied both the sacred oracles of God as
revealed in His word, as well as the doctrine of evolution as
propounded by its adherents, will naturally be reminded of
what a celebrated heathen philosopher was wont to say
respecting the "Atomic Theory," which has met with a
singular revival in our own day, and which is as destitute
of reason as the evolution hypothesis.

"The man who believes the atomic theory," wrote Cicero two thousand
years ago, "will believe that if a countless number of the letters of the
alphabet were thrown on the ground, they would fall in such order as to
form legibly the Annals of Ennius." 7

For if we are to understand the Atomic Theory apart from

---

6 "This," says Sir David Brewster in his Life of Newton, "this memorable,
and I may add noble sentiment, was uttered a short time before his death"
(vol. ii., p. 406). The axiom that "humility always accompanies real great-
ness," was plainly seen in Newton's character through life, and is a striking
condemnation of many vain and boasting infidels of the present day.

an overruling self-existent Creator, we must necessarily accept the doctrine of Materialism as propounded by some of the German philosophers, who appear to have turned it into a god of their own invention. Thus Dr. Büchner says—

"Motion and matter are alike eternal;" or as expressed by Wiener, "Matter is and always has been eternal;" or as Heeche puts it, "Force is a general junction of matter—we know no matter not endowed with force, and, vice versa, we know no forces which are not connected with matter;" or as Carl Voght has declared, "All our life, the life of all organisms, the whole telluric and cosmic life, is built on the principle that matter remains eternally the same."

Thus man, created originally after the image and likeness of his Creator, and all the universe, is, according to these materialists, but the product of an accidentally existing molecule of atoms—one of the bubbles on the surface of the ocean of being, which will by and by burst.

Respecting evolution, besides Mr. Darwin's inability to produce one single specimen in confirmation of his theory, the impossibility of reconciling it with the positive statements of Holy Scripture, and the admission of Professor Tyndall that "Darwin may be wrong. . . . . . . . and deeming it certain that his views will undergo modification," as well as that of Professor Huxley, who now seems to speak of the theory in a measure with bated breath as "the Hypothesis of Evolution,"—all these are healthful signs that our sceptical philosophers are recovering their senses, and that in due time evolution will disappear, like so many other nine day wonders, into what Tyndall has prophetically foretold of himself, viz., "the infinite azure of the past."

And though Professor Tyndall appears in his captivating Belfast Address to suppose it possible that the teaching of "Kant," or others of the same school, is "reconcilable" with that of the immortal "Newton"—in so speaking, he appears to have but a faint conception of what that illustrious philosopher taught in all that relates to God and man. Those who can believe in any of the three missing links, e.g., that organic life
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8 Professor Tyndall's Belfast Address, p. 65.
can be developed from dead matter, or that the chicken can evolve a mammal, or that the irrational monkey can be transmuted into such a reasoning being as Sir Isaac Newton, have nothing in common with that gigantic, perhaps the greatest, intellect ever made by the Supreme Creator, which has appeared among the sons of men. Happy would it be if any of those, who in the present day prefer an ideal God of their own invention to Him who has revealed Himself, both in His word and works, to those who are earnest in their search after truth, could only realize the full meaning of Sir Isaac's own creed on this supremely important subject, the God of the Bible, as set forth in these telling words:

"This Being governs all things, not as a soul of the world, but as the Lord of the universe, and upon account of His dominion He is styled Lord God, Supreme over all. The Supreme God is an eternal, infinite, absolutely perfect Being. But a being, how perfect soever, without dominion, is no Lord God. The term God very frequently signifies Lord, but every lord is not God. The dominion of a spiritual Being constitutes him God; true dominion, true God; supreme dominion, supreme God; imaginary dominion, imaginary God. (E.g., Spontaneous generation; or the Evolution hypothesis?) He is not eternity and infinity, but eternal and infinite. He is not duration and space, but has duration of existence, and is present: by existing always and everywhere, He constitutes duration and space, eternity and infinity. Since every part of space and every individual moment of duration is everywhere certainty, the Maker and Lord of all things cannot be said to be in no time and in no space. He is omnipresent, not by His power only, but in His very substance, for power cannot subsist without substance. God is not at all affected by the motions of bodies, neither do they find any resistance from His omnipresence. He necessarily exists, and by the same necessity He exists always and everywhere. Whence also it follows, that He is all similar—all eye, all ear, all brain, all arm, all sensation, all understanding, all active power; but this not in a human or corporeal, but in a manner wholly unknown to us, therefore not to be worshipped under any corporal representation."9

This fine passage of the great and humble-minded Newton seems to be embodied in the brief, but finer declaration of our Divine Master—"God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth."1
Nearly a century and a half after the death of the greatest of great men, the humble-minded Sir Isaac Newton, there was elected to a fellowship of the same college at Cambridge a young man from Devonshire, of brilliant gifts, well known in subsequent years as a most accomplished lecturer and essayist, the recently deceased Professor Clifford, of University College, London. Originally of High Church proclivities, erecting a crucifix in his rooms, the suitable emblem of Roman idolatry, and a diligent student of the works of the great Papal doctor, Mr. Thomas Aquinas, he gradually laid aside all his early belief in Christianity, and stood before the world, if we may believe the Edinburgh Review, as an atheist of the deepest dye. According to the reviewer, Clifford became "one of the bitterest and most unflinching opponents of every thing that in general the world calls religion, a contemptuous and obtrusive denier of God, of soul, and of immortality. . . . He can hardly speak of a Christian doctrine except in the language of parody; he seems nervously anxious to be as offensive as possible, and his voice seems to vacillate between a sneer and a forced giggle. His opinions, when they took their final consistency, formed an ethical system, which was one very simple message, There is no God, no soul, no future life."²

It is impossible for us now to enter upon any critique of the late Professor Clifford's opinions on the subject of religion, but we feel bound to say, after a study of his Life, Lectures, and Essays, as published by Stephen and Pollock, we think that the Edinburgh Review has been unduly severe on his opinions, perhaps from having misunderstood him, as it is evident that what the Edinburgh Review ascribes to the professor's views of Christianity, should be ascribed to the teaching of the Church of Rome. Clifford was neither an Atheist, nor an Agnostic, nor a Pantheist; the more exact description of him would be, if it is lawful to coin a term for the occasion, to set him down as an Anthropotheist; at least, such is the only meaning we can deduce from the following passage:—

² Edinburgh Review, April, 1880, pp. 419, 486.
"The dim and shadowy outlines of the superhuman deity fade slowly away from before us: and as the mist of his presence floats aside, we perceive with greater and greater clearness the shape of a yet grander and nobler figure—of Him who made all gods, and shall unmake them. From the dim dawn of history, and from the inmost depth of every soul, the face of our Father Man looks out upon us with the fire of eternal youth in His eyes, and says, Before Jehovah was, I am." 3

On considering the attempts which have been made during the present century by the Rationalists of all classes, whether avowed atheists, speculating sceptics, or semi-infidels, to disparage the teaching of God's Word, it is a satisfaction to the humble-minded Christian to know that they have utterly failed to find any flaw in the armour of Divine Truth; and likewise to feel assured, that the criticisms of sceptics, from Astruc in the 18th century down to Bishop Colenso and Professor Robertson Smith of the present day, have had the good effect of calling forth a host of defenders, so that the Truth of the Bible stands on a firmer basis than it did, when the first attempt was made by Porphyry in the third century, and revived by the sceptics of the 18th and 19th centuries, to undermine the infallible Word of God.

Although we are taught by St. Paul that not many "wise" of this world are called to receive and understand the priceless blessings of "the truth as it is in Jesus," it is undoubtedly true that the greatest of Englishmen in intellectual gifts have bowed to the supremacy of Holy Scripture. Take, for example, the illustrious names of Bacon, Milton, Newton, Butler, Coleridge, or Chalmers, and many others. Where can the infidels produce such a galaxy of intellectual stars? Is any one venturesome enough to assert that the leading infidels of to-day are for a moment to be compared to them?

Or consider the numberless variations, speculations, and contradictions of the so-called scientific world. Can any one think that their crude theories and ever-varying hypotheses are likely to invalidate in the slightest degree the truth of God's Word? To mention one fact in support of our contention,

that all the attempts in this direction have both tended to confirm the truth of Scripture, as well as to expose the folly and vanity of infidel objectors. At the commencement of the present century the French Institute had as many as 80 theories before them for the rectification of the Biblical record of creation, all of them being hostile to Scripture. Not a single one of them has stood the test of time. Whereas how different is the case with the Mosaic cosmogony as revealed in Scripture. The more it is examined and investigated, the more clearly is it proved to have been written by one directly inspired of God.

The difference between the Mosaic record and the fanciful theories of geology put forth by speculating sceptics in the present day, may be compared to the difference between the formation of a butterfly and the finest piece of lace ever manufactured by man. Apply a powerful microscope to both. The more beautiful and perfect appears the one—the work of the Great Creator, the more imperfect and coarser appears the other—the handy work of the vain and feeble creature. Such is the vast gulf between the infinite and the finite—between the Holy Almighty God, and poor, weak, unsanctified and unbelieving man.

Professor Roscoe has well said, in a lecture on the Atomic Theory—

"In order to flourish and produce fruit, science must be free—free to experiment and observation without let or hindrance; free to draw the conclusions which may flow from such experiments or observations; free, above all, to speculate and theorize into regions removed far beyond the reach of our senses."

To this every well-read theologian may give his cordial assent, for it is certain that Christianity has every thing to hope and nothing to fear from the advancement of every thing deserving the name of science. What we reasonably object to is the wild
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4 See La Bible and Science Moderne, par M. Panchaud, p. 13.

5 I have gone into this subject fully in my Truth of the Bible, pp. 48 et seq.; as also in a lecture delivered at the Victoria Institute, Feb. 7th, 1876, on Heathen Cosmogonies compared with the Hebrew.
speculations which are too often put forth in the much-abused name of science. And we object to these things more in the interest of science than of theology, because while science may be seriously injured by the blundering of injudicious friends, or speculating and irrational votaries, the fundamental basis of theology is too firmly seated in the inner consciousness of man to be overturned by any amount of illogical reasoning on the part of its friends, or a greater amount of illogical rancour on the part of its foes.

The Scriptures themselves present no bar to the most comprehensive investigation on the part of those who seek to know the all-perfect harmony between the Word and the Works of God, as a distinguished writer has well said—

"Science has a foundation, and so has religion. Let them unite their foundations, and the basis will be broader, and they will be two compartments of one great fabric reared to the glory of God. Let the one be the outer and the other the inner court. In the one, let all look, and admire, and adore; and in the other, let those who have faith kneel, and pray, and praise. Let the one be the sanctuary, where human learning may present its richest incense as an offering to God; and the other, the holiest of all, separated from it by a vail now rent in twain, and in which on a blood-sprinkled mercy-seat, we pour out the love of a reconciled heart, and hear the oracles of the living God." 6

6 Method of the Divine Government, by Dr. McCosh.
CHAPTER XIV.

THE PROMISED DELIVERER.

Great is the relief at being able to turn from the crude guesses, the bold conjectures, and the unsubstantial theories of the Rationalists respecting the Creator of the universe and the origin of man, to the consideration of that "more sure word of prophecy," of which the apostle Peter says, "whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.... For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."7

Of all the prophecies which we have hitherto considered, none are so important, and happily none are so capable of proof to those who are content to take God at His word, as those which bear the name of Messianic, relating to every thing predicative of the promised Deliverer, who was to undo the work of the Evil One, when he persuaded our first parents in Paradise to disbelieve their Maker, and to prefer the reasoning of the first and earliest Rationalist, man's unwearied foe, "that old serpent, the Devil."8

The prophecy which records this incident in the first volume of the Book of Moses is thus expressed:—

"And the Lord God said unto the woman, What is this that thou hast done? And the woman said, The serpent beguiled me, and I did eat. And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; and I shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel."9

It is important to remember that the word rendered "it" in

7 2 Pet. i. 19, 21. 8 Rev. xx. 2. 9 Gen. iii. 13, 15.
the Authorised Version, is used elsewhere in Scripture to denote one of the names of God, as it is here of the promised Deliverer, the Messiah, which, as the one only descendant of Eve who had no earthly father, was specially "manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil." And we know how this was effected, when Christ, the promised seed of the woman, "blotted out the handwriting of the ordinances against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it." Or again, "Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he (Jesus) also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil." Although the Jewish writers do not directly interpret the "bruising" of the serpent's head to the promised Messiah, yet both the Targums of Jerusalem and of the Pseudo-Jonathan say that this victory over the serpent shall be "in the days of the Messiah."

It is well known that the Church of Rome has corrupted this passage of Holy Scripture (Gen. iii. 15) in order to ascribe the victory over Satan to Mary, "the mother of Jesus," instead of to her divine Son. The original Hebrew is perfectly unequivocal, for though the pronoun might be so pointed as to signify either he or she, yet the verb is, according to the Hebrew idiom, masculine; and, as we have already seen, the Hebrew הָיוּ "it" is used in Scripture as one of the names of God, and not of any fallen creature, like Mary and all mankind. This is the reading of all the various MSS. and printed editions of the Hebrew Bible, and of the Samaritan text. All the Rabbinical commentators, and the ancient Syriac and Arabic Versions, have the same masculine pronoun. In the Septuagint Version it is the same, as the LXX. have translated the term ἄνωθεν, "He," even though a

1 Ps. cii. 27; Isa. xlviii. 12. 2 1 John iii. 8.
3 Col. ii. 14, 15. 4 Heb. ii. 14.
5 Although the Hebrew pronoun לָו by itself is either masculine or feminine, the Hebrew verb has a peculiarity which the English language has not, viz., it has in the third person two distinct forms for the masculine and feminine, בָּרֲעָתָיו as it stands in the text, he shall bruise; and if she had been meant, it would have been written differently, as בָּרֲעָתָהּ, she shall bruise.
neuter noun, \( \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu \alpha \), "seed," precedes it. The original version of the Vulgate had \( \iota \rho \\xi \sigma \epsilon \), not \( \iota \rho \sigma \alpha \), as is proved by the language of Jerome, to whom the Romanists attribute the Vulgate translation, in his work, *Quest. Hebr. in Gen.*, "\( \iota \rho \xi \sigma \zeta \) conteret caput tuum;" so that the alteration must have been made after Jerome's time (close of the fourth century), and was evidently made with a design to support the false, anti-Scriptural, and unecatholic doctrine of the Church of Rome, viz., that of the *Immaculate Conception*.

In the valuable and interesting *Course of Sermons on the Prophecies of the Messiah*, delivered by the present Bishop of Winchester at Cambridge twenty years ago, the preacher supposes "a discussion between an enquiring, thoughtful follower of the Roman standards, and a pious, intelligent disciple of Moses and the prophets," in which the latter is represented as giving reasons for the belief current amongst the Jews at the time of the Nativity that a great Deliverer would speedily come, that He would restore the kingdom to Israel, and make Jerusalem the chief among the nations, and joy of the whole earth.

I think, therefore, this subject may be profitably considered in its twofold aspect—first, How the prophecy respecting the promised Deliverer was understood at the time by the more thoughtful Jews; and secondly, How far the traditions concerning this great Deliverer appear to have spread amongst the leading nations of the world.

1. The chief Messianic prophecies are thus interpreted by the Jewish doctors. The aged patriarch Jacob before his death commanded his sons to assemble themselves together, in order that he might inform them what should happen to them "in the last days," i.e., the days of the Messiah. The prophecy relating to the tribe of Judah is thus expressed:—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet until Shiloh come." 

This is interpreted in the Targum of Onkelos as follows:—

"There shall be dominion in the beginning, and in the end a kingdom

---

6 Gen. xlix. 10.
shall be anointed from the house of Judah. There shall not depart a ruler from the house of Judah, nor a scribe from his children's children for ever, even till Messiah cometh, whose is the kingdom, and whom the people shall obey. I wait for thy salvation, O Lord."

The simple meaning of this Messianic prophecy appears to be the sceptre, as the emblem of dominion, or as we should say, the sovereignty of the house of Judah, should not cease or depart from that tribe until Shiloh, the promised Deliverer, whose name signifies "the Prince of Peace," should appear. And the term "lawgiver" seems to point to the Sanhedrim, or Court of Judicature, the members of which chiefly consisted of the tribe of Judah, the prince or chief of which was always of that tribe, and which retained its power to the latter end of Herod's reign, when Christ was come.7

Again, Balaam's prophecy respecting what the twelve tribes of Israel would do to the people of Moab "in the latter days" is thus worded:—"There shall come a Star out of Jacob, and a Sceptre shall rise out of Israel, and shall smite the corners of Moab, and destroy all the children of Sheth."8

This prophecy the Targum of Onkelos thus expounds—

"I behold him, but not now; I see him, but not near. A King shall rise out of Jacob, and a Messiah shall be magnified out of Israel, who shall destroy the princes of Moab, and shall bear dominion over all the children of men."

So the various prophecies of Isaiah, e.g., "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, The Mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace;"9 and the famous chapter respecting the sufferings, the death, and the rejection of the "man of sorrows" is distinctly applied in the Targum of Jonathan to the promised Deliverer. Indeed the Hebrew text 1 "Behold, my servant shall deal prudently," is rendered in the Targum, "Behold, my servant Messiah shall deal," &c.

The second Psalm, which is so exclusively Messianic, as the Church of Christ has ever believed since the day of Pentecost,

7 See Gill's Commentary of Genesis, xlix. 10.
8 Numb. xxiv. 17.
9 Isa. ix. 6.
1 Isa. lii. 13.
was acknowledged by the Jews in ancient times. The Zohar,² the Talmud, and other early Jewish authorities refer the Psalm to the promised Messiah. Even modern Jews, like Kimchi and Jarchi, admit it was so interpreted by their forefathers, though the latter significantly argues that it is better to adopt another interpretation "in order to refute the heretics," ³ i.e., Christians, just as Paul answered his accusers amongst the Jews at the bar of the Roman Governor Festus, "the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." ⁴

With regard to the birthplace of the predicted Messiah, the Targum of Jonathan on Micah v. 2 speaks with the same clearness as the inspired Hebrew prophet himself, though seven centuries had intervened between the two, in the following way:—

"And thou, Bethlehem Ephrata, art thou little to be numbered among the thousands of Judah? From thee shall come forth to me the Messiah to exercise dominion in Israel, whose name is spoken of from the beginning, from the days of eternity."

Elsewhere, Jonathan ben Uzziel, who like his school-fellow, "Simeon the Just," may have lived up to the time of the Nativity, writes on the promised Messiah—

"A King shall come from the sons of Jesse, and a Messiah shall be anointed from his children's children... I will raise up to David a righteous Messiah, and a King shall reign and prosper .... They shall obey Messiah, the son of David, their King."

Such was the understanding of the ancient Jewish doctors respecting the prophecies, which related to the coming of the promised Messiah. The Jews had in their sacred books, which

---

² The Zohar, or standard work of the Cabalistic system, was probably composed as early as the second century of the Christian era. See a good account of its age in Jerusalem and Tiberias: a Survey of the Religious and Scholastic Learning of the Jews, by J. W. Etheridge, M.A., Doctor in Philosophy, pp. 312—315.

³ Some editions of Jarchi have omitted these words, but the Bishop of Winchester has pointed out that Pococke has restored them "from manuscript authority" (p. 9).

they regarded as inspired of God—and the testimony of history amply confirms their belief—a collection of professedly predictive prophecies. They interpreted a large portion of these as referring to a great expected Deliverer, and they were in earnest expectation of that Deliverer at the time when the Saviour appeared, and dwelt on earth for a period of between twenty and forty years. Centuries before Christ appeared, His race, His parentage, His birthplace, His life, His death, His atoning sacrifice, His succeeding kingdom and glory, were sketched in clearest outline by the prophets of Israel.

"Nothing," justly observes the Bishop of Winchester, "can account for certain foreknowledge, short of that infinite wisdom which cannot be deceived, that infinite power which cannot be thwarted. And so the definite accomplishment of divine prophecy proves, with unfailing certainty, the Divine mission and inspiration of the prophets who uttered it" (p. 104).

It may be of interest to Christians in the present day, when "the spirit of error" so largely prevails, whether in an infidel or a Rationalistic sense, and such remorseless criticisms are made on every portion of Holy Scripture, and especially on the writings of three of the most famous of the Hebrew prophets, viz., Moses, Isaiah, and Daniel, to note how strong and clear is the testimony of those nations, which had not the blessing of possessing a revelation from on high, to the fact that they were in expectation of some great Deliverer, of the character defined in Scripture of the predicted Messiah. Thus Confucius, the great Chinese philosopher, who flourished in the sixth century B.C., is stated by Dr. James Legge, in his Life of Confucius, to have known that in the early ages of the world there had been divine interference in human affairs, and that he lived in expectation that such would occur again.

But it is the testimony of those nations, which were located nearer the cradle of the human race, probably somewhere in Central Asia, and which became in succession the leading nations of the world, such as the Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Chaldeans, the Greeks and Romans, with which we are now more immediately concerned; and it is to them we must chiefly look for any signs of an expectation of the promised Deliverer.
THE PROMISED DELIVERER.

1. As regards the Egyptians.

In two very able lectures delivered by the late Mr. W. R. Cooper, F.R.A.S., in the year 1876, at the Victoria Institute, on The Horus Myth in its Relation to Christianity, and the Myth of Ra, he shows that the doctrine of a vicarious Deliverer of mankind, in the person of a mysterious Being who is at once both very God and very man, such as the Christian knows it from Revelation, was in a certain measure anticipated by the tradition which the ancient Egyptians had in the dogma of one of their chief myths relating to Horus-Ra, as the only-begotten son of his Father, the Deliverer of mankind from the Evil One; and which only could have been known to the ancient Egyptians by means of primeval tradition, carried back to the founder of their nation, and the first colonizer of Egypt, Mizraim, the son of Ham, and grandson of the patriarch Noah.

It is far too large and abstruse a subject to enter upon here; but it will be sufficient if we say that it appears certain by an appeal to that wonderful book, The Ritual of the Dead, which embodies the faith of the ancient Egyptians, as well as from the various Lalanies which the priests used in their worship, that such titles as the following are met with, which they ascribed to their deity Horus-Ra under various forms:


Hence, a modern author, who has investigated the subject of the early beliefs which prevailed in Nineveh, Babylon and Egypt, justly observes, in reference to the subject of the creed of the ancient Egyptians—

For a translation of the Book of the Dead by the prince of English Egyptologists, my friend Dr. Birch, of the British Museum, see Egypt's Place in Universal History, vol. v., pp. 124—333. Some parts of the ritual, such as chapter xvii., are as old as the eleventh dynasty, i.e., prior to the time of Abraham, about 2000 B.C.
"In Egypt the fair Horus, the son of the black Osiris, who was the favourite object of worship, in the arms of the goddess Isis, was said to have been miraculously born, in consequence of a connection on the part of that goddess with Osiris after his death, and, in point of fact, to have been a new incarnation of that god, to avenge his death on his murderers.

The son thus worshipped in his mother's arms, was looked upon as invested with all the attributes, and called by almost all the names of the promised Messiah. As Christ, in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, was called Adonai, The Lord, so Tammuz was called Adon or Adonis. Under the name of Mithras, he was worshipped as 'the Mediator.' As Mediator and head of the Covenant of grace, he was styled Baal-berith, Lord of the Covenant (Judges viii. 33). In this character he is represented in Persian monuments as seated on the rainbow, the well-known symbol of the Covenant. In India, under the name of Vishnu, the Preserver or Saviour of men, though a god, he was worshipped as the great 'Victim-Man,' who before the worlds were, because there was nothing else to offer, offered himself as a sacrifice."

2. Respecting the Assyrians and Babylonians.

As yet Cuneiform scholars have not discovered such clear testimony as appears to have prevailed amongst the ancient Egyptians respecting the promised Deliverer. Nevertheless, Assyrian archaeology has yielded more important testimony to the events recorded in Genesis respecting creation and the fall of man. Amongst the treasures of the British Museum, there is on an early Babylonian cylinder a pictorial representation of our first parents in Paradise. The figures of a man and woman are represented on each side of a seven-branched tree, holding out their hands to gather its fruit. The serpent is represented as standing upright on his tail beside the woman, as if suggesting the evil thought of unbelief; as recorded by Moses—"Hath God said, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil." Smith appears to consider this Babylonian cylinder anterior to B.C. 1600; though others give it a much later date; while Fergusson, in his elaborate work on Tree and Serpent Worship,

---

6 The Two Babylons, by the late Rev. A. Hislop, of East Free Church, Arbroath, fifth edition, pp. 113, 114.
7 The Chaldean Account of Genesis, by George Smith, pp. 68, 91.
has a drawing of an exactly similar scene, with the addition of a fourth figure, standing behind the serpent, with horns and houghs, evidently intended as a representation of Satan, taken from another Babylonian cylinder, supposed to be of the time of Nebuchadnezzar, i.e., circa B.C. 600. 8

Moreover, the fifth tablet of the Chaldean account of the creation seems to teach that amongst the ancient Babylonians the Sabbath was considered as coeval with creation. An extract from the tablet will show this. Speaking of creation by the Supreme Deity, it reads as follows:—

"He made the year. Into four quarters He divided it. Twelve months He established with their constellations three by three. . . . In the centre He placed Luminaries. The moon He appointed to rule the night. . . . The seventh day He appointed a holy day, And to cease from all business He commanded. Then arose the Sun in the horizon of heaven." 9

But, as well as traditions of the Fall and of a seventh day of rest, the early Babylonians had records relating to the Tower of Babel, the confusion of tongues, and the dispersion of mankind. In the year 1876, Mr. George Smith discovered among the Assyrian texts, in the British Museum, a mutilated tablet containing portions of six columns in writing, and preceded "by at least one tablet, describing the sin of the people in building the tower." The mutilated fragment continues as follows:—

". . . . his heart was wicked, and evil disposed towards the Supreme God. . . . He confounded their speech both small and great.

8 Lajard's Culte de Mithra, plate vi., fig. 4.
9 Talbot's translation of the Chaldean Account of the Creation in the Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, v., p. 427. Mr. Talbot observes—"It has been known for some time that the Babylonians observed the Sabbath with great strictness. On that day the king was not allowed to take a drive in his chariot; various meats were forbidden to be eaten, and there were a number of other minute restrictions." In another Chaldean tablet, translated by Mr. Talbot, and also by Mr. George Smith, we have the Babylonian account of "The Revolt in Heaven," "The Creation of Man," and the fight between "Bell and the Dragon" (Bibl. Archæol., iv., p. 349, &c., and Smith's Chaldean Genesis, p. 61, &c.).
Babylon brought to subjection.
Their strong tower they builded all the day
During the night He made an entire end of their tower.
In His anger He determined to scatter them abroad.
He gave His command, and their counsel was confused."

There can be no doubt that the Chaldean tradition is in perfect harmony with the Mosaic records, as Abydenus mentions that the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues was known to the Babylonians, only they appear to have derived the name of their city, not as in Genesis—"The name of it is called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth"—but from Bab-el, "the door of El," the name of the Chaldean god Kronos, or Saturn.

M. Oppert, in his Expedition to Mesopotamia, has given a full account of the Temple of Borsippa, in confirmation of the Chaldean account of the Tower of Babel and confusion of tongues. This temple was six hundred feet square; with its angles facing the four cardinal points, like the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh, seventy-five feet in height, over which were built seven other stages of twenty-five feet each, making two hundred feet in all, or about half the height of the greatest wonder of the ancient world. In the Borsippa inscription, Nebuchadnezzar names this building, The Seven Lights of the Earth, i.e., the seven planets; a portion of which inscription reads, according to M. Oppert, as follows:

"As regards the building of the Seven Lights of the Earth, the most ancient monument in Borsippa, a former king originally built it about forty-two ages ago; but he did not complete it, because at a very remote period the people had abandoned it without order expressing their words."

The only sign of the Babylonians having any tradition of the promised Deliverer appears in the character of one of their deities, whose name is mentioned once by the prophet Jeremiah (1.2)—"Babylon is taken, Bel is confounded, Merodach is broken to pieces." From the Assyrian and Babylonian inscriptions, it appears that Bel and Merodach, or Marduk, were

1 Smith's Chaldean Account of Genesis, pp. 160, 161.
2 Genesis, xi. 9.
3 Eusebius, Propr. Evangel., lib, ix.
not separate deities, as is usually considered, but the same. Mr. St. Chad Boscawen says that—

"One of the most beautiful characteristics of this god was that of 'Mediator and Saviour' between the gods and man, the vanquisher of evil, and the giver of life."4

Marduk is described in a hymn given in the Western Asiatic Inscriptions, IV. 29, as eldest son of Hea, the supreme lord of heaven and earth, who has no equal—the merciful one who can raise the dead to life—the powerful one—the life giver—the prosperer, &c., among the gods.5 All of which naturally leads us to suppose that the Assyrians and Babylonians had some notion of the promised Deliverer.

3. Respecting the ancient Persians.

On the first vague acquaintance with the religious writings of the ancient Persians, or "Parsees," as they are now termed, it became an axiom amongst the Rationalists that the fuller belief in the doctrine of the resurrection, such as it is represented in Daniel xii. 2, came from the Zend-Avesta. Those who disputed the antiquity of the books of Scripture eagerly accepted any statements of the antiquity of the writings of Zoroaster. But, as Professor Max Müller observes, "There are no facts to prove that the text of the Avesta, in the shape in which the Parsees of Bombay and Yezd now possess it, was committed to writing, previous to the Sassanian dynasty, which began A.D. 226."6

Although the Zend religion is anything but original, as it appears to have been nothing more or less than an offshoot of the Vedas, when it broke away, at some unknown period of time,7 in mutual and deadly hatred from the religion of the Hindus, nevertheless there appears to be evidence from the

4 Transactions of the Victoria Institute, vol. xii., p. 152.
6 On the Veda and Zend-Avesta, p. 24. In Dr. Pusey's work on the Prophet Daniel, there is a complete exposure of the vain attempts of the German Rationalists to exalt the Zend-Avesta and to depreciate Holy Scripture. See pp. 513, &c.
7 Professor Max Müller says—"That the Zoroastrians and their ancestors started from India during the Vaidik period can be proved as distinctly as
Zend-Avesta that the worshippers of Ormazd, like the children of Israel, had some expectation of the promised Deliverer. Zoroaster, who is supposed to have flourished as a contemporary with Darius Hystaspes, is said to have delivered the following prediction:

"In the last days a just and righteous man will appear, who would adorn the world with religion, who would revive justice among the inhabitants of the world, suppress wrongs, and restore ancient customs which had fallen to decay; kings would follow and serve him; he would establish true religion, and in his time peace and tranquillity would prevail, dissensions be forgotten, and troubles pass away."8

It is related that Albumazer, who lived at the court of the Caliphs of Granada, an astrologer of the ninth century, when interpreting the signs of the Zodiac, says:

"There ariseth in the first constellation, as the Persians, Chaldeans, and Egyptians teach, a young woman, whose Persian name, translated into Arabic, is Adrenedefa, a pure and immaculate virgin, holding in her hand two ears of corn, sitting on a throne nourishing an infant, who has an Hebrew name, by some called Jhesu, with the signification of Jesus, which the Greeks call Christ." This curious story may have given rise to the idea of Shakespeare in Titus Andronicus, when he speaks of an arrow being shot up as high as the "good boy in Virgo's lap."9

4. Respecting the Hindus.

Had they any expectation of a Deliverer? It is difficult to say. A few brief extracts from the Rig-Veda, the chief and most important of the Veda hymns,1 seems to show a yearning after

that the inhabitants of Massilia started from Greece." And he quotes with approval the opinion of Professor Roth of Tubingen, that "The Veda and the Zend-Avesta are two rivers flowing from one fountain head; the stream of the Veda is the fuller and purer, and has remained truer to its original character; that of the Zend-Avesta has been in various ways polluted, has altered its course, and cannot with certainty be traced back to its source" (Chips from a German Workshop, vol. i., pp. 86, 87).

8 Hyde, De Historid Veterum Persarum. Possibly the expectation of the promised Deliverer amongst the followers of Zoroaster may serve to explain the readiness with which the Persian magi came to worship the infant Saviour at Bethlehem, as soon as they saw His star in the east.

9 Titus Andronicus, act iv., scene iii.

1 "Veda" means originally "knowledge," and this name is given by the Brahmins to the whole body of their ancient sacred literature. The name
the true God, possibly arising from the Brahminical tradition respecting the Deliverer:

"In the beginning there arose the golden child. He was the one born Lord of all that is. He formed the heavens and the earth. Who is the God to whom we shall offer our sacrifice?

"He who gives life and strength, whose shadow is immortality and death. Who through His power is the one king of the breathing world. Who governs all, both man and beast.

"He whose greatness these snowy mountains and the wide ocean proclaims. Through whom the highest heavens were established. He who measures out the light in the air.

"He who alone is God above all gods. Who created the heavens and the earth. He who is all righteous, and who created the mighty waters. He is the God to whom we should offer our sacrifice.

"O Maruts! May there be to us a mighty Son, who is a living ruler of men, by whose aid we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode; then may we come to your own house."

Such appears to have been the idea entertained by the ancient Brahmins respecting the promised Deliverer.

5. Respecting the Greeks.

The testimony of the learned Greeks about the time of Socrates, i.e., the fifth century B.C., respecting the Deliverer, is clearer still. Thus, Sophocles, who was born B.C. 497, or about thirty years before Socrates, records the true idea which the ancient Grecians entertained of a Supreme Creator, as distinguished from the false conjectures of Epicurus and others of later times, in the following lines:

"There is One, in truth, but one God,
Who made the heaven, and spacious earth,
And azure waves of sea, and blasts of winds."

Athens, the central seat of earthly wisdom among the Greeks, which contained an altar "To the Unknown God," was

"Veda" is commonly given to four collections of hymns, which are respectively known by the names of "Rig-veda," "Yagur-veda," "Sama-veda," and "Atharva-veda," the first being by far the most important of all.

2 Max Müller's Chips from a German Workshop, vol. i., pp. 29, 46.

3 Acts xvii. 23. Hales considers this altar was erected by Erechtheus, supposed to reign as early as B.C. 1400. Lucian, a Greek author of the second century, mentions this altar in one of his dialogues—"Let us adore the Unknown at Athens, stretching forth our hands towards heaven" (Philop., c. 29).
colonized at a very early date, according to the Parian chronicle, \textit{circa} B.C. 1580,\textsuperscript{4} from Sais, in Egypt, where stood that temple which had inscribed on its walls the celebrated inscription, which seems to embody the revelation made to Moses at Horeb, beside the burning bush—“And God said unto Moses, I AM THAT I AM: and He said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, I AM hath sent me unto you”\textsuperscript{5}—

“I am All that hath been, and is, and shall be: and my vail no mortal hath yet uncovered.”

Plato, the disciple of Socrates, describes in the \textit{Phædo} his master teaching his favourite pupil Alcibiades, who is represented as questioning him concerning the divine oracle, who was expected to come as a man at some future time. Alcibiades asks, “When shall this time come, Socrates? And who shall be the instructor? For I long to see this man whoever he is.”

To this question Socrates replies:—

“He it is who careth for thee, and I think that as Minerva in Homer (\textit{Iliad}, v., 127) removed the mist from the eyes of Diomed, that we might understand God and men; so it is necessary in the first place, that He should remove the mist from your soul which is now attached thereto; and next, that He should give the means by which you may be able to distinguish between good and evil; for now indeed you seem unable so to do.”

To this Alcibiades rejoins in a way which is most instructive to many nominal Christians:—

“Let Him remove the mist, or whatever else it is, since I am prepared to decline none of His directions, whosoever this man may be, provided I may thus be enabled to become better.”

Moreover, we learn from the beautiful \textit{Hymn to the Creator}, by the poet Eupolis, likewise a pupil of Socrates, how that the pious heathen considered that this divine oracle or teacher was to be associated with Deity in the providential care and

\textsuperscript{4} I believe this to be the date of the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, as the only date wherein the Biblical chronology, that of Egypt computed from the monuments and the papyri, and the testimony of the Parian chronicle, can be made to harmonize.

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Exodus} iii. 14. So Christ told the Jews, “Verily I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I Am” (John viii. 58).
instruction of mankind. Socrates' expectation of the promised Deliverer, and his conception of the Supreme Creator, is well expressed in the following hymn:

"Author of Being, Source of Light,
With unfading beauties bright;
Fulness, goodness, rolling round,
Thy own fair orb without abound;
Whether Thee, thy suppliants call,
Truth, or Good, or One, or All,
EI, or IAΩ: Thee we hail,
Essence that can never fail,
Grecian, or barbaric name,
Thy steadfast Being still the same:
Thee will I sing, O Father, Jove,
And teach the world to praise and love.

And yet, a greater hero far,
Unless great Socrates could err,
Shall rise to bless some future day,
And teach to live, and teach to pray.

Come, Unknown Instructor, come!
Our leaping hearts shall make Thee room;
Thou with Jove our vows shall share
Of Jove and Thee we are the care.

6 Acts xvii. 27. Euripides may have expressed this "feeling after God" in his celebrated Dirge for Alcestis, when, according to the Grecian legend, the wife is represented as nobly giving her own life for that of her beloved husband Admetus. The lines read as follows:

"We will not look on her burial sod,
As the cell of sepulchral sleep;
It shall be as the shrine of a radiant God,
And the pilgrim shall visit that blest abode,
To worship and not to weep;
And as he turns his steps aside,
Thus shall he breathe his vow:
'Here slept a self-devoted bride,
Of old to save her lord she died;
She is a spirit now.
Hail bright and blest one! Grant to me
The smiles of glad prosperity!'"

'So shall he own her name divine,
So bend him at Alcestis' shrine!'"
No less remarkable is the testimony of another of Socrates' disciples, the illustrious Plato, whose expectation of the promised Deliverer, or "the desire of all nations," as the Hebrew prophet Haggai writes, appears so marvellous. Speaking of the "Just One," as Plato terms Him, whom the pious and devout philosophers of that age expected, Plato says:

"He shall be stripped of every possession except his virtue; stigmatized as wicked, at a time when he exhibits the strongest proofs of goodness; endowed with patience to resist every temptation and reverse of fortune, but inflexibly maintaining his integrity; not ostentatious of his good qualities, but desiring rather to be good than to seem so. Indeed, the recompense which the Just One, so disposed, as I said, shall receive from the world is this: He shall be scourged, tortured, bound, deprived of his eyes, and at length, having suffered all sorts of evils, He shall be crucified."

6. Respecting the Latins.

Our first witness shall be Virgil, who records in his Fourth Eclogue to Pollio, written B.C. 40, what the sibyl had previously predicted, as proving what the Romans expected concerning the promised Deliverer:

"The last era of the sibylline oracle is now coming;
A grand order of ages is to be born anew.
A new progeny is now to be sent down from heaven,
And a golden race shall rise all o'er the world....
The Sun (of Righteousness) is now to reign....
Under Thy guidance; if any traces of our guilt
Remain, Thy absolution from perpetual dread
Shall free the lands: the serpent, too,
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Shall perish—and a King shall rule
The peaceful world, inheriting His Father's virtues.
Assume thy glorious honours, for the time
Is now at hand, Beloved Offspring of Heaven,
Jove's Mighty Son. See how all nature gladdens
At the prospect of the age to come!"9

The Sibylline Oracles, to which Virgil refers, were of two kinds. Those originally brought by Tarquin to Rome, and burnt with the capitol B.C. 83. After the rebuilding of the capitol other fragments were brought from Erithrea by three ambassadors deputed for that purpose; and more were subsequently obtained, as Tacitus relates, by Augustus. Although it may be assumed with tolerable certainty that the Romans were expecting such an one, as answers to the Scripture prophecies of the promised Deliverer, it is doubtful how much of the original sybil was known even in the time when Virgil wrote. German criticism has been much exercised on this matter; and the conclusion seems to be that the third book of the Sibylline Oracles, with the exception of some later additions, supposed to have been written about 40—31 B.C., was the work of a Jew, composed about 160 B.C., and is the old pre-Christian Erythraen sibyl, known to Alexander Polyhistor, Varro, Virgil, Josephus, and others, and is expressly named as the Erythraen sibyl by Clement, Pausanias, &c., and that the Old Testament, e.g., Isaiah xi., was the chief source of its oracles.1

St. Augustine in one of his works, when mentioning the building of Rome, says—"In those days Sibyl of Erythrea wrote some apparent prophecies concerning Christ, which we have read in bad Latin. For Flaccianus, a learned man, having conference with us about Christ, produced a Greek MS., saying, it was the prophecies of the Erythreaen sibyl, in which he pointed out a certain passage which had the initial letters of the lines so arranged that these words could be read in them—

"'Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Saviour.'"

9 Bucolica, Eccl. iv., 4—50.
1 A full account of German criticism on the Sibylline Oracles is given in Dr. Pusey's Lectures on the Prophet Daniel, pp. 364—368.
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Augustine, after noticing that it was doubtful whether "this sibyl was the Erythraean, or, as some rather believe, the Cumæan," combines in a single paragraph, what Lactantius, who preceded Augustine by about a century, had set down in many short quotations. Thus he quotes the sibyl as predicting of the promised Deliverer:—

"Afterward He shall fall into the hands of wicked men, who will buffet Him and spit upon Him; and He will submit His holy back to stripes. He will hold His peace when struck with the fist; and He shall be crowned with a crown of thorns... The veil of the Temple shall be rent; and at midday it will be darker that night for three hours. He will undergo death, taking sleep for three days, and then returning to the Light, He will come again as at the first." 3

Although many will naturally say that this must have been written after the event, and is nothing better than a Christian forgery, it scarcely appears more distinct than Plato's testimony concerning the promised Deliverer, which was undoubtedly written four centuries before Christ was born.

Tacitus, in his account of the Jews and the siege of Jerusalem, speaks of the prevailing notion respecting the Deliverer, though he applies the prediction to Vespasian and Titus rather than He for whom the prophecy was intended:—

"The majority" he says, "were deeply impressed with a persuasion that it was contained in the ancient writings of the priests, that it would come to pass at that very time that the East would renew its strength, and they that should go forth from Judæa would be rulers of the world." 6

And so Suetonius tells us, that—

"A firm persuasion had long prevailed through all the East, that it was fated for the empire of the world, at that time, to devolve on some one who should go forth from Judæa." 6

Such is the testimony which recent discoveries have brought

---

2 Friedlieb, in his analysis of the third book of the Sibyline Oracles, adduces the testimony of Lactantius, as bearing testimony to the pre-Christian Erythrean sibyl, but being still known, and available for investigators. See Pusey's Daniel, p 365.
3 Augustine, De Civitate Dei, lib. xviii., § 23. 4 See p. 304.
to light respecting the belief entertained by the ancient Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks, and Latins, of that promised Deliverer, alluded to in Gen. iii. 15; the tradition of which must have been known to the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, on their escape from the judgment which overtook the antediluvian world; and among whose descendants "the nations were divided in the earth after the flood." 7

The two most remarkable prophecies concerning the promised Deliverer, as set forth in the sacred oracles of God, and which necessarily rest on a different footing from the traditions of those nations who were without a revelation from on high, are those so familiarly known to the Biblical student as the prophecy respecting the signs which were to herald Christ's advent, in the sceptre departing from Judah, as foretold by the patriarch Jacob when dying in Egypt; and that well-known prediction respecting the "cutting off of the Messiah," commonly termed Daniel's prophecy of the "seventy weeks," delivered about 1000 years after the time of Jacob, when the Hebrew prophet was a captive in Babylon. Let us consider these prophecies separately.

First. Jacob's prophecy respecting Judah's sceptre.

The prophecy of the dying patriarch relative to Judah, the fourth son of Jacob and Leah, which was pointedly declared to be a guide as to what should befall the twelve tribes of Israel "in the last days," may literally be rendered thus:—

"Judah! thou! thy brethren shall praise thee.
Thy hand, in the neck of thine enemies:
The sons of thy father shall bow themselves to thee.
A lion's whelp is Judah:
From the prey, my son, thou hast ascended.
He couched, lying down like a strong lion,
And like a lioness; who shall arouse him?  
From Judah the sceptre shall not depart,
Nor a lawgiver from his offspring,
Until that Shiloh shall come;
And to Him shall be assembled the peoples." 8

7 Gen. x. 32. 8 Gen. xlix. 8—10.
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The prophetic portion of the passage is contained in the four last lines, which constitute the 10th verse:

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until SHILOH come; and unto Him shall the gathering of the people be."

Although much unnecessary criticism has been expended on this verse, the simple sense of it appears to be as follows:—The ruling power of authority shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver, either as maker or teacher of the law, from the tribe, until the promised Deliverer as the SHILOH shall come; and to Him shall all nations be gathered.9

(1.) The word Shebet, used to denote the ruling power or sceptre of authority, is the same as Balaam's prophecy—"There shall come a star out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall rise out of Israel." 1

(2.) The LXX. and the Vulgate render the term "lawgiver" by "leader," the Targums paraphrasing it by "scribe, or interpreter of the law," which seems to denote that until the Messiah came the ruling power should exist in the tribe of Judah, as we know from Scripture history was the case in the family of David, being seated on the throne until the Babylonian captivity; and that from King Jechoniah, who was carried captive to Babylon, and his heir Zerubbabel, the leader of the children of Israel, when Cyrus granted them permission to return to Jerusalem when the 70 years' captivity was ended, sprang the reputed father of the Lord Jesus Christ. And although the governing power was not retained by the house of David after the return from Babylon, it is said that the prince of the Sanhedrim, or court of judicature, which appears to have exercised both legislative and executive functions, was always of the tribe of Judah; and which retained its power

---

9 The proof of the sceptre having departed from Judah during our Lord's ministry on earth, is seen in the historic fact that the power of life and death was taken away from the Jews, and placed in the hands of the Roman governor (Matt. xx. 18, 19; xxvii. 1, 2; Mark xv. 1; Luke xviii. 22, 23; John xviii. 28, 29).

1 Numb. xxiv. 17.
until the days of Herod, when the promised Deliverer in the person of Jesus Christ was come.

(3.) In the word Shiloh we encounter a difficulty, which some moderns of Rationalistic tendencies have raised to the uninterrupted interpretation of Jews and Christians for the last three thousand years, whether Shiloh is the name of a person or a place. They translate the passage as follows:—"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah until he come to Shiloh." The explanation of this as given by Roediger, in his continuation of Gesenius' Thesaurus, is—

"That the tribe of Judah should go before the other tribes, and have the supreme command in the war waged with the Canaanites, and that this war was not finished until after the victorious Israelites had entered Shiloh, and where the sacred ark was eventually set up."

But there are some fatal objections to this rendering. 1st. There is no evidence that the city of Shiloh existed at the time when the patriarch Jacob delivered the prophecy; or, if it then existed, what special connexion had Joshua in the war with the Canaanites, when the house of God was in Shiloh (Judges xviii. 31) with the tribe of Judah? 2nd. We are distinctly taught in Genesis xlix. 1, that Jacob's prophecy had reference to what would happen to the children of Israel "in the last days." Jewish and Christian commentators have alike understood this phrase to apply "to the days of the Messiah," or, as we should term it, "the Gospel dispensation," and which of necessity cannot be applied to the time of Joshua's government when he led the Israelites unto the land of promise.

2 Mr. Obbard, in his Prophecy of Jacob, mentions an instance to show how unreliable Gesenius really is. He observes at p. v. of his preface—"Under the word מַלְכֵי הָעָם Gesenius (Thesaurus, 672 B) quotes 'R. Eliezer in Pirke Aboth, c. 38.' Any beginner in post-Biblical Hebrew knows that the Pirke Aboth, which contains the moral teaching of the great Rabbi Hillel, has but six chapters. Perhaps Gesenius may have written, as Gill in loco has done, 'Pirke Eliezer, c. 38.' Moreover, Gill calls attention to this fact, which I do not recollect ever to have seen noticed elsewhere, viz., that when the expected Messiah or Shiloh did come, 'the Jews believed that he would not reign for ever, but only for a limited period—some said forty years, some seventy, others four hundred years.'" (F. Bab. Sanhedrim, fol. 99. 1).
It is undeniable that all Jewish antiquity referred the prophecy of Jacob to the Messiah. The Targum of Onkelos says—“Until the Messiah come, whose is the kingdom?” The Jerusalem Targum—“Until the time that the King Messiah shall come, whose is the kingdom?” The Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan—“Until the King the Messiah shall come, the youngest of his sons.” The Babylonian Talmud—“What is Messiah’s name? His name is Shiloh, for it is written, Until Shiloh come.” The more modern Jews, pressed by this powerful argument that the prophecy can refer to none other than our Saviour as the foretold Messiah, have endeavoured to meet it by applying the name Shiloh to Saul, or David, or even to Nebuchadnezzar.

Though differences have arisen as to the exact meaning of the name Shiloh, none are to be found in ancient times respecting its meaning a person and not a place. The LXX., as the earliest translators, the Targums, with the exception of that of Pseudo-Jonathan, and all the Greek versions, render it as signifying—“He who is kept in secret;” or, “He to whom it belongs;” or, “He whose right it is.” The Vulgate, the earliest of the Latin translations, renders it Qui mittendus est—“He who is or shall be sent.” With which we may compare what is said in Isaiah (viii. 6) of the people of Israel “refusing the waters of Shiloah,” which bore this signification, when the Messiah was come, as we learn from our Lord’s command to the man blind from his birth.—“Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, which is by interpretation, sent.” And so a Rabbinical comment on Deuteronomy xxii. 7—“If you keep this precept, you hasten the coming of the Messiah, who is called Sent.” And how applicable this was to Christ, let the following passages declare—“I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel” (Matt. xv. 24).

3 The early Christian fathers are unanimous in referring Jacob’s prophecy concerning Shiloh to the Lord Jesus Christ. See Justin Martyr i., §§ 32, 64; also Dial. cum Tryph., §§ 20, 52; Irenaeus Adv. Haer., iv. 23; Origen Conts. Cel., lib i.; also Hom. in Gen., xvii; Cyprian Conts. Jud. i., § 20; Euseb. Hist. Eccl., i. 6, Augustine, De Civit. Dei, xvi. 41.

4 See Shöttgen Hor Heb, p. 1264.

5 John ix. 7.
“As the Father hath sent me, so send I you” (John xx. 20). Hence, St. Paul calls “Jesus Christ the Apostle, i.e., the Sent One, and High Priest of our profession” (Heb. xiii. 1).

Some modern interpreters, however, are more inclined to interpret the word Shiloh as signifying “Peace,” or “Peace-maker,” a title which is peculiarly applicable to our Messiah, who is emphatically described by Isaiah (ix. 6) as “the Prince of Peace.” This is so understood on the ground that the word “Shiloh” is legitimately formed from the Hebrew, signifying Shalah, “to rest,” or “to be at peace.”

But, whatever be the rightful etymology of the Hebrew word Shalah—“Shiloh,” there can be no doubt that this prophecy was one important link in the long chain of prediction which produced that general expectation of a Messiah universally prevalent in Judæa at the period of the Christian era, and which the Latin historians, such as Tacitus and Suetonius, relate, as we have before noticed, had long prevailed throughout the East; and which we contend could not have existed without the heathen world having some traditions of the prophecies recorded in Scripture of the promised Deliverer.

Now it is worthy of note that when the government of the children of Israel passed from a theocracy to the regal form, Saul of the tribe of Benjamin was the first appointed king; but after a brief trial the sceptre passed to David of the tribe of Judah, with whose line it has continued in some sense ever since. For when the revolt of the tribes took place in the time of David’s grandson Rehoboam, and the division of the twelve tribes took place, three of them, viz., Judah, Benjamin, and Levi remained in subjection to the first-named tribe, and which for the next few centuries bore the name of the kingdom of Judah. Hence we find the perpetuity of David’s kingdom so frequently insisted upon by the prophets of Israel, not only in respect to the past, but also as regards the future; when David’s greater Son shall be on the throne ruling over His people Israel. As it is written:—

“Thus saith the Lord God; Behold I will take the children of Israel from among the heathen; and I will make them one nation in the land upon the
mountains of Israel; and one king shall be king to them all; and they shall be no more two nations, neither shall they be divided into two kingdoms any more at all. And David my servant shall be king over them; and they shall dwell in the land that I have given unto Jacob my servant, wherein your fathers have dwelt; and they shall dwell therein, even they, and their children's children for ever; and my servant David shall be their prince for ever.'

After the return from Babylon the children of Israel appear to have been under the government of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, and heir by adoption of Jeconiah king of Judah, as we find him the leader of the first band of captives, who returned from Babylon to Jerusalem in the first year of Cyrus, B.C. 537; and he is termed "governor of Judah," in the "second year of Darius the King," B.C. 520.  7 But afterwards the government appears to have fallen into the hands of Ezra, of the tribe of Levi, and eventually of the high priests, just as the Popes gradually assumed the temporal sovereignty of Rome, which had been previously held by the emperors. But inasmuch as the kingdom of Judah consisted of the three tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi (Ezra i. 5), and that the Sanhedrim, which came into existence sometime between the return from Babylon and the Nativity, was composed chiefly of the men of Judah, we see the fulfilment of the prophecy that the government of the tribes of Israel still rested with Judah until the promised Shiloh appeared.

The history of the Asmonean princes shows how the sovereign power was retained by the descendants of Mattathias, 8 the father of the illustrious hero, Judas Maccabæus, until the last of the family, the beautiful Mariamne, married the blood-thirsty monster, Herod the Great, in whose reign Christ, the promised Shiloh, was born. After the death of Herod the Great the kingdom was divided by Augustus Cæsar into tetrarchies; and Archelaus, who is mentioned by Matthew (ii. 22) as "reigning in Judæa in the room of his father Herod," was appointed to the sovereignty of Judæa, Idumæa, and Samaria, with the title of

---

6 Ezek. xxxvii. 21—25; cf. also Isa. lx. 21; Jer. xvii. 25, xxxi. 36; Joel iii. 20; Micah iv. 7.
7 Ezra ii. 2; Hag. i. 1.
8 Josephus, B. J. I., i., § 3.
Ethnarch; that of king being reserved as a reward for future good conduct. His reign of nine years was, however, stained from the beginning with the greatest injustice and cruelty; at the end of which, while sitting at a banquet, Archelaus was suddenly summoned by Caesar to Rome. There he was formally tried, his brothers, as well as his subjects, being his accusers. He was condemned to banishment to the city of Vienne in Gaul; his estates were confiscated, and Judaea was reduced to a Roman province. And thus, as a distinguished historian observes—

"The sceptre finally departed from Judah; the kingdom of David and Solomon, of the Asmonean princes and of Herod, sank into a district, dependent on the prefecture of Syria, though administered by its own governor, a man usually of the equestrian order."  

There is a valuable chronological testimony in confirmation of this view, which I have never seen noticed by any writer, but which I venture to think affords some strong evidence to the truth of this Messianic prophecy. There are certain prophecies respecting the appearance of the promised Shiloh in the Temple on Mount Zion which seems to throw some light on this important subject.

The prophet Haggai, who wrote in the reign of Darius, about twenty years after the return from Babylon, delivered this prophecy:—

"Thus saith the Lord of hosts; Yet once, it is a little while, and I will shake the heavens, and the earth; and I will shake all nations, and the desire of all nations shall come: and I will fill this house with glory, saith the Lord of hosts" (ii. 6, 7). As a difficulty has been raised by some in applying this to the promised Shiloh, because in the phrase, "the desire of all nations shall come," the verb is in the plural number, as all the ancient MSS. so write it, I would notice some reasons for accepting the usual Christian interpretation of this text, viz., that it is a direct prediction of our Lord's presence in the Temple of Jerusalem, which had been originally built by Solomon, destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, rebuilt by Zerubbabel

after the return from Babylon, and five centuries later restored with great magnificence by Herod the Great, and to “the goodly stones” of which the disciples called Christ's attention, when He delivered His memorable prophecy respecting its complete destruction. Although the LXX. render “the desire of all nations” by the plural ἡ εὔλεκτή, “desirable,” or “precious things,” for the Hebrew singular, which merely proves that they had no proper understanding of the prediction, the context is adduced by the inspired writer of Hebrews xii. 26—“Whose voice then shook the earth; but now He hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven,” the exact words of Haggai ii. 6. Moreover, viewing the text critically, we may suppose that this Hebrew singular nominative with a plural verb may be parallel with Genesis i. 1, where the plural nominative properly rendered by “God,” not Gods, agrees with the singular verb “created.” Bishop Wordsworth thinks that the plural verb in this passage, “the desire of all nations shall come,” may be explained by the fact that its antecedent the singular nominative involves the idea of Christ's twofold nature, His Deity as well as His humanity.

This longing for “the desire of all nations” increased amongst the devoted children of Israel as the time drew nigh, when the promised Shiloh should come, as we find in the case of Simeon, who was “waiting for the consolation of Israel, when the Holy Ghost was upon him,” and also in that of “one Anna, a prophetess, of the tribe of Aser,” who was at the same time “looking for redemption in Jerusalem.” So is it now with the faithful in the true Catholic Church. Christ is the desire of all holy souls, who long for nothing else than to please Him daily, to love Him more, and to worship Him better, and who are thus said by St. Peter to be “looking for and (by that act of faith, hope and love) to be hasting (not “unto,” as in the Authorized Version) the coming of the day of God, when He will come whose right it is to reign, to “make up His jewels” and to take His bride home.

Malachi’s prophecy—“Behold, I will send my messenger,

---

2 2 Pet. iii. 12.
and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in" (iii. 1), has been variously interpreted by the modern Jews. Some regard it as an angel; others of the prophet Malachi himself; others again of their ideal Messiah Ben Joseph, whom they think will precede the Messiah Ben-David. But one very learned Rabbi Tanchum (quoted by Pococke) declares the opinion of the most ancient Jews to have been that "my messenger" referred to Elijah the Tishbite, of whom the last words of Malachi are spoken—

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." 3 "This," says Rabbi Tanchum, "is without doubt a promise that there should appear a prophet in Israel a little before the time of the appearance of the Messiah; and some of the learned do think that he is Elijah himself. . . . Others think it meant some great prophet like him in degree, and therefore called by the name of Elijah." So Jerome, who flourished in the fifth century, mentions in his Commentary on Malachi, that the Jews of his time "understood the prophecy of Elias the prophet." 4

It is evident from the synoptic Gospels that John the Baptist was to be acknowledged by the faithful as the fulfilment in a spiritual sense of Malachi's prophecy concerning Elijah; though our Lord's words, "If ye will receive it, this is Elijah, which was for to come," 5 seem to show that we are to look for a more complete fulfilment in the appearance of the literal Elijah, previous to the Jew's recognition of the true Messiah, at the time of Christ's second advent.

That portion of Malachi's prophecy which relates to the appearance of the Messiah in the Temple on Mount Zion, which was standing in its beauty when Malachi wrote, at the very time when Daniel's prophecy respecting the rebuilding of Jerusalem was accomplished, is thus recorded—"The Lord, whom ye seek, shall

---

3 Malachi iv. 5.

4 Quoted by the Bishop of Winchester, On the Prophecies of the Messiah, p. 47, from Pococke's Com. on Malachi iv. 5.

5 Matt. xi. 14; xvii. 11, 12; Mark ix. 12, 13; Luke i. 15—17.
suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in; behold, he shall come, says the Lord of hosts."6 There are three comings of Christ into the Temple specially mentioned by the evangelists. 1. When brought by His earthly parents to be circumcised, and thus admitted into covenant with God, according to the law of Moses. 2. When He was found by His parents "in the Temple, sitting in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions."7 3. When "Jesus went into the Temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the Temple, and said unto them, It is written, My house shall be called the house of prayer; but ye have made it a den of thieves."8 The true dates for these three appearances of Christ in the Temple, as we shall endeavour to prove in the next chapter, are respectively, b.c. 7—6; a.d. 5—6; and a.d. 29. The second appearance, when Jesus was "twelve years old," a.d. 5—6, is the one to which apparently the prophecy points, as that was the very year when Archelaus, the son of Herod the Great, was deposed by the Emperor Augustus Caesar, when the sceptre may be said to have finally departed from Judah; when the Jews were deprived of the power of life and death; when the kingdom of David was reduced to a Roman province, and the last semblance of independence passed away for ever from the guilty tribes of the house of Israel. Then the promised Shiloh "suddenly," or unawares, appeared in the Temple on Mount Zion.

---

6 Malachi iii. 1. The decree for rebuilding Jerusalem was given to Nehemiah, b.c. 444, and the first "seven weeks," or a period of forty-nine years, appears to have been allotted to the rebuilding of the city; and this must have been finished b.c. 405, the exact time when Malachi wrote.

7 Luke ii. 46.

8 Matt. xxi. 12, 13.
CHAPTER XV.

MESSIANIC PROPHECY — THE DEATH OF THE MESSIAH.

That the Jews were in expectation of the promised Shiloh at the epoch of our Saviour's appearance in the Temple is evident from the assertions of their two principal historians, whose works have come down to us. Thus Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria, who was born B.C. 25, comments on Exodus xxiii. 20, where the Angel of God is spoken of as follows:

"God as the Shepherd and King conducts all things according to law and righteousness, having established over them His right Word, even His only begotten Son, who, as the Viceroy of the great King, takes care of and ministers to the sacred flock. For it is written, Behold I AM, and I will send my Angel before thy face to keep thee in the way." 9

So Josephus, who was born about sixty years after Philo, and who took so leading a part in the war which ended so disastrously for his nation, when relating the history of Pontius Pilate's government of Judæa, says—

"Now there lived at this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to Him many, both Jews and Gentiles. This was the Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those who loved Him at the first did not forsake Him; for He appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousands other wonders concerning Him. And the Christians, so named after Him, are flourishing at this day. 1

9 Phil. Jud. de Agricult., vol. i., p. 308; Mangey's edit.
1 Joseph., Antiq. xviii. 3, § 3. Although the genuineness of this passage has been disputed, the evidence in its favour is very strong. It is cited by Eusebius, Jerome, Rufinus, and others, and is found in all the copies of Josephus' works now extant, whether in MS., or printed. It is found in the ancient Hebrew version, preserved in the Vatican library, which Cardinal Baronius (Annal Eccl., A.D. 134) notices was marked with an obelus, and which only could have been done by a Jew.
Though the evidence in favour of Christ fulfilling the prophecies relating to the appearance of the promised Shiloh, at the time when the sceptre was departing from Judah, is so very clear, still more clear and decisive is the evidence respecting the exact time when the Messiah was to die, or to be "cut off," as a sacrifice for the sins of the people. So minute is the prophecy respecting this solemn event, the most awful and awe-inspiring in the annals of the world, that not merely the year, but also the month, the day, and the hour are all marked in the Divine counsels, and were revealed to Daniel, when he spake by the Holy Ghost, as to the exact moment when this most important occurrence would take place.

Sir Isaac Newton is reported to have said that the foundation of the Christian religion rested upon that famous prophecy relating to the cutting off or death of the predicted Messiah, commonly termed "Daniel's seventy weeks." Adopting a more literal rendering of the passage than that of the Authorised Version, the prophecy reads thus:—

Dan. ix. ver. 24. "Seventy heptads have been divided unto thy people, and upon thy holy city, to complete the apostasy, to perfect the sin-offering, to make reconciliation for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most Holy."

Ver. 25. "Know therefore and understand, from the time of issuing the decree to rebuild Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven heptads and sixty-two heptads; the street shall be again built, and the walls, even in times of trouble."

Ver. 26. "And after, or at the close of the sixty-two heptads, MESSIAH SHALL BE CUT OFF, but not for himself: and the people of a prince who is coming shall destroy the city and the temple; and the end shall be in an overwhelming flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined."

Ver. 27. "And one heptad shall confirm a covenant with many; and in the one-half of the heptad he shall cause sacrifice and offering to cease, and upon the wing (of the temple) there shall be the abomination of desolation, even until the consummation, and that which is determined shall be poured out upon the desolate."

The events predicted in Daniel's prophecy of the seventy weeks may be summarily described as follows:—

1. That there would be a period of 70 heptads, or 490 years,
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determined in the counsels of the Almighty, for both judgment and mercy upon the chosen race, i.e., the twelve tribes of Israel.

2. That the exact time of the cutting off or death of the Messiah as a sacrifice and offering for sin was fixed by taking the decree for rebuilding Jerusalem as a starting point.

3. That the whole period of 490 years is thus divided in the prophecy—

(a) The rebuilding of Jerusalem would take 7 heptads, or 49 years.

(b) To the death of the Messiah, an additional 62 " 434 "

(c) Final heptad, in the midst of which sacrifice would cease. 1 " 7 "

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{Periods} & \text{Years} \\
70 & 490 \\
\end{array}
\]

As the final heptad, or 7 years, has nothing to do with the previous 69 heptads, or 483 years, it will be sufficient to point to the historical fact that Josephus mentions, that after the invasion of Judah by the Romans, and the war had lasted about three years and a half, when—

"Titus had ordered his soldiers to dig up the foundations of the tower of Antonia, and Josephus was brought as a prisoner before him, on that very day which was the 17th of Panemus (July), the sacrifice, called the daily sacrifice, had failed, and had not been offered to God, for want of men to offer it." 2

It seems, therefore, clear that the daily sacrifice, which had never ceased to be offered by the children of Israel, from the time when they were brought out from Egypt by the Almighty, under the leadership of Moses, with the exception of two periods, viz., the 70 years' captivity in Babylon, and the three years when Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170—168, polluted the Temple with the abomination of desolation,3 did really cease when the Romans took Jerusalem, and has never been offered since, in accordance

2 Joseph., J. B., lib. vi., c. 2, § 1. Whiston, the editor of Josephus, says, "This was a remarkable day indeed, the 17th of Panemus, when, according to Daniel's prophecy, the Romans in half a week caused the sacrifice and oblation to cease (Dan. ix. 27). For, from the month of February, A.D. 66, about which time Vespasian entered on this war to this very time, was just three and a half years. See Bp. Lloyd's Tables of Chronology" (Whiston's Josephus, vol. iv., p. 184).

3 Compare 1 Maccabees i. 54, with 2 Maccabees x. 5.
with the prophecies of Moses that the judgment upon rebellious Israel should be of "long continuance," and of Hosea that "the children of Israel should abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice." As the explanation of verse 27 of Daniel's prophecy respecting the final portion of the "seventy weeks" belongs, as some think, to unfulfilled prophecy, I purposely avoid entering upon it here, as the subject of the present chapter relates exclusively to that portion of the prophecy which refers to the time when the Messiah was to die for the sins of the people.

The subject of Daniel's prophecy relating to the cutting off of the Messiah has presented no little difficulty to commentators, generally for two reasons. First, from being wedded too much to Ptolemy's Canon; and, secondly, from accepting the ordinary date of A.D. 33 as the year of the crucifixion, as there is overwhelming evidence, which I shall make clear to my readers, that this is four years too late.

The first thing to ascertain is to which decree the prophecy refers, as the *terminus a quo* or starting point from which the ancient Church had to compute the time when the Messiah was to be cut off, or die for the sins of the people. There are four decrees, as we gather from Scripture, relative to the Jew's return to Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity. The first was in the first year of Cyrus, and related solely to permission to rebuild the Temple (Ezra, ch. i.). The second was in the second year of Darius, and was a repetition of Cyrus' decree, because the building had been suspended through the machinations of the enemies of the Jews (Ezra, ch. vi.). The third was in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, and related to the adornment of the Temple. The fourth decree, which was granted to Nehemiah by King Artaxerxes in the 20th year of his reign, is the only one recorded in Scripture which in any way bears upon Daniel's prophecy, which foretold that the date of the Messiah's death was to be computed from the time of "issuing the decree to restore and build Jerusalem." All the three previous decrees

---

4 Deut. xxviii. 39; Hos. iii. 4.
related to the building and adornment of the Temple; this last one solely to the rebuilding of the city, the streets and "the walls" of which are specially mentioned in order to distinguish it from the previous ones, and to show that it is the one which alone fulfils the prophecy. And it certainly seems strange that so many interpreters of Daniel should have overlooked this, the most important point in the prophecy for determining the time when the prediction of Messiah being cut off should have its fulfilment.

Let us now note the words of Scripture respecting the condition of Jerusalem at the time that the decree was granted. The book of Nehemiah opens with the statement that Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes, was in attendance on the Persian king, in Shushan, the palace, in the 20th year of his reign, when he received a visit from certain men of Judah who had recently been at Jerusalem, and of whom he eagerly inquired "concerning the Jews which had escaped, and concerning Jerusalem." They replied that the Jews of Jerusalem were "in great affliction," for though over 80 years had elapsed since Cyrus had given permission to the captives throughout his empire to return to Jerusalem and rebuild the Temple, they were obliged to confess that "the walls of Jerusalem" were still broken down as they were left by Nebuchadnezzar, "and the gates thereof burnt with fire." This had such an effect on the mind of Nehemiah that the king inquired the cause of his melancholy; to whom his cupbearer replied—

"Why should not my countenance be sad, when the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lieth waste, and the gates thereof are consumed with fire? If it please the king, and if thy servant have found favour in thy sight, that thou wouldest send me unto Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchres, that I may build it." Then the king granted Nehemiah's request, and issued orders unto "Asaph, the keeper of the king's forest," to supply "timber to make beams for the gates of the palace, and for the walls of the city. And the king granted me according to the good hand of my God upon me." All this took place "in the month Nisan, in the 20th year of Artaxerxes the king." 5

Very touching is the account which Nehemiah gives of his actions on his arrival at Jerusalem:

5 Neh. ii. 1, et seq.
"I arose," he says, "in the night, I and some few men with me; neither told I any man what my God hath put in my heart to do at Jerusalem; and I went out by night by the gate of the valley, and viewed the walls of Jerusalem, which were broken down. And the rulers knew not whither I went, or what I did. Then said I to them, Ye see the distress that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire: come, and let us build up the wall of Jerusalem, that we be no more a reproach."

Enough has now been stated from Scripture to show that in the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes the walls of Jerusalem, which had been destroyed nearly one and a half century before at the time of Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion, had not been rebuilt; and that it is from that year we have the starting point, or terminus a quo, from which to compute the exact date when the Messiah would be cut off. The point to be considered, then, what is the true date for the accession of Artaxerxes, and consequently that of the twentieth year of his reign?

The Canon of Ptolemy places the accession of Artaxerxes B.C. 464; his twentieth year would therefore fall B.C. 444. Add to this 69 heptads, or 483 years, to bring it to the year when the Messiah was to die, and we arrive at A.D. 49! Commentators seeing the impossibility of accepting that year as the true date of the crucifixion, have proposed, in defiance of the positive statements in the book of Nehemiah, to accept the decree given in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, or thirteen years earlier, although that decree, as we have seen, relates exclusively to the service of the Temple, and has nothing to do with the broken down walls of Jerusalem! This, however, would have the effect of dating the crucifixion thirteen years earlier than A.D. 39, and consequently of fixing it at A.D. 26. But, as this is historically impossible, some interpreters, as Dr. Pusey, for example, have thought it sufficient to accept that year as the date of Christ’s baptism, and to interpret the succeeded seven years as fulfilling the final heptad of Daniel’s prophecy of the seventy weeks, terminating with the death of the Messiah, A.D. 23, according to the commonly accepted date for the year of the crucifixion.

We have already seen that Daniel’s terminus a quo, or starting point of the prophecy of the “seventy weeks,” is the
decree for rebuilding the city, the gates, and the broken down walls of Jerusalem, which occurred when Artaxerxes, in the twentieth year of his reign, granted permission to Nehemiah to begin the work. The point first to be considered, then, is the exact date of Artaxerxes' accession, which Ptolemy's Canon, drawn up between five and six centuries after that event, dates the accession B.C. 464; consequently his twentieth year would fall B.C. 444. But Thucydides, who was born B.C. 471, and who consequently may be regarded as a contemporary witness, says, particularly, that when Themistocles fled from Greece to the court of the Persian king, Artaxerxes had just ascended the throne, the words of the historian being that on his arrival in the kingdom he "sent letters to Artaxerxes, the son of Xerxes, who had newly come to the throne, to the following effect:—

'I, Themistocles, am coming to thee, who, of all the Grecians, as long as I was forced to resist thy father that invaded us, have done your house the most damages,' &c."6

With Thucydides, Charon of Lampsacus, his contemporary, agrees respecting Artaxerxes being on the throne when Themistocles arrived in Persia. The question, therefore, to be considered is in what year did that event take place. Thucydides does not enables us to fix it to any certain year, simply making it to coincide with the time when the Athenians were besieging Naxos; and Diodorus Siculus7 (writing in the first century B.C.) says that other events, specified by Thucydides as taking place at that time, occurred during the consulship of Poplicola and Nautius Rutilus, B.C. 475; and one year later than his ostracism from Athens, which he dates during the consulship of Tricostus and Savilius, B.C. 476.8 Eusebius, who flourished in the fourth century A.D., considers the flight of Thucydides to have taken place in the fourth year of the seventy-sixth

---

6 Thucydides, Hist. of the Grecian War, lib. i.
Olympiad B.C. 473. Hence, the *Universal Biographie* dates the death of Themistocles B.C. 470. From these several statements we may safely conclude that Themistocles was ostracised and banished from Athens, B.C. 476, and that he reached the court of Persia shortly after the Athenians had besieged Naxos, B.C. 474–3, when he found Artaxerxes was on the throne. Plutarch, writing in the first century A.D. the *Life of Themistocles*, relates that both:

"Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus say that Xerxes was then dead, and that it was to his son Artaxerxes that Themistocles addressed himself; but Ephorus and others write that Xerxes was then upon the throne. *The opinion of Thucydides seems most agreeable to chronology, though the matter is not perfectly well settled.*"

Now Thucydides does not say that Xerxes was dead, but only that Themistocles addressed himself to Artaxerxes his son, who had then begun to reign. And the explanation of the difficulty is simply this, that in the twelfth year of his reign Xerxes took his son Artaxerxes as partner in the kingdom, just as Nabopolassar treated Nebuchadnezzar, or as Nabonides took his son Belshazzar, and Augustus Caesar took his successor Tiberius into partnership; and it is by recognizing these historical facts that we are enabled to understand texts of Scripture, which otherwise would be difficult to explain.

Counting, therefore, as Thucydides and Charon of Lampsacus did, the accession of Artaxerxes from the time he was admitted into partnership with his father Xerxes, in the twelfth year of the latter's reign, we may date the accession of his son at B.C. 474, and the twentieth year, when he gave permission to Nehemiah to rebuild the city and the walls of Jerusalem, at B.C. 455. Moreover, as this permission was given, as Nehemiah states, "in the month Nisan," which was the month of the Passover, we have to count seven heptads and sixty-two heptads, sixty-nine in all, i.e., 483 years from the Passover of B.C. 455, and we are brought to the Passover of A.D. 29, when according to Daniel's prophecy the Messiah was to be cut off.

Modern research has confirmed the view of Artaxerxes having been taken into partnership with his father in the twelfth year of his reign in a very singular manner. On the Cosseir road in Egypt, leading from Hammamet to the Red Sea, stands a monument, with an hieroglyphic inscription, recording that a certain functionary, named "Adenes," Lord of Coptos, held office in Egypt during the reigns of three Persian kings, viz., six years under Cambyses, thirty-six under Darius Hystospes, and twelve under his son Xerxes. Whiston, writing on this subject upwards of one and a half century ago, justly supposes that Xerxes admitted his son Artaxerxes into partnership in the twelfth year of his reign, under the direction of his prime minister Artaphanes. Nine years later Artaphanes sought to set up for himself, having a sort of regent power for seven months; when he was slain by Artaxerxes, who thereby had a second beginning of his reign, counting from his father's death, which took place according to Ptolemy's Canon in the twentieth year of his reign. Thus we are enabled to understand that Nehemiah dates the years of Artaxerxes' reign from the time when he was taken into partnership with his father, some eight or nine years earlier that the reckoning in Ptolemy's Canon.

Before considering the evidence in confirmation of the opinion that the Messiah was cut off A.D. 29, it may be well to see how the year A.D. 33 came to be fixed upon as the generally received date, according to the headings of our English Bibles, as the year of the crucifixion. Hales considers that Roger Bacon, the renowned friar of the thirteenth century, is "the earliest authority" for assuming the crucifixion to have taken place A.D. 33, because he "found by computation that the paschal full moon A.D. 33 fell on Friday; and this circumstance led him and several others to conclude that this was the year of the crucifixion." Roger Bacon, however, much in advance

1 Burton's Excerpta Hieroglyphica, pl. viii. and xiv.; Lepsius Denkmaler, pl. iii., bl. 283; Dr. Birch's note in Loftus' Chaldea and Susiana, p. 411; Dr. Hinck's article in the Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy, ph. 28.
2 See Whiston's Literal Accomplishment of Scripture Prophecies, p. 73.
of his age as was undoubtedly the case, was mistaken in supposing that the “full moon” falling on a Friday was the test for settling the year when the Messiah was cut off, as Scripture shows that it was on the fourteenth day of the moon that the Passover was commanded to be kept, and that “Christ our Passover” was sacrificed on that day according to the law; besides, the astronomical tables prove, as will presently be seen, that the fourteenth day of Nisan, the Passover month, fell on a Wednesday, in the year A.D. 33.

I am inclined to think that the popular error about the crucifixion having occurred A.D. 33 is to be traced to the faulty computation of Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman monk of the sixth century, who made such a muddle of the date of the nativity. He was misled probably by Eusebius having placed the crucifixion “in the nineteenth year of Tiberius,” which answers to A.D. 33; whereas it is quite clear from his Ecclesiastical History that Eusebius dates the crucifixion in the year answering to A.D. 29. Let me here take the opportunity of showing from the astronomical tables the days for several years on which the Passover was kept, and the Saviour rose from the grave, which all are agreed occurred on the first day of the week, which we now call Sunday.

It will be seen by the annexed tables that the only year out of seven years, when the seventeenth Nisan fell on Sunday, the first day of the week, was in the year A.D. 29, the undoubted year when “Christ our Passover was sacrificed for us.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D. H. M. S.</td>
<td>Mar. 14</td>
<td>Saturday, March 27</td>
<td>Tuesday, March 30</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3 15 17 53</td>
<td>4 Thursday</td>
<td>17 Sunday</td>
<td>20 B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10 1 37</td>
<td>22 Tuesday, April</td>
<td>4 Friday, April</td>
<td>7 A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>11 18 50 14</td>
<td>12 Sunday, March</td>
<td>25 Wednesday, Mar.</td>
<td>28 G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0 3 38 51</td>
<td>1 Friday</td>
<td>14 Monday</td>
<td>17 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>19 1 51 31</td>
<td>19 Wednesday, April</td>
<td>1 Saturday, April</td>
<td>4 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>8 10 0 7</td>
<td>8 Sunday, March</td>
<td>21 Wednesday, Mar.</td>
<td>24 C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 I have given in my First and Second Advent, p. 102, a table of the new moon at Jerusalem, according to Furgusson’s tables, calculated with sufficient minuteness to determine an eclipse; by which it appears that the
Thus, then, it would appear, as far as astronomy can throw any light on the question, that the cutting off of the Messiah must have taken place at the Passover of the year answering to A.D. 29. This will naturally lead us to consider all the evidence which can be adduced in support of this view, which is generally accepted by most scholars in the present day. The first question to be considered is the true date of the nativity, as that will help very materially to determine the true date of the crucifixion. The common opinion that Christ was born on December the 25th B.C., has been so long accepted by Christendom generally, that any deviation from this opinion is regarded by unlearned persons as almost a heresy; but it is as certain as any thing can be in this uncertain world that the crucifixion did not take place at the Passover of A.D. 33; and it is more than probable that the nativity did not occur on December 25.

Our common era rests, as is well known, upon a computation made by Dionysius Exiguus, a Roman “monk” of the sixth century, as his friend Cassiodorus terms him—not “abbot,” as Bede writes. It was known in England as early as the eighth century, but did not become general until the twelfth. It commenced with the day of the Annunciation, or Lady Day, March 25th, B.C. 1; and the first year of the Christian era, according to this computation, terminates in March, A.D. 1. This rule of commencing the year prevailed in this country until the reformation of the calendar in 1752, when it returned to the ancient mode of beginning the year on the first of January.

The computation of Dionysius obtained general acceptance until the middle of the seventeenth century, when the great work of the celebrated Protestant divine, Archbishop Usher, showed the impossibility of its being correct. And so faulty is it proved to be, that we find the English chroniclers at the time of its introduction into England computing that the nativity

exact time of the new moon at Jerusalem for March, A.D. 29, o.s., was March 4, at 17 minutes 53 seconds after 3 A.M.; and the 14th day of the moon on Passover was necessarily on the 17th.
must have taken place A.D. 6, the year when Archelaus was banished by Augustus Cæsar to Gaul, and ten years after the death of Herod the Great. Thus, Bede in the seventh century, the writer of the famous Saxon chronicle in the ninth, Odericus Vitalis in the eleventh, and Matthew of Westminster in the fourteenth century, alike agree in asserting that the nativity took place in the sixtieth year after Cæsar's invasion of Britain, which answers to A.D. 6, or to the third year of the 193d Olympiad, which equally answers to A.D. 6.  

Ignorance of the science of chronology was one of the characteristic features of the dark ages. The date of Cæsar's invasion of Britain, B.C. 55, is now as well-known as that of the Norman Conquest, in A.D. 1066; and when a chronicler tells us that the nativity took place in a year answering to ten years after Herod the Great was dead and buried, it simply proves the wretched state of chronology in that age.

As it is impossible to calculate the true date of the nativity without first ascertaining the year of Herod's death, we place in a brief compass the principal events connected with his reign and our Saviour's life on earth, giving the consular years, when so stated by Josephus, and Dion Cassius, and others, in confirmation of such chronology, commencing with the first year of Herod's reign, and terminating seventy years later with the date of the crucifixion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B.C.</th>
<th>CONSULS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Herod receives the kingdom of Judæa from the Roman Senate. Calvinus II. Pollio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Herod and Soeius, the Roman general, capture Jerusalem. Agrippa and Gallus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Temple of Janus closed by Augustus the first time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; second &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; third &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Nativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The death of Herod the Great and accession of Archelaus, &quot;in the room of his father Herod.&quot; 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Bede's Eccl. Hist., lib. i., c. 4; The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, § 2.
6 Matt. ii. 22.
A.D.

6 Banishment of Archelaus, in the tenth year of his reign, when the sceptre finally departed from the Jews, and Judæa became a Roman province. In the same year Christ entered into the Temple “when He was twelve years old.”

25 Pontius Pilate, governor of Judæa, in the fifteenth year of the hegemon 8 of Tiberius Caesar; when Christ began his three and a half years' ministry; and was baptized by John the Baptist in the river Jordan in the autumn of this year, “when Jesus began to be about thirty years of age.”

29 The Crucifixion at the Passover, on the fourteenth of Nisan, and seventeenth of March, when the Messiah was cut off, at the termination of the sixty-ninth week, or 483 years after the decree for rebuilding Jerusalem granted by Artaxerxes in the twentieth year of his reign, B.C. 455.

The next step in our investigation will be to ascertain as accurately as possible the year in which our Saviour Christ was born. There are three modern authors 1 who have gone deeper into this matter than perhaps any other who have made the chronology of our Lord's life on earth their special study, and they appear to have almost unanimously arrived at the conclusion that the weight of evidence is in favour of the year B.C. 7, 2 being the true date of the nativity of our Lord Jesus

7 Luke ii. 42.

8 I have preferred the word hegemon to the word “reign” of the Authorized Version, in order to show the distinction between the fifteenth year of Tiberius, counting from the time when he was associated in the empire with Augustus, about three years before the latter's death, August 19th, A.D. 14, and the fifteenth year of his sole reign, in the Passover of which year Christ was crucified. Lardner, in his great work on the Credibility of the Gospel History, chap. iii., has discussed this subject with great learning and complete success.


2 Lardner, however, seems doubtful whether the nativity may not have occurred in either of the years B.C. 7—5.
Christ. Supposing that His birth occurred either in September or December of that year, and that His baptism took place some time during A.D. 25, He would then have reached the age of thirty-one, which sufficiently agrees with the words of the evangelist, that "Jesus Himself began to be about thirty years of age" when He was baptized by John in the river Jordan.  

It is a remarkable fact that we should have such conflicting testimony respecting the year of the nativity, while on the date of the crucifixion it is just the reverse, proving apparently that this was purposely designed, in order that those who carefully study "the sure word of prophecy" may be enabled to see in it the exact fulfilment of the prediction respecting the cutting off of the Messiah, in the death of Christ on the cross of Calvary.

The following list will convey an idea of the differences amongst ancient and modern authors respecting the date of the nativity—

1. Dionysius Exiguus, fifth century; Dr. Pusey, nineteenth century.
2. Origen, third century; Henry of Huntingdon, twelfth century.
3. Eusebius, fourth century.
5. Clinton, nineteenth century.
6. Bede, seventh century; the Saxon Chronicle, ninth century.

3. Ethelward, tenth century.
4. Orosius, fifth century; Odericus-Vitalis, eleventh century; Matthew of Westminster, fourteenth century.

(1.) The first clue to guide us in our search is the historical fact mentioned by St. Matthew (ii. 1, 2), that "When Jesus was born in Bethlehem, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is He that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen His star in the east, and are come to worship Him." Have we in these words an account of a star miraculously created by omnipotent power for the occasion, or some natural appearance in the heavens, which God in His Providence used as a means of indicating to the magi the birth-

---

3 Luke iii. 23.
place of His only Son? While all Christians admit God's power to create a world of light in a moment of time, if it so pleased Him, there is no reason to suppose that the evangelist's account of the star refers to any thing more than a natural appearance in the sky, sufficiently clear to guide the magi on their holy mission to worship the Prince of Peace.

We know such has long been a common belief among the Jews. Abarbanel, a distinguished rabbi of the fifteenth century, relates as a current tradition amongst his brethren of the seed of Abraham, that no conjunction could be of mightier import than that of the planets Jupiter and Saturn, which were, he says, "in conjunction, a.m. 2365, before the birth of Moses, in the sign of Pisces, and were a most significant sign for the Jews." And hence, he concludes, that the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in that same sign in his own time (a.d. 1463) betoken the near approach of the birth of the Messiah.

Ideler, in his useful Manual of Chronology, having procured an exact calculation of the conjunctions of Jupiter and Saturn, as investigated by Kepler, whose calculations have been verified in our time by Professor Pritchard and Sir George Airy, formerly Astronomer Royal, shows that the two planets, Jupiter and Saturn, were in conjunction in the month of May, a.u.c. 747, which answers to b.c. 7, in the twentieth degree of the constellation Pisces. A second conjunction occurred in September of the same year; and a third in the month of December, both in the same constellation. Alford remarks on this conjunction in his Greek Testament—

"Supposing the magi to have seen the first of these conjunctions, they saw it actually in the East; for on the twenty-ninth of May it would rise three and a half hours before sunrise (Pritchard). If they then took their journey, and arrived at Jerusalem in a little more than five months (the journey took Ezra, vii. 9, four months), if they performed the route from Jerusalem to Bethlehem in the evening, as is implied, the December conjunction in 15° of Pisces, would be before them in the direction of Bethlehem. These circumstances would seem to form a remarkable coincidence with the history in our text."

Such is the conclusion which Dean Alford has justly drawn

---

respecting the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the year B.C. 7.

(2.) We learn from the evangelist Matthew (ii. 13), that Joseph and Mary were commanded to flee into Egypt with the child Jesus, because of Herod's intention to destroy Him. Moreover, we are told they remained in Egypt until Joseph had a dream commanding him to take the young child and return to the "land of Israel: for they are dead which sought the young child's life" (v. 20). It was an old tradition, mentioned by Epiphanius, that Joseph and Mary remained with the holy child "two years in Egypt." If they were two years in Egypt after the massacre of the Innocents, which must have been one year sooner, as we shall presently consider, this would place the nativity three or four years earlier, as Sulpitius remarks, than the death of Herod, who had perpetrated the dreadful deed. Hence, the accuracy of the evangelist's expression, "They are dead which sought the young child's life," evidently pointing to the death of Herod and his eldest son Antipater, who had arrived in Judea from Rome a few months before his father's death. Immediately on his arrival he was cast into prison, and after trial convicted of conspiring against Herod, and by his orders strangled only five days before his own death. As Herod died B.C. 4, and his son Antipater was put to death only five days before him, this would necessarily fix the nativity B.C. 7.

(3.) Matthew (ii. 16) likewise tells us that when Herod had "enquired of the magi diligently" respecting the time when the star appeared, and thinking himself "mocked" because they did not return from Bethlehem, where he had sent them, he "was exceedingly wroth, and sent forth and slew all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according to the time which he had diligently enquired of the wise men."

Although there is but little proof from the works of secular historians of this cruel slaughter of the Innocents, yet there is a saying of the Emperor Augustus Caesar, recorded by the Latin

---

5 Josephus, Antiq. xvii., c. 8, § 1.
poet Macrobius, which seems to bear upon the subject, as he says—"When Augustus heard among those male infants about two years old, which Herod, the King of the Jews, ordered to be slain in Syria, that one of his sons was also murdered, he said, 'It is better to be Herod's hog than his son.'" Assuming that the journey of the magi to Jerusalem took the best part of one year, and that Herod's slaughter of the children of Bethlehem of the age of two years, this would serve to account for three years between the nativity and the death of Herod. And this view is confirmed by Josephus, in his mention of the remarkable fact that "when the whole Jewish nation took an oath to be faithful to Cæsar, and the interests of the king, these men (viz., the sect of the Pharisees), to the number of above six thousand, refused to swear. The king having imposed a fine upon them, the wife of Pheroras (his brother) paid the money for them; and they in return foretold that God having decreed to put an end to the government of Herod and his race, the kingdom would be transferred to herself, her husband and their children. Salome (Herod's sister) having discovered the plot, revealed it to the king; on which Herod put to death the most guilty of the Pharisees, and likewise slew every one of his own family who adhered to those things spoken by them." Lardner, who has discussed this matter most fully in his Credibility of the Gospel History, has come to this right conclusion—

"That the oath in Josephus, taken by all the Jewish nation, is the same thing with the taxing or enrolment mentioned by St. Luke; and I think that this oath refers to a census made in Judæa."

This "taxing," I shall endeavour to show, took place in the year B.C. 7.

(4.) St. Luke says—"It came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrolment made when Quirinius was governor of Syria." I have adopted here the rendering of the Revised Version in preference to that of the Authorized Version, simply because I think, in this instance, it

6 Macrobius, Saturnalia, lib. ii., c. 4. 
7 Josephus, Antiq., xvii. 2, § 4. 
8 Lardner, vol. i., p. 299. 
9 Luke ii. 1, 2.
conveys a more accurate description of St. Luke's meaning than our own deservedly venerated Authorized Version.

Passing by the difference between these two versions in the reading of a certain name, whether Cyrenius or Quirinius, as they are evidently the same person, we have to consider the exact meaning of St. Luke's words, as this text forms one of the most disputed passages in the whole of Scripture. We may judge this to be the case, by knowing that Dr. Lardner, in his _Credibility of the Gospel History_, book ii., chap. i., entitled, "Objections against Luke ii. 1, 2 considered," gives upwards of two hundred and forty pages to answer them; but it is done in a masterly way, and will well repay careful persual by any who are interested in the subject. It is one of the passages which the Rationalists have delighted to point their sharpest arrows, with the hope of convicting God's Word of speaking falsely. Hence Strauss, in his _Life of Jesus_, points derisively to this passage of St. Luke, as one of those points in which he desires to prove the Gospels guilty of contradiction; but, as a reviewer of Zumpt's able work on the same subject, _Das Geburtsjahr Christi_, has well said—

"Zumpt's success is complete in replying to a difficulty which some thirty years ago Dr. Strauss was gloating over, and declaring to be entirely insoluble; and now we behold it solved. Hence, we have another proof that Biblical studies are not as they were once regarded, a stationary science, but, like all other sciences, admit of progression and increase."¹

In order fully to comprehend the difficulties as well as the arguments in support of the true meaning of "Cyrenius' taxing," as related by St. Luke, these two works, Dr. Lardner's and Zumpt's, ought to be carefully studied. It will be sufficient if I now give the results of what these two great scholars of England and Germany have discovered for the elucidation of this difficult text.

It has now been clearly proved that Cyrenius or Quirinius was _thrice_ sent by the Emperor Augustus into Syria. 1. To make an enrolment of the citizens during the time that Saturninus was President of Syria, as was occasionally done in

¹ See _Quarterly Review_ of April 1871, p. 512.
other proved instances. 2. When he was sent as president for the first time in the year of Herod's death. 3. When sent a second time with the same power in the year of Archelaus' banishment to Gaul. Hence, Zumpt has succeeded in proving the list of governors of Syria, with the dates of their respective appointments, as follows:

- C. Sentius Saturninus became President of Syria B.C. 9
- P. Quinctilius Varus succeeded him " 6
- P. Sulpicius Quirinius (for the first time) " 4
- M. Lollius A.D. 1
- C. Marcius Censorinus " 4
- P. Sulpicius Quirinius (for the second time) " 6

We have already seen that Eusebius in his Chronicon, or it may be only his copyist, committed the grave mistake of dating the nativity the year that Quirinius was sent by a decree of the Senate, i.e., for the second time, to Syria, in the year A.D. 6; though, as we shall see, Eusebius gives positive evidence of the crucifixion having taken place at the Passover of A.D. 29; this would make Him only 22 or 23 at the time of His death. The plain declaration of Tertullian, who was born within 120 years after the crucifixion, and who wrote when the Acta Pilate, the official records of Pilate's government, were still in existence, and to which he confidently appeals in confirmation of his statements, however, completely sets aside the mistaken conclusion of Eusebius; as he says, when speaking of the nativity, and in full acquaintance of what St. Luke had written in his Gospel on the subject:

"There is historical proof that at this very time a census had been taken in Judea by Sentius Saturninus, which might have satisfied all enquirers respecting the family and descent of Christ."2

The opinion that Cyrenius made the enrolment or census during the time that Saturninus was actually governor of Syria, is confirmed by the language of Justin Martyr, who flourished about half a century before Tertullian, as he says:

"That Jesus Christ was born in Bethlehem, you can ascertain from the registers of the taxing made under Cyrenius, your first Procurator in Judea."3

2 Tertullian, Against Marcion, lib. iv., c. 19.
3 Justin Martyr, First Apology, c. 34.
Remembering that this was addressed to the reigning Emperor Antoninus Pius, *circa* A.D. 143, and that the term Justin uses of Cyrenius being only *Procurator*, which means "a deputy governor," shows that he took the census at the time when another was president or governor of Syria, as was the case when Sentius Saturninus held the office, which he ceased to do when succeeded by Varus, B.C. 6. The time of Varus' arrival in Syria is fixed by the Antiochian medal, which bears a figure representing the city of Antioch, with the name Varus, and the Greek numerals XXV. As the people of Antioch dated their era from the battle of Actium, Sept. 2, B.C. 31, we learn that Varus must have come as governor to Syria before Sept. 2, B.C. 6. Saturninus must have left Syria, and the census of Cyrenius, taken during the presidency of the former, must have occurred before that date. On these grounds, therefore, we are warranted in placing the nativity as early as B.C. 7.

(5.) The prophecy of Isaiah (ix. 6, 7) affords fresh confirmation to the nativity date of B.C. 7, as it is written—"Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given. . . . and his name shall be called the Prince of Peace. Of the increase of His government and peace there shall be no end." It has been reasonably argued that the birth of the Messiah must have taken place at a time when there was universal peace throughout the vast empire, which then possessed the sovereignty of the civilized world. We know that the Romans had a custom of closing the temple of Janus when peace prevailed throughout the empire. This temple was closed three times during the reign of Augustus. The first time, within two years after the battle of Actium, B.C. 29. The second time, B.C. 8, when Augustus began to take a census in Rome, as the Monumentum Ancyranum in its second table shows; and when Cyrenius, as deputy governor in Syria, carried it out in the following year, which would fix the nativity to B.C. 7. And the third time, A.D. 14, the year of Augustus' death. This opinion is confirmed apparently by the testimony of Justin Martyr, who addressed his *First Apology* on behalf of the Christians to the "Emperor Antoninus Pius, to

*Canon Browne's Ordo Seclorum, pp. 44, 5.*
his son Verissimus the philosopher, and to Lucius the philosopher, the natural son of Caesar, and the adopted son of Pius." It is not quite clear in what year the Apology was published, as there are certain signs in the address which seem to imply that it must have been soon after the accession of Antoninus Pius, July 10th, A.D. 138; whereas at the close of the Apology he quotes an "Epistle of the Emperor Hadrian on behalf of the Christians," written some time before his death, at the above-mentioned date. This is followed by the Epistle of Antoninus to the Common Assembly of Asia, also on behalf of the persecuted Christians, written by a liberal-minded heathen philosopher.

This epistle happily bears a date, as it was written when the Emperor Antoninus was "consul for the third time," which occurred A.D. 140. Supposing the Apology was written within two or three years after this date, it would accord very well with the testimony which Justin bears to the time of the nativity, as he incidentally remarks in the Apology—"We say that Christ was born 150 years ago, under Cyrenius, and subsequently, in the time of Pontius Pilate, taught what we declare that He taught."5 Probably, Justin is here speaking in round numbers, and that if it was written in A.D. 140, the same year in which the Emperor Antoninus addressed his epistle to the Asiatics, it would date the nativity B.C. 9, or if written two years later, it would make it synchronize with the more correct date of B.C. 7. Although, therefore, we cannot say positively that this is the true year of the nativity, and none other, we may adopt the language of the American chronologer, who has probably made a more minute investigation into the whole subject than any other writer of ancient or modern times; and who concludes chapter x., on the "day of our Lord's nativity," in these words:—

"We cannot but lament that the influence of great names has established it almost as an axiom of modern times, that the date of our Saviour's birth is a subject of mere conjecture. We cannot but lament the cold, heartless indifference with which even such a critic as Archbishop Newcombe could say, 'Jesus was born, says Lardner, between the middle of August and

5 Justin Martyr, First Apology, ch. xlvi.
the middle of November, B.C. 6 or 5. We will take the mean time, October 1st.'!!!

"We cannot but lament that the Blessed Event, which the Holy Spirit from the beginning predicted—the blessed event of which patriarchs and prophets beheld afar off, and were glad—the blessed event on which the whole history of a ruined world is dependent—should be, even in thought, so shrouded in dark oblivion!

"Jesus completed his 30th year on the 25th of December preceding His baptism, when Agrippa and Lentulus were consuls (A.D. 25). . . Consequently He was born on the 25th of December, A.J.P. 4707 (B.C. 7), in the very same year in which Augustus shut the temple of Janus the third time, in token of Universal Peace." 6

If the evidence for fixing the date of the nativity at B.C. 7 be considered sufficiently clear, far more certain is the evidence which fixes the date of the crucifixion, when the predicted Messiah was to be cut off for the sins of mankind, at none other than the Passover of A.D. 29. The evidence may be summarily divided under four heads:—1. The Scriptural. 2. The Prophetical. 3. The Astronomical. 4. The Historical.

1. The evidence from Scripture.

All the direct evidence, which we can gather from Scripture respecting the exact time when the Messiah was cut off, is as follows:—That it was during the government of Pontius Pilate (A.D. 25—36), on the fourth Passover, after the baptism of Christ, which took place in the 15th year of the hegemon, or associated reign of Tiberius Caesar. 7 That year coincided with the Christian era A.D. 25, and, consequently, the fourth Passover, after A.D. 25, would fall A.D. 29, in that remarkable year when the twin brothers, Rufus and Rubellius, the Gemini, were consuls.

It is plain from St. John's Gospel that there were four Passovers during the time of our Lord's ministry on earth. The first, after Christ's baptism, when "the Jew's Passover was

6 Dr. Jarvis' Chronological Introduction to the History of the Church, p. 565.
7 The associated reign of Tiberius, when Augustus made him partner in the empire, commenced A.D. 11; the 15th year would therefore fall A.D. 25, and the 19th A.D. 29. Perhaps the earliest testimony respecting the year of the crucifixion, places it in the nineteenth year of Tiberius' reign.
at hand” (ch. ii. 13). The second, when Christ healed the man at Bethesda. “After this there was a feast of the Jews” (ch. v. 1). The third, just before Christ miraculously fed the 5000. “The Passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh” (ch. vi. 4). The fourth was when “Jesus, six days before the Passover (at which He was crucified), came to Bethany” (ch. xii. 1).

2. The evidence from Prophecy.

The only direct evidence we have under this head is contained in Daniel’s prophecy of the “seventy weeks,” which has already been considered at length in this treatise. Daniel was inspired to foretell that from the decree or permission given to rebuild the broken down walls of Jerusalem to the cutting off of the Messiah should be “seven weeks and threescore and two weeks,” or 69 weeks of years in all, i.e., 483 years. We have seen that the permission to rebuild Jerusalem was granted to Nehemiah by King Artaxerxes, in the 20th year of his reign (b.c. 455), in the month of Nisan, i.e., the Passover month; and counting from the Passover of that year to the Passover of A.D. 29, we have exactly the predicted 483 years.

3. The evidence from Astronomy.

Scripture teaches very clearly, as we have before shown, that on the 14th day of the first Jewish month they were required to slay the paschal lamb, on which day, and no other, according to the law of God, “Christ our Passover, was sacrificed for us.”8 Josephus testifies with what regularity the feast of the Passover was kept in his time;9 and, inasmuch as he was born within a few years of the crucifixion, his evidence is of peculiar value. The astronomical tables show that both in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, b.c. 455, and 483 years later, A.D. 29, the 14th day of the Passover month fell on the day answering to our 17th of March, the day on which some of the early Christians, as we shall presently bring evidence to prove, were wont to keep as the anniversary of our Lord’s crucifixion.

4. The evidence from History.

All the Christian writers of the first few centuries, with the exception of Epiphanes, are unanimous in their testimony that

8 1 Cor. v. 7, 8.
9 Josephus, Antiq. xi. 4, § 8.
the Messiah was cut off in the year when the Gemini were consuls, which answers in our era to A.D. 29, or they record some incident which makes it coincide with that year. The following list of writers, extending from the first century to the fifth century, will show how strong the evidence of history is in fixing the date of the crucifixion to the year A.D. 29.


It will be sufficient if we give the express testimony of three or four of these writers. The Gospel of Nicodemus, the first on our list, professes of course to have been written in the first century, and was probably composed early in the second century. The words of the author read as follows:—

"The death of Christ took place in the 19th year of Tiberius Caesar, emperor of the Romans, on the eighth of the calends of April, which is the 25th of March, during the consulship of Rufus and Rubellius (the Gemini), in the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad." 1

All the marks in this passage agree with the year A.D. 29, save the last, where the 202nd Olympiad is written by mistake for the 201st. The Greek copy reads the 15th in place of the 19th year of Tiberius' reign, which serves to confirm this, but the Greek and Latin copies alike place the crucifixion during the consulship of the Gemini, which fixes it unalterably to the year A.D. 29.

Justin Martyr does not mention the consular year, but contents himself with saying that Christ was born during the census taken by Cyrenius, suffered under Pilate, and arose from the grave on the day which we call Sunday, and on which we hold our assemblies for public worship. But what is worthy of note, he confidently appeals to the official and authentic Acta Pilati in confirmation of his statements, saying in his Apology, addressed to the Emperor Antoninus Pius—

1 Evangelium Nicodemi Græce, πεσολογον, quoted in Dr. Giles's Codex Apocryphus, Novi Testamenti, pt. i., p. 151.
"That Christ did these wonders of curing the dumb, and raising the
dead, &c., you can learn from the acts of Pontius Pilate." 2

The incidental notices of various secular historians prove
clearly that the public records of the Roman empire were laid
up in public buildings, just as in England they were formerly
preserved in the Tower of London, and now in the Public
Record Office of the present day. Consequently, as Dr. Jarvis
justly remarks—

"So long as Rome was safe from foreign foes, and independent of foreign
masters, that is, until the conquest of the Goths and other northern nations
in the fifth century of the Christian era, they were in perfect preservation." 3

TERTULLIAN, writing half a century later than Justin
Martyr, appeals with similar confidence to these Acta Pilati.
In his Apology, or defence of Christianity against heathenism,
addressed to the rulers of the Roman empire, when speaking
of the crucifixion, and of our Lord having predicted it, as the
Hebrew prophets had before predicted the same thing, says—

"At the moment of Christ's death the meridian light of the sun was
withdrawn. Those who did not know that this was predicted concerning
the Christ, thought that it was an eclipse; and reason not allowing this (on
account of the moon being full or nearly so at the time of the Passover), they
denied it, although you have in your archives a relation of that phenomenon."

Moreover, Tertullian after mentioning other particulars
respecting the crucifixion and Christ's resurrection, adds these
words:—

"Having given His disciples a commission to preach the Gospel through
the world, He was taken up to heaven—a fact far more certain than
the assertions of your Proculi concerning Romulae. All these things
Pilate did to Christ; and now being in fact a Christian according to
conviction, he sent a full account of Him to the reigning Emperor
Tiberius Caesar." 4

Tertullian would never have ventured to appeal to the
Roman archives, or to assert that Pilate gave an account
to Tiberius of the particulars he enumerates, unless he had
himself examined the archives, and read this original document.

In another of his works, Tertullian gives a minute account of

2 Justin Martyr, First Apology, chapters 46, 48, 67.
3 Chronological Introduction, &c., p. 374. 4 Tertullian, Apology, c. xxii,
the time of the crucifixion in the following words. When speaking "of the times of Christ's birth and death, and of the destruction of Jerusalem," as well as of Daniel's prophecy of the "seventy weeks," he continues, it was predicted of Christ in the Psalms (xxii. 16)—

"They pierced my hands and my feet. And this piercing was done within the time of the seventy hebdomads (weeks of years), under Tiberius Caesar, during the consulate of Rubellius Geminus and Rufus Geminus, in the month of March, at the time of the Passover, on the eighth day before the calends of April (March 25th), on the first day of unleavened bread, on which they slew the lamb at even, just as had been enjoined by Moses." 5

All these particulars, save March 25th, which will be explained presently, agree with the Passover of A.D. 29, and with no other years before or after.

LACTANTIUS, at the close of the third century, writes—

"In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, and during the consulship of the two Gemini, the Jews affixed Christ to the cross." 6

EUSEBIUS' testimony is to the same effect, though in his Chronicon he gives so many contradictory dates respecting the time of the crucifixion that it would be impossible to ascertain his meaning, were it not for his clear and decisive testimony in another work, which pins it down positively to A.D. 29; e.g., Eusebius dates the crucifixion "in the nineteenth year of Tiberius." If he means his associated reign, when he was taken as partner in the empire with Augustus, A.D. 11, it would synchronize with the year A.D. 29; but if he means Tiberius' sole reign, counting from the death of Augustus, it would place it four years later, A.D. 33. Eusebius, however, quotes the testimony of Phlegon,7 who records a solar eclipse in "the fourth year of the 203rd Olympiad," i.e., A.D. 36, to

5 Tertullian, Answer to the Jews, c. viii.
6 Lactantius, Institutions, lib. iv., § 10.
7 I have examined at length Phlegon's testimony, which Eusebius adduces in proof of the crucifixion, A.D. 36, in my First and Second Advent, pp. 30—33, and it will be sufficient to observe that had Eusebius possessed any elementary knowledge of astronomy he would not have committed the mistake he has made, as a solar eclipse could not have occurred when the moon is full, which it was or nearly so at every Passover, the time when Christ suffered.
prove that the crucifixion took place in that year. And, as if to make "confusion worse confounded," Eusebius quotes in addition the testimony of Josephus, to prove that it happened "about the time when Josephus relates, at the time of the feast of Pentecost, a voice was suddenly heard proceeding from the holy of holies, in the Temple of Jerusalem, crying, Let us depart hence; let us depart hence." 8 As Josephus records this as having happened the year that Titus captured Jerusalem, it would date the crucifixion in the year A.D. 70 ! And thus, according to our present reading of Eusebius' Chronicon, 9 we have four alternative dates, either A.D. 29, or 33, or 36, or 70, for the year when the Messiah suffered death on the cross of Calvary !

Eusebius has, however, left decisive testimony that he means the first of these four dates for the year of the crucifixion. For, in his Ecclesiastical History, he quotes from the archives of the kingdom of Edessa certain letters relating to the mission of the apostle Thaddeus to that city, and the wonderful cures which he effected there "after the ascension of Christ," and which letters, he adds, "were taken by us from the archives (of that city), and translated word for word from the Syriac language." After quoting these letters in full, Eusebius relates that Thaddeus' mission to Edessa took place "in the 340th year," i.e., of the era of the Seleucidae, or the Edessens. 1 That era commenced September 30th, B.C. 312; consequently the 340th year of the Seleucidae extended from September, A.D. 28, to September, A.D. 29, during which the crucifixion, the ascension, and the visit of Thaddeus the apostle to Edessa, must have taken place, according to the unexceptionable testimony of the official archives of that city.

The last testimony which I shall now adduce from the writings of the ancient Christian fathers is that of the saintly Augustine, Bishop of Hippo in Africa, who, when writing at the close of the fourth century, says—

---

8 Josephus, J. B., lib. vi., c. v., § 3.
"Christ died in the consulship of the Gemini, on the 8th of the calends of April, March the 25th, and rose again the third day, as the apostles saw him with their eyes, and felt with their hands."

Such is the unanimous testimony of the Christian fathers of the first four centuries respecting the year when the Messiah was cut off by the sacrifice of Himself on the cross of Calvary; and this historical testimony is accepted by such high modern authorities as Lardner (Credibility of the Gospel History), Adam Clarke (Commentary of the Bible), Clinton (Fasti Hellenice), and Zumpt (Das Geburtsjahr Christi). There is, however, one point which must be noticed in reference to those ancient authorities who specify the day, as well as the month and the year, on which the crucifixion took place. When they mention the consular year as that of the Gemini on which it occurred, we know that it is fixed to the year which we now call A.D. 29; when they mention simply the month, as Tertullian does, we know from the astronomical tables that the fourteenth day of the month, Nisan or Abib (as the first or Passover month was originally called), fell that year in the month of March; but when they specify, as Augustine and others have done, "the 8th of the calends of April, i.e., the 25th of March, as the day of the crucifixion, we discover a discrepancy between that and the 14th day of Nisan, or Passover day, of eight days, as in the year A.D. 29 it fell on the 17th of March. This, however, is susceptible of an easy explanation.

The Easter controversy, which began in the second century, and lasted until the Council of Nice in the fourth century, and even then was not finally settled, will afford some light respecting this important discrepancy. The Christians of the first century adopted the Jewish cycle of eighty-four years for finding the proper day of the Passover; and this plan continued in use until the final scattering of the Jewish race in the reign of Hadrian, A.D. 136, and the cessation of the first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem, who were all of the Hebrew race. Then Christians began to inquire into the defects of the Jewish cycle, which was

---

2 Augustine, The City of God, lib. xviii., § 64.
3 Exod. xxiii. 15; Deut. xvi. 1.
found, as Bingham says, to "make Easter sometimes anticipate the vernal equinox, and so bring Easter into one year."

In the second century the Asiatic Churches still continued to observe Easter as the Jews did their Passover, viz., beginning it on the 14th day of the month Nisan, even though it might fall before the vernal equinox. Pope Pius I., A.D. 150, began the dispute by issuing a decree that Easter should only be observed on the Lord's-day, pretending that his brother Hermes had been so instructed by an angel. A few years later, however, when the martyr Polycarp came to visit Pius' successor Anicetus at Rome, though they communicated amicably together as sincere Christians, Irenæus mentions that Anicetus could not persuade Polycarp to keep Easter as he did, because the latter "had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord and the rest of the apostles." And when a few years later Pope Victor, A.D. 185—196, began to display the cloven foot of the Papacy, by haughtily excommunicating those who refused to observe Easter as the Church of Rome did, he was very properly rebuked by Irenæus for his presumption in venturing to set aside the teaching of the apostles, such as the Asiatic Churches continued to follow.

Polycrates in the same way condemned the violent action of Pope Victor, writing to tell him respecting the custom of the Asiatic Churches for the first two centuries:

"We observe the proper genuine day, neither adding thereto, nor taking therefrom, as John, who rested upon the bosom of our Lord, Polycarp, and others did. All these observe the 14th day of the Passover according to the Gospel, deviating in no respect, but following the rule of faith."

And then, in allusion to the Papal threats, he bravely concludes—

"I, brethren, being now sixty-five years old in the Lord, am not at all alarmed at the threats which are now made to intimidate me. For they who are greater than I have said, 'We ought to obey God rather than men.'"

Noble words of Polycrates, in his brave attempt to destroy the germ of the Papal apostasy. But it was ordered otherwise,

---

4 Bingham's *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, lib. xx., c. 5.
and we gather from Constantine's epistle to the bishops, who were unable to attend the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, where the custom of John and the other apostles was virtually condemned, by the decree requiring that the Easter Pasch should be kept on one and the same day by all. The Council of Antioch, A.D. 341, went a step further, and excommunicated all churches which refused obedience to the anti-apostolic decree of Nice. It was, however, to little purpose that this arbitrary act was fully carried out. More than half a century after the Council of Nice, Ambrose, speaking of the year A.D. 387, says that Easter was kept at three different times, viz., March 21st, April 18th, and April 25. Bishop Stillingfleet proves from Gregory of Tours that this occurred again in the year 577. From Pope Leo's epistles, it appears that in 455 A.D. there were eight days difference between the time of keeping Easter with the churches of Alexandria and Rome. And it was not until A.D. 800 that the Churches of Great Britain and Ireland submitted to the decree of the Council of Nice passed five centuries before, contrary to the practice of St. John and his fellow-apostles.

The upshot of this dispute is to show that the custom of the Asiatic Churches, following the apostolic custom of keeping the festival of Easter, as the Jews kept their Passover, on the fourteenth day of the month Nisan, as a moveable and not as a fixed feast, as Christians universally do now, is the only sure and certain guide for fixing the day on which the Messiah was cut off, and Christ offered on the cross of Calvary. Now Epiphanius tells us that the Audians of the fourth century continued to "observe" Easter on the fourteenth day of the moon, after the manner of the Asiatic Churches, asserting that this custom was confirmed by the Apostolic Constitutions, and affirming that the bishops, at the Council of Nice, had introduced a new custom to please the Emperor Constantine. Epiphanius adds that other churches in Cappadocia, which were nicknamed Quarta-decimans ("after the way which they call

---

7 Eusebius' Life of Constantine, iii., 14; Theod., Eccl. Hist., i., 10; Socrates, H. E. I., 9; Lozomen, H. E. I., 31.
8 Epiphanius, Panarion, hær. 70, n. ix., x.
heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers”), kept the anniversary of the crucifixion on the 16th of the calends of April, i.e., March 17th, grounding their reasons for so doing upon certain information contained in the Acta Pilati respecting the day of our Lord’s crucifixion.9 As other copies read the eighth of the calends of April, i.e., March the 25th, we now may see the reason why Augustine and others adopted the latest date of March the 25th as the day of the crucifixion, in place of March the 17th (the true date as being “the fourteenth day of the first month,” according to God’s command),1 as the Audians and Quarta-decemans observed it, that being the true Passover day of the year, A.D. 29, when the twin brothers, Rufus and Rubellius (the Gemini), were the consuls at Rome for that year.

We have thus ascertained the year, and the month, and the day of the month, for the cutting off of the Messiah. It only remains to consider the hour when “Christ our Passover was slain,” in order to show the exact fulfilment of this wondrous prophecy of Daniel respecting the predicted Deliverer. By God’s command the Passover was to be kept and the paschal lamb slain “between the two evenings;”2 i.e., according to our mode of reckoning, between 3—5 P.M.; as Josephus, when describing the feast, says, “The Passover on which they sacrificed from the ninth hour until the eleventh,”3 i.e., from 3 P.M. to 5 P.M. There is special mention made by three of the evangelists that the supernatural darkness at the crucifixion lasted from the sixth hour to the ninth, i.e., from 12—3 P.M.; after which Christ yielded up the ghost, “between the two evenings,” i.e., from 3—5 P.M. His body was taken down from the cross “when the even was come,”4 at the going down of the sun, so that His body should “not remain all night upon the tree,”5 by which we see clearly how exactly “Christ our Passover was slain,” at the very hour appointed by the command of God.

---

9 Epiphanius, Panarion, Hær. 50, Quart., n. xi. 1 Exod. xii. 6. 2 Exod. xii. 6; Numb. ix. 2, 3. 3 Josephus, J. B., vi., 9, § 3. 4 Mark xv. 42—46. 5 Deut. xxi. 22, 23.
Taking these things into consideration, and many more arguments of a like nature might be added in confirmation of the view here advocated, I believe that the evidence from Scripture, Prophecy, Astronomy, and History, is conclusive regarding the most momentous event in the annals of the world since the fall of our first parents in Paradise, viz., that the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, the crucifixion of the Saviour, the cutting off of the Messiah, happened "between the two evenings" of Nisan, fourteenth and sixteenth of the calends of April, or March 17, in the fourth year of the 201st Olympiad, A.U.C. 782, A.D. 29, at the Passover, in the fifteenth year of the sole empire of Tiberius, during the consulship of the Gemini, exactly sixty-nine hebdomads, or weeks of years, i.e., four hundred and eighty-three years, according to Daniel's prophecy, after the decree was given in the ninth of Nisan, B.C. 455, by King Artaxerxes, in the twentieth year of his reign, to Nehemiah, to restore and build up the broken down wall of the city of Jerusalem.

It will be seen that in coming to this conclusion respecting the year, the month, the day, and the hour when the crucifixion took place, and the Messiah was cut off, as Daniel had predicted, we are enabled to reconcile all the requirements of the prophecy concerning the most important and solemn event in the world's history, when the incarnate Son of God laid down His life for the sins of men. They may be summed up as follows:—

1. To find the true date of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, as the terminus a quo, when the prophecy may be said to begin.
2. To find the true date of the terminus ad quem, at the exact expiration of four hundred and eighty-three years later, when the Messiah was cut off.
3. To show that about forty years after, the Jews were deprived by the Romans of the power of capital punishment, the city and Temple of Jerusalem, as the

---

6 In order to reconcile these conflicting dates, it should be noted that the reckoning of the Olympiads began at Midsummer—the era A.U.C., or building of the city of Rome, April 21st,—the consular years January 1st, and the Christian era A.D., the invention of Dionysius Exiguus, March 25, o.s., which lasted in England until 1752, when New Year's Day, n.s., was reckoned from January 1st.
Jewish rabbis declare, were entirely destroyed, and the tribes of Israel scattered over the face of the earth.

We know from history how this came to pass in the year A.D. 70; and we thus have in this prediction of the cutting off of the Messiah, which Daniel was inspired to deliver six centuries before it came to pass, all the conditions required for the most complete and exact Fulfilment of Prophecy of any that are mentioned in the sacred oracles of God.

It may be well to add, that supposing we are wrong in our conclusions respecting the day on which the Messiah was cut off, and that Friday, as Christendom hath observed it for so many centuries, was the true week-day of the crucifixion, it would not set aside the historic fact of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross having been effected at the Passover of A.D. 29, or the prophecy of Daniel having been literally fulfilled by the cutting off of the Messiah, when the twin brothers, the Gemini, filled the office of consuls of Rome.

Before concluding this chapter on Messianic prophecy, it may be well to put in a tabular form a selection of the prophecies, which bear upon the life and deeds of the promised Deliverer, the Shiloh, the Messiah, as announced in the Old Testament, and fulfilled according to the New.

The following fifty predictions may be considered as representing many more of a like nature, which may be adduced in evidence of the truth of the Word of God:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREDICTIONS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT</th>
<th>FULFILLED ACCORDING TO THE NEW.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Genesis iii. 15.</td>
<td>1 John iii. 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Psalm ii. 7.</td>
<td>Hebrews i. 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. xvi. 10.</td>
<td>Acts ii. 25—7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Justyn Martyr, who wrote his Apology at Rome, about a hundred and thirty years after the crucifixion, is the first person, I believe, who mentions that “Christ was crucified on the day before that of Saturn,” or Saturday (Apol. i., c. 67.)
### Predictions in the Old Testament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Fulfilled according to the New Testament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Psalm xxii. 1</td>
<td>Matthew xxvii. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>, , 16</td>
<td>John xix. 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>, , 18</td>
<td>, , 23, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>, xxxi. 5</td>
<td>Luke xxiii. 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>, xxxiv. 20</td>
<td>John xix. 33—36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>, xxxv. 11</td>
<td>Mark xiv. 55, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>, xxxviii. 12</td>
<td>Luke xx. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>, xli. 9</td>
<td>John xiii. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>, xlv. 6, 7</td>
<td>Hebrews i. 8, 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>, lxviii. 18</td>
<td>Ephesians iv. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>, lxix. 4</td>
<td>John xv. 24, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>, xci. 21</td>
<td>Matthew xxvii. 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>, cix. 25</td>
<td>, , 39, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>, ex. 1</td>
<td>, , xxii. 43—45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>, cxviii. 22</td>
<td>Luke xx. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Isaiah vii. 14</td>
<td>Matthew i. 22, 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>, ix. 6</td>
<td>Luke ii. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>, xi. 3</td>
<td>John i. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>, xi. 11</td>
<td>, , x. 11, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>, xlii. 1</td>
<td>Matthew iii. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>, lii. 2</td>
<td>, , xii. 15, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>, xlix. 6</td>
<td>Luke ii. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>, i. 6</td>
<td>Matthew xxvi. 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>, liii. 1</td>
<td>John xii. 37, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>, lii. 2</td>
<td>, , i. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>, lii. 3</td>
<td>, , 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>, lii. 5</td>
<td>1 Peter ii. 23—25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>, lii. 7</td>
<td>Mark xv. 3—5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>, lii. 9</td>
<td>Matthew xxvii. 57—60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>, lii. 11</td>
<td>Hebrews ix. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>, lxi. 1, 2</td>
<td>Luke iv. 17—21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>, lxv. 1</td>
<td>Romans x. 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Daniel ii. 44, 45</td>
<td>Acts iv. 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Joel ii. 28, 29</td>
<td>, , ii. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Jonah i. 17</td>
<td>Matthew xii. 40, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Micah v. 2</td>
<td>, , ii. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Zechariah iii. 8, 9</td>
<td>Revelation v. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>, vi. 12, 13</td>
<td>Ephesians ii. 20—22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>, xi. 12</td>
<td>Matthew xxvi. 14, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>, xii. 13</td>
<td>, , xxvii. 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>, xiii. 1</td>
<td>Hebrews ix. 9—14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>, zi. 7</td>
<td>Matthew xxvi. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Malachi iii. 1</td>
<td>Mark i. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER XVI.

PROPHECIES RELATING TO NINEVEH.

We have now seen how the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament have been literally accomplished, whether in respect to the appearance of the promised Deliverer, or the sceptre departing from Judah at the time predicted, or the historical fact of the Messiah being but to death in the year and at the exact time predicted by the prophet Daniel, nearly six centuries before it came to pass. It now only remains for us to consider some further instances of Fulfilled Prophecy, as recorded in the Old Testament, relative to NINEVEH, BABYLON, EGYPT, TYRE, and ISRAEL, in confirmation of the truth of Scripture; while we may find encouragement in our retrospect of the past, to bear continually in mind those prophecies which speak of the future of the city of Zion, and the restoration of the house of Israel to that land which God gave to Abraham and his seed as "an everlasting possession" (Gen. xvii. 8).

1. We commence with the prophecies relating to NINEVEH.

These may be said to be comprised in the writings of three of the minor prophets. (a.) Jonah the son of Amittai, of the ninth century B.C., is sent on a mission to Nineveh, to warn the people that "within forty days Nineveh would be overthrown." The Ninevites believed God's messenger, proclaimed a national fast, from the least unto the greatest they cried mightily unto God, who, when He saw that they turned from their evil ways, "repented of the evil, that He had said that He would do unto them; and He did it not." 8 (b.) The prophet Nahum comes next in chronological order, as about 150 years after Jonah's visit to Nineveh, towards the close of the eighth century B.C., he was

8 Jonah iii. 4—10.
inspired to foretell the attack of Sennacherib on the kingdom of Judah, its failure, and the king's miserable end, as well as the complete and irretrievable ruin, and the utter desolation of the Assyrian kingdom. (c.) Zephaniah, who followed Nahum after an interval of about seventy years, prophesied a few years before the fall of Nineveh that God would destroy the kingdom of Assyria, and make Nineveh such a desolate wilderness that it would only be habitable henceforth for birds and beasts.

Nahum's prophecies relating exclusively to Assyria and Nineveh may be described under four heads. 1. The failure of Sennacherib in his attack on Israel. 2. The capture of Nineveh by means of the river. 3. The final destruction and utter desolation during the last twenty-five centuries. 4. The casual mention of the conquest of Egypt by the Assyrians.

Nahum thus speaks of Sennacherib's attack upon Israel:

"There is one come out of thee (Nineveh), that imagineth evil against the Lord, a wicked counsellor... Now will I break his yoke from off thee (Israel), and will burst thy bonds in sunder. And the Lord hath given a commandment concerning thee (Sennacherib, king of Assyria), that no more of thy name be sown: out of the house of thy gods will I cut off the graven image and the molten image: I will make thy grave; for thou art vile."

Nothing can more accurately describe the character of Sennacherib, the proud and haughty King of Assyria, than that given by Nahum, as "a wicked counsellor that imagineth evil against Jehovah." This prophecy was delivered during the reign of Sargon, the father of Sennacherib, and about thirty years before the murder of the king by his two sons was accomplished, which is thus described in the book of Kings:

"It came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000: and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses. So Sennacherib king of Assyria departed, and went and returned, and dwelt at Nineveh. And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisroch his god, that..."

9 Nahum vi. 8—14; ii. 8—10; iii. 7—19. 1 Zeph. ii. 13—15.
2 Nahum is believed to have prophesied B.C. 713; Sennacherib was murdered B.C. 680, when his son Esarhaddon succeeded him.
Adrammelech and Sharezer his sons smote him with the sword: and they escaped into the land of Armenia. And Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead.\(^3\)

Thus Nahum's prophecy that the murder of the wretched king by his parricidal children should be accomplished in the temple of Nisroch, the principal idol deity of the Assyrians, as the expression, “I will make thy grave, for thou art vile,” is justly explained in the Targum of Jonathan on this wise: “I will make the house of thy gods thy grave.” An inscription found at Kouyunjik, a palace built by Sennacherib at Nineveh, and now in the British Museum, though unfortunately in a mutilated condition, seems to confirm the truth of this awful incident in the history of Assyria and the family of the “vile” king. The clay tablets brought from Nineveh are generally speaking much fractured, and in no instance is there greater reason to regret the loss of a part of an inscription than here; as it seems clear that the lost portion described the murder of Sennacherib by his unnatural sons. Combining, however, this inscription with another of the reign found near Nineveh on the mound which bears the name of Nebbi Yunus, i.e., “the prophet Jonah,” which is also in the British Museum, the two inscriptions would read as follows:

"Esarhaddon king of Sumir, and Accad, son of Sennacherib king of Assyria, who was the son of Sargon king of Assyria . . . .

[All the upper part of the column is lost.]

. . . . From my heart I made a vow. My liver was inflamed with rage. Immediately I wrote letters, saying, that I assumed the imperial power in my father's house. Then to Ashur, the Moon, the Sun, Bel, Nebo, Nergal, Ishtar of Nineveh, I lifted up in hands prayer, which they answered encouragingly by the oracle, saying, Go on, fear not! We march at thy side! We aid thy expedition,” &c.

History tells us the result. Esarhaddon obtained the throne, which he occupied for fifteen years, leaving the succession to his son Ashur-bani-pul, B.C. 666.\(^4\)

\(^3\) 2 Kings xix. 35—37.

2. The prophecy of Nahum opens with the fatal words, "The burden of Nineveh;" and the chief part of it relates to its complete destruction and its utter desolation, notwithstanding its magnificence and earthly splendour, considered by some ancient authors to be the finest city in the world;\(^5\) while its destruction, so sudden and so speedy, was foretold by Nahum, that it would be effected by means of the river which surrounded the doomed city. "The gates of the rivers," says the prophet, "shall be opened, and the palace shall be dissolved" (ii. 6).

The "rivers" of which Nahum speaks, which ordinarily were a strength to Nineveh, were the cause of her weakness and her final fall. And curious to relate, the Annals of Sennacherib, which reach down to within 56 years of the destruction of Nineveh, relate how he repaired one of his palaces which had been undermined by the swelling of the river Tigris.

"I repaired," he says, "the small palace, which had become very ruinous in every part, because the river Tigris during 16 years had undermined and ravaged it."

It is this same king of Assyria who compelled Hezekiah to pay him tribute, as it is set forth in Scripture.

"Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the King of Assyria to Lachish, saying, I have offended; return from me: that which thou puttest on me I will bear. And the King of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold" (2 Kings xviii. 14).

The confirmation of this historical incident is recorded in an inscription on the Kouyunjik bulls in the British Museum, part of which reads as follows:—

"Sennacherib, the powerful prince, king of the land of Assyria, king of the four regions, worshipper of the great gods, especially of Assur, the mighty god who hath no equal. Hezekiah king of Judah, not submitting to my yoke, I besieged, captured, and plundered 46 of his cities. Himself I made like a caged bird in the midst of Jerusalem, the city of his royalty."\(^6\)

But Nahum had likewise foretold that "fire" as well as "the rivers" should help forward the destruction of Nineveh.

---

\(^5\) Strabo (xvi. 1, 5) says "Nineveh was much larger than Babylon;" but this is doubtful.

PROPHECIES RELATING TO NINEVEH.

"Behold," says the prophet, "thy people in the midst of thee are women: the gates of thy land shall be set wide open unto thine enemies: the fire shall devour thy bars. Draw thee waters for the siege. There shall the fire devour thee." 7

Recent excavations show that the gorgeous palaces of Nineveh, whether of Khorsabad, Nimroud, or Kouyunjik, all show traces of fire in their destruction. Calcined alabaster, masses of charred wood and charcoal, colossal statues split through with the heat, are met with in parts of the Ninevite mounds, and attest the veracity of Nahum's prophecy.

"It is evident," says Layard, "from the ruins, that Khorsabad and Nimroud were sacked and set on fire." 8

3. But this does not exhaust what Nahum prophesied respecting Nineveh. Its sudden destruction, its complete annihilation, its perpetual desolation is foretold by the prophet in these words:

"With an overrunning flood the Lord will make an utter end of the place thereof (Nineveh)... What do ye imagine against Jehovah? He will make an utter end: affliction shall not rise up the second time... The Lord hath given a commandment concerning thee (Nineveh), that no more of thy name be sown... Nineveh is empty, and void, and waste... Woe to the bloody city! it is all full of lies and robbery... There is no healing of thy bruise; Thy wound is grievous: all that hear the bruit of thee shall clap their hands over thee." 9

Nahum's prophecy that God would make Nineveh a complete desolation, and very speedily, as the words prove, "with an overrunning flood he shall make an utter end of the place," and it shall become with the utmost rapidity "empty, void, and waste," was verified to the letter in a way which has no parallel in any city of the world, of ancient or modern times. The complete destruction and almost instantaneous desolation of Nineveh was new in history. For no sooner was she taken by the combined forces of the Medes and the Babylonians, than she seems to have disappeared from the face of the earth almost as much as if she had been swallowed up by an earthquake.

7 Nahum iii. 13—15.
8 Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, p. 351, et seq.; Vaux's Nineveh and Persepolis, pp. 196—8.
9 Nahum i. 8, 9, 14; ii. 10; iii. 1, 19.
Herodotus, who was born within 140 years after Nineveh was overthrown, makes no mention of her after her fall in his history, save in the casual remark that “the Tigris was the river on which Nineveh formerly stood.”\(^1\) Xenophon, in his account of the retreat of the 10,000 Greeks, B.C. 401, passed close to the ruins of Nineveh, and calls it a “great deserted enclosure,”\(^2\) apparently ignorant that the capital of the greatest empire in the world, which had conquered Egypt and captured Thebes not two and a half centuries before, had once stood on that spot, then “empty, void, and waste,” as Nahum had foretold it would be. A few years later, Alexander the Great marched over the same deserted spot in order to gain the world, not knowing what a mighty empire was buried under his feet. Lucian, in the second century B.C., a native of a city on the banks of the Euphrates, records in one brief sentence the utter desolation of the city by the brief notice—“Nineveh has perished, and there is no trace left where it once stood.”\(^3\) Can we have clearer testimony to the Fulfilment of Prophecy respecting the desolation of the once mighty city of Nineveh, than the testimony which these historians afford.

4. The fourth and last prophecy of Nahum which remains to be noticed is the fact that Nineveh, which had been the appointed punisher of Egypt and the conqueror of Thebes, should a few years later suffer in the same way herself. Thus speaks the prophet:

“It shall come to pass, that all they that look upon thee shall flee from thee, and say, Nineveh is laid waste.... Art thou better than populous No (Thebes), whose wall was from the sea? Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and it was infinite.... Yet was she carried away, she went into captivity: her young children also were dashed in pieces at the top of all the streets: and they cast lots for her honourable men, and all her great men were bound in chains.”\(^4\)

Isaiah, also, who lived rather before Nahum, foretold likewise the conquest of Egypt by Sargon king of Assyria:

“And the Lord said, Like as my servant Isaiah hath walked naked and barefoot three years for a sign and wonder upon Egypt and Ethiopia; so

\(^1\) Herodotus, lib. i., § 193. \(^2\) Xenophon, Anabasis, lib. iii., § 4. \(^3\) Lucian, Charon, ch. 23. \(^4\) Nahum iii. 7, 10.
shall the King of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, to the shame of Egypt.""

Recent discoveries in Egypt and Assyria have yielded proofs of the truth of Nahum's prophecy respecting Egypt being conquered and carried captive by Assyria. Time was when Egypt, during the splendour of the 18th dynasty, carried her arms deep into Asia, taking territory from Assyria, and compelling the latter to pay tribute to the descendants of Ham, with whom the supremacy among the nations of the earth then rested. And nearly a thousand years was suffered to pass away before the positions of conqueror and conquered were reversed: and Assyria was enabled to inflict upon Egypt a greater measure of suffering then she herself had received centuries before.

The occasion of Assyria's conquest of Egypt must have been brought to pass by Hoshea king of Israel sending to the King of Egypt for assistance against the rising power of Assyria.

"Shalmaneser king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea; for he had sent messengers to So king of Egypt, and brought no present to the King of Assyria, as he had done year by year: therefore the King of Assyria came up against Samaria, and besieged it. And at the end of three years they took it; in the sixth year of Hezekiah, i.e., the ninth year of Hosea king of Israel, Samaria was taken.""

This record of the capture of Samaria and the captivity of the ten tribes of Israel has been confirmed by the recent discovery and decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions of Nineveh in a very remarkable manner. It will be seen that Scripture says "Shalmaneser king of Assyria besieged Samaria; but does not say that he captured the city and led its inhabitants into captivity; only that the siege lasted three years, at the end of which "they took it." Now to whom does the term "they" refer? Nothing but the contemporary annals of King Sargon's reign enables us to solve this difficulty. But it is now quite certain that Sargon was the king who terminated the siege of Samaria, and carried into captivity large numbers of the people of Israel.

The annals of Sargon are the largest of all the Assyrian texts.

---

5 Isa. xx. 3, 4. 6 2 Kings xvii. 4, 5; xviii. 9, 10.
They have been engraved in the two halls of the palace of Khorsabad, built by Sargon himself at Nineveh. They have been accurately copied by M. Botta in his *Monuments de Ninive*, and translated by the skill of Dr. Julius Oppert, one of the first Assyrian scholars of the day. No less than four specimens of the following text appear on the walls of the Assyrian palace, as if to show the importance of the announcement, which is thus recorded:

"Palace of Sargon, the great king, the powerful king, king of the legions, king of Assyria, viceroy of the gods at Babylon, &c., &c.

"In the beginning of my reign . . . (three lines wanting) . . . with the help of the sun, I besieged and occupied the towns of Samaria, and carried into captivity 27,280 persons. I took them to Assyria, and placed in their stead people to live there whom my hand had conquered. I instituted my lieutenants as governors over them, and imposed on them the same tribute which one of my predecessors had done . . . . .

"In the second year of my reign, Hanun king of Gaza, and Sebech (So) sultan\(^7\) of Egypt, allied themselves to oppose me at Raphia, and to fight against me, but I conquered them. Sebech yielded to my arms; he fled, and no trace of him has been discovered since. I imposed a tribute on Pharaoh king of Egypt, and Samsie queen of Arabia, &c., &c.

"To maintain my position in Media, I have erected fortifications in the neighbourhood of Kar-Larkin. I annexed thirty-four towns of Media to Assyria, and levied annual tributes of horses upon them.\(^8\)

The records of Sargon, from Khorsabad; those of his son Sennacherib, from Kouyunjik; of his grandson Esarhaddon, from Nebbi Yunus; and of his great grandson Assur-bani-pul, from various cylinders now in the British Museum, have thrown much light on the synchronous histories of Israel, Assyria, and Egypt in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., each and all of them tending to confirm both prophecy and history as related in the sacred oracles of God. In a chamber belonging to the palace of Kouyunjik, Layard discovered a piece of clay bearing the seal of the Egyptian sultan Sebech (the Scripture So), and that of Sennacherib king of Assyria, which originally

\(^7\) The Assyrian word *sultan* is the same as the Hebrew *shilton* and the Arabic *sultan*, and means "power," belonging to a mighty sovereign, and is retained to this day, to signify the sovereign of Turkey.

\(^8\) *Records of the Past*, vol. v., 21—28; ix. 1—5.
was affixed to a treaty between the two, the parchment or papyrus on which the treaty was written has long crumbled into dust, but the seal, discovered by an enterprising Englishman twenty-six centuries after the event, is sufficient to tell its own tale.\(^9\)

Manetho gives the names of three kings as forming the twenty-fifth, or Ethiopian dynasty of the Pharaohs, as Manetho writes them in Greek: 1. Sabacon; 2. Sebechus, his son; 3. Tarchus. The two last are respectively mentioned in Scripture as “So king of Egypt,” and “Tirhakah king of Ethiopia.”\(^1\) “So” in Hebrew, “Sebech” in Assyrian, as Oppert writes it, answers to the “Sebechus” of Manetho; as the “Tirhakah” of Scripture answers to the “Tarchus” of the Egyptian historian. The chronology of Manetho answers very well to the Biblical chronology in respect to these two sovereigns who are described as contemporaries with Shalmaneser, Sargon, and Sennacherib, kings of Assyria, and Hoshea the last king of Israel. The fall of Samaria may be positively dated as B.C. 721, one year after the accession of Sargon; the three years’ siege having been begun by Shalmaneser B.C. 724. Sennacherib succeeded his father Sargon B.C. 705, and was succeeded by his son Esarhaddon B.C. 681.\(^2\) The reigns of Sebech, or So, and Tirhakah extended, according to a computation founded on Manetho, to B.C. 732—680.

Although both Sargon and Sennacherib inflicted punishment on the Egyptians, the prophecies of Isaiah and Nahum relating to the punishment inflicted by the Assyrians, appear to refer to the reigns of Esarhaddon and his son Assur-bani-pul. In the Egyptian campaigns of Esarhaddon and Assur-bani-pul, by G. Smith, and the Assyrian Inscriptions, by Dr. Julius Oppert, we have satisfactory evidence of the conquest of Egypt by the Assyrians. Esarhaddon, after having established himself in his kingdom, and recovered much which had been lost by his father Sennacherib’s unhappy campaign against Judæa, resolved upon the conquest of Egypt, which he effected in the ninth

---

\(^9\) Layard’s *Nineveh and Babylon*, p. 156.  
\(^1\) 2 Kings xvii. 4; xix. 9.  
\(^2\) *The Assyrian Eponym Canon*, by G. Smith, pp. 66—68.
year of his reign. After having divided Egypt into twenty
satrapes on his return to Assyria, he caused a tablet to be
carved on a rock at the mouth of the Nahr-el-kelb in Syria, a
cast of which is now in the British Museum, describing the
conquest of Egypt, the capture of Memphis, and defeat of
Tirhakah.

Esarhaddon returned to Nineveh with the spoils of Egypt,
and the Egyptians remained subject to Assyria for several
years; until "Tirhakah king of Ethiopia" made an attempt to
recover his power in Egypt, and marched against Thebes which
he succeeded in taking. Esarhaddon being at that time very
ill, and near the end of his days, associated his son Assur-bani-
pul in the kingdom, on the twelfth of the month Ayar, b.c. 686;
and sent him to recover Egypt. In the mean while, Tirhakah
having conquered the whole of Upper Egypt, marched against
Memphis, the capital of Lower Egypt.

Assur-bani-pul was at that time at Nineveh, and being much
moved with the loss of Egypt, set out at the head of his army
to reconquer the country. On his march various tributary
chiefs on the shores of the Mediterranean, and among them ten
kings of the Isle of Cyprus, did homage to the great king of
Assyria. A battle was fought near the eastern branch of the
Nile—the river with seven streams spoken of by Isaiah (xi. 15),
when the Egyptians were completely overthrown. Tirhakah
fled from Memphis, and embarking on the Nile sailed for
Thebes. Assur-bani-pul followed, and, as the record states,
marched "a journey of forty days to Thebes," a distance of
about three hundred miles,\(^3\) when Tirhakah having fled, the
whole country submitted to the Assyrians.

But the prophecy was not yet fully accomplished; for
although the King of Assyria returned to Nineveh laden with
the spoils of Egypt, a successful conspiracy of some Egyptian
chiefs hitherto faithful to Assyria, enabled Tirhakah to recover
Thebes, which he made his capital. Niku, however, one of the
leaders in the conspiracy, having been taken captive, made his

\(^3\) Nineveh and Babylon were about the same distance from each other as
Memphis from Thebes.
submission to Assur-bani-pul, who restored him to his throne at Sais, in Lower Egypt. Niku's son Psammeticus succeeded him at Sais, about the year 650 B.C., as Urdamane, son of Tirhakah, succeeded him at Thebes. Psammeticus revolted against the Assyrians, and drove them out of Memphis. But the power of Assyria was still unbroken, and though at that time a revolt of the Tyrians compelled Assur-bani-pul to divide his army, sending one part against Tyre, he in person marched on Egypt, recovered Memphis, and drove the rebel sovereign back to Thebes, which this time one of the inscriptions says he reached after "a march of ten days," though as the _terminus a quo_ is not mentioned it does not necessarily conflict with the previous and longer march to Thebes already mentioned of "forty days." Urdamane, the son of Tirhakah, is said to have fled to a place called _Kip-kiki_. The King of Assyria, after plundering Thebes, and carrying with him two huge granite obelisks as part of his spoils, returned in triumph to Nineveh; thus literally accomplishing what Isaiah (xx. 4, 5) had predicted a hundred years before, and Nahum (iii. 8, 10) half a century later, concerning the conquest of Egypt and the sacking of their cities by the victorious arms of the mighty King of Assyria, whose kingdom within less than fifty years later was so suddenly to pass away, and to become "empty, void, and waste," an "utter desolation" for ever.
Passing by for want of space the intensely interesting evidence which archaeology has brought to light by the Cuneiform inscriptions in confirmation of the truth of the Bible, we must confine ourselves to what the Hebrew prophets predicted respecting Babylon, an empire as mighty and as evanescent in the ancient world, as that of Napoleon in our own day.

The 13th chapter of Isaiah opens with the ominous words, "The burden of Babylon;" and bearing in mind that the prophecies of Isaiah were written upwards of two centuries before the first blow which Babylon received from Cyrus with the combined army of Medes and Persians, and nearly five centuries before the predicted doom of desolation began to be fulfilled, we shall have sure evidence that Isaiah was one of those to whom the apostle Peter refers, when he says—

"For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."^1

In the chapter already mentioned we find in ver. 4 an account of the mustering of the nations destined by the Almighty to punish Babylon; ver. 17 specifies "the Medes" by name as one of those nations, and alludes to their disregard of "silver and gold;" vv. 19—22 speak of "Babylon, the glory of kingdoms," becoming "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah"—uninhabitable "from generation to generation"—the Arabians refusing to "pitch tent there," and the shepherds declining to "fold their sheep there."

In chapter xiv., after alluding to "this proverb against the King of Babylon," in the person of Nebuchadnezzar, Isaiah

\(^1\) 2 Pet. i. 21.
foretells the destruction of Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty, when "the Lord of hosts shall cut off from Babylon the name, and remnant, and son, and nephew" (vv. 4, 22).

Chapter xxi. specifies the siege of Babylon as being carried on by the Medes and Persians—

"Go up, O Elam (Persia): besiege, O Media" (v. 2). And a few verses later Isaiah foretells what was literally fulfilled two and a half centuries later, "Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods he (Cyrus) hath broken unto the ground" (v. 9). Cyrus king of Persia is specially mentioned by name as "my shepherd" and the "Lord's anointed," appointed "to open the two-leaved gates of brass of Babylon;" and afterwards to perform God's pleasure, "even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the temple, Thy foundation shall be laid" (xliv. 28, xlv. 1, 2).

Chapter xlvii. 8, 9, specifies that she (the virgin daughter of Babylon), who boasted she should never be a "widow," should nevertheless suffer—

"These two things in a moment in one day, the loss of children, and widowhood . . . . for the multitude of thy sorceries, and for the great abundance of thine enchantments."

Such are the chief prophecies of Isaiah respecting Babylon. Now turn we to notice what Jeremiah says on the same subject.

In chapter xxv., after speaking of the 70 years' captivity in Babylon of the children of Israel, Jeremiah foretells that "the land of the Chaldeans," i.e., Babylonia, would become "perpetual desolations" (v. 12).

Chapter l. is almost a repetition of the prophecy of Isaiah, only delivered about one and a half century nearer the time of its fulfilment, as it speaks of—

"An assembly of great nations coming up against Babylon" (v. 9); and that the country should be "wholly desolate" (v. 13); and that she, which had been "the hammer of the whole earth," would "become a desolation among the nations" (v. 23); and that "as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah," so would it be with Babylon: "The wild beasts and owls" would make it their dwelling; and that it should "no more be inhabited for ever; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation" (vv. 29, 40).

Chapter li. is still more explicit in its predictions that—
"Babylon, which had been a golden cup in the Lord's hand, is suddenly fallen and destroyed" (vv. 7, 8); that "the Lord hath raised up the spirit of the kings of the Medes to destroy Babylon" (v. 11); and "they shall not take of thee a stone for a corner, but thou shalt be desolate for ever, saith the Lord. . . . for every purpose of the Lord shall be performed against Babylon, to make the land a desolation without an inhabitant" (vv. 26, 29). Then comes this remarkable prophecy respecting Cyrus' capture of Babylon, "One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to shew the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end" (v. 31).

This is followed by a repetition of the prophecy that—

"Babylon should become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment, and an hissing, without an inhabitant" (v. 37). "Her cities are a desolation, a dry land, and a wilderness, a land wherein no man dwelleth, neither doth any son of man pass thereby" (v. 43).

Notwithstanding that Babylon was the most magnificent city known to the ancient world, and protected by the strongest walls, special mention is made by the prophet that "the broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly broken" (v. 58).

Then comes the summary of all the predictions against Babylon—

"So Jeremiah wrote in a book all the evil that should come upon Babylon, even all these words that are written against Babylon. . . . It shall be desolate for ever. And when thou hast made an end of reading this book, thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of Euphrates: And thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her: and they shall be weary. Thus far are the words of Jeremiah" (vv. 60—64).

Now we may briefly consider how all which Isaiah and Jeremiah were inspired to predict respecting Babylon, both in its glory and its desolations, were literally accomplished. The history of Babylon appears to reach as far back as the period within two centuries of the Noachian Flood. Borosus, the native historian, possessed records of the nation for above 2000 years prior to the conquest of Babylon by Alexander the Great. During that interval it was for many centuries the most powerful empire in Asia, or, with the exception of Egypt, in the world. For a time it was subdued by the Assyrians, and appears to have held the position of the second capital in that
mighty kingdom; and when Nineveh fell, and the Assyrian empire so suddenly disappeared from among the great nations of the earth, Babylon at once recovered her former supremacy, and for a period of 70 years, from the reign of Nebuchadnezzar to that of Belshazzar, "Babylon, the glory of the kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," as Isaiah terms it, or "this great Babylon," as Nebuchadnezzar himself called it, well deserved the name. For in truth it was the most magnificent city in the world. Herodotus, who was born about half a century after its capture by Cyrus, and who therefore must have seen it in the same state of splendour in which Nebuchadnezzar had left it, for the Persians were far from injuring it in any way, has made us familiar with its glories, and which perfectly accord with the boast of its maker as reported by the prophet Daniel—

"Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty?"

The historian describes Babylon as—

"Standing on a broad plain, as an exact square, 120 furlongs in length each way, so that the entire is 480 furlongs (i.e., 60 miles)."

Herodotus proceeds to describe the way in which the wall, which surrounded the city, and which forms an important point in the prophecy, was built. He then goes on to say that—

"On the top of the wall, along its edges, they constructed buildings of a single chamber, facing one another, leaving between them room for a four-horse chariot to turn. In the circuit of the wall are a hundred gates, all of brass, with brazen lintels and side-posts."

This accords with "the gates of brass" mentioned by Isaiah, and "the broad walls of Babylon" specified by Jeremiah; but which, notwithstanding, should not be able to defend her from being taken, or eventually from being "utterly broken," according to the purpose of the Lord God Almighty, as He had inspired His prophets to foretell how it would in time be accomplished.

Herodotus, moreover, speaks of a "second inner wall of less thickness than the first, but very little inferior to it in

---
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strength;" and as Babylon was built on both sides of the river Euphrates, the centre of each division was guarded by a fortress of great strength. In one division stood Nebuchadnezzar's magnificent palace, where Belshazzar was carousing with his nobles, when Cyrus captured the city, and whose remains to this day, according to Rich (First Memoir, p. 22), show its size to have been "a square of 700 yards in length and breadth." The other division contained the famous temple of Jupiter Belus, which Herodotus says was contained—

"In a square enclosure, two furlongs each way, with gates of solid brass. In the middle was a tower of solid masonry, a furlong in length and breadth, upon which was raised a second tower, and on that a third, and so on up to eight. The ascent to the top is on the outside by a pathway which winds round all the towers, on the top of which there is a spacious temple, and inside stands a couch of unusual size, richly adorned with a golden table by its side."

The historian, after describing more of the wonderful buildings of Babylon, especially those executed by a queen whom he calls "Nitocris," proceeds to relate Cyrus' expedition against Babylon, and his mode of capturing the city. He does not mention the duration of the siege; but he relates a curious incident which certainly delayed Cyrus a year in his expedition, by "one of the sacred white horses having been drowned in crossing the river Gyndes," that in his insensate rage he "put off his attack on Babylon," and employed his army in cutting 180 ditches on each side of the river, in order to punish it for causing the loss of one of his favourite steeds, "but not without," as Herodotus remarks, "losing thereby the whole summer season."

On Cyrus' approach to the city the Babylonians went forth to meet him, but being defeated by the Persians they retired within their defences, and made light of his attempt to capture the city, as they were amply provisioned for many years to come, and they were confident that their city, which is termed by the prophet Isaiah "the virgin daughter of Babylon," from its never having been captured, never could or would be by any power of man.

Cyrus, according to the historian, was for a time in great
perplexity, as he could make no progress in the siege of a city protected by such wonderful walls as Babylon possessed; until adopting a plan of draining the river Euphrates by means of a canal, he was enabled to pass his army through the stream, then reduced to a depth of about three feet:—

"Had the Babylonians," says Herodotus, "been apprised of what Cyrus was about, or had they noticed their danger, they would never have allowed the Persians to enter the city, but would have destroyed them utterly; for they would have made fast all the street gates, and mounting upon the walls would so have caught the enemy as it were in a trap. But, as it was, the Persians came upon them by surprise, and so took the city. Owing to the vast size of the place, the inhabitants of the central parts, as the residents at Babylon declare, long after the outer portions of the city were taken, knew nothing of what had happened; for, being engaged at a festival, they continued their revels until they learnt the capture of the city but too surely."

Herodotus further adds in his description of the "power and resources of the Babylonians," that it was the most fertile of all the provinces of the vast Persian empire, "Assyria is equal in respect of resources to one-third of the whole of Asia." Pliny and Strabo alike confirm the testimony of Herodotus, asserting that the soil of Babylonia never produced less than "two hundredfold," sometimes reaching even to "three hundred," while the grain grown there was of a prodigious size, an amount of grain which scarcely seems credible in our northern and colder climate.

The testimony of Herodotus confirms the truth of these several points mentioned in the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the former of whom wrote upwards of two centuries before, and the latter about seventy years before the capture of Babylon.

1. That Cyrus king of the Medes and Persians, who is called by both Isaiah and Xenophon the Lord's "Shepherd," was named as the sovereign who was appointed of God for the

---

6 Herod., Hist., lib. i., §§ 178—191. Aristotle mentions that the capture of Babylon by Cyrus was unknown in some parts of the city until the third day after it had taken place.
7 Herod., Hist., lib. i., § 192.
8 Pliny, Nat. Hist., lib. v., c. 26; Strabo, lib. xvi.
purpose of performing all His pleasure, both in the punishment of Babylon and the restoration of the children of Israel to Jerusalem after their seventy years' captivity.

2. That the prophecies respecting the Medes and Persians being the predicted nations for the punishment of Babylon is fully borne out by the history of Herodotus, though at the time of the capture of Babylon, "the Persians, who had long been impatient of the Median dominion,"9 had become supreme by Cyrus having conquered Astyages king of the Medes, and brought them into subjection. It was by the union of these two powerful nations, as Isaiah and Jeremiah had foretold, that Babylon was captured. And it is worthy of special note that "Darius the Mede," to whom Cyrus entrusted the sovereignty of Babylon on its capture B.C. 538, was not the chief, but only second ruler in the kingdom.1

A careful investigation of the words of the prophet Daniel proves this clearly in accordance with authentic history, as many have been misled in their interpretation of the Book of Daniel by assuming that "Darius the Mede" was king of Babylon by right of conquest, instead of being, as he really was, only the viceroy of the predicted conqueror Cyrus.

The words of Daniel read in the Authorised Version as follows respecting the handwriting which appeared on the walls of Nebuchadnezzar's palace, when Belshazzar was feasting his nobles the night that Babylon was taken, and which foretold its doom:

"This is the handwriting that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERSES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians. Then commanded Belshazzar, and they clothed Daniel with scarlet, and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning him, that he should be the third ruler in

9 Herodotus, lib. i., § 127.
1 Thus Daniel was "third ruler" in the kingdom, both under the native dynasty, as well as that of the conquerors. Nabonedus, Belshazzar, and Daniel forming the trio in the former; Cyrus, "Darius the Mede," and Daniel in the latter.
the kingdom. In that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old."

Now the expression in the Authorised Version, "Darius the Mede took the kingdom," would seem to imply that Darius took Babylon in the sense that William the Conqueror took London after the battle of Senlac, or Hastings. But the Hebrew does not support this translation, for the literal rendering of Daniel ix. i. reads—"Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans;" both terms imply that "Darius the Mede" was a viceroy appointed by Cyrus, the predicted conqueror, to govern Babylon, and which explains the fact that his name is not mentioned by any of the secular historians who relate the fall of Babylon by the united forces of Medes and Persians.

Abydenus, an historian who lived about two centuries after the time of Nebuchadnezzar, suggests an explanation of the fact that Cyrus appointed a Median viceroy to govern Babylon when he had captured the city, and therefore, although this viceroy's name never appeared in the list of the kings, it was natural that he should have appeared to Daniel and other Jews residing in Babylon as an actual monarch. The words of Abydenus, as quoted by Eusebius, are as follows. Alluding to the infirm state of health into which Nebuchadnezzar had fallen at the close of his life, and which seems to point to the madness spoken of by Daniel (iv. 32, 33), Abydenus writes—

"It is related by the Chaldeans, that Nebuchadnezzar, as he mounted to the roof of his palace, was possessed by some god, and cried out, saying, 'Oh! Babylonians, I foretell you of a calamity which must shortly come to pass, which neither Bel my ancestor, nor his queen Beltis can persuade the Fates to avert. A Persian mule will come assisted by your gods, and will impose on you the yoke of slavery, the author of which shall be a Mede, the vain-glory of Assyria. Before he should lay his yoke upon my countrymen, would that some flood might engulf him, and his memory be blotted out for ever! Or that he might be doomed to wander through some desert, where is neither city nor trace of men, a solitary exile among rocks and caverns, where beasts and birds alone dwell! Would that I, before these thoughts had

\[2\text{Dan. v. 25, 31.}\]
entered my mind, had closed my life in peace! Thus having prophesied, Nebuchadnezzar suddenly disappeared from sight.”

This remarkable testimony of Abydenus respecting Nebuchadnezzar’s prophecy of “the Persian mule” (Cyrus) inflicting such a blow upon the Babylonian power, and the place were it was uttered, and the apparent allusion to his own illness or madness, naturally remind us of Daniel’s words to the great king, when he foretold his being banished from the haunts of men, and compelled to dwell with the beasts of the field, and added—

“All this came upon the king Nebuchadnezzar, as at the end of twelve months he walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon.”

Moreover, one of the recent archaeological discoveries of Sir Henry Rawlinson is of immense importance, as proving the credibility of the prophet Daniel’s testimony, and its perfect accordance with the statements of secular historians which have come down to us. Herodotus, Berosus, Abydenus, concur in stating that the capture of Babylon by the Medes and Persians took place in the reign of Nabonedus (or Labynetus, as he is called by Herodotus, lib. i., § 74), who was not of the royal line of Nebuchadnezzar, as Daniel (v. 11) and Isaiah (xiv. 22) seem to imply was the case with the reigning sovereign Belshazzar when Babylon was taken. They add that the king was absent when the capture took place; and that in place of being slain as Belshazzar was, he subsequently surrendered himself to Cyrus at Borsippa, who treated him kindly, gave him a principality in Carmania, where he spent the remainder of his days. They represented that Nabonedus obtained the throne in this way. On the death of Nebuchadnezzar, his son Evil-merodach succeeded him (2 Kings xxv. 27), who was overthrown after a reign of two years by his brother-in-law Neriglissorus, who was succeeded by his son Laborosoarchadus, a child, who after a brief reign of nine months, was seized by conspirators and put to death by torture. A Babylonian named Nabonedus, one of the conspirators, was made sovereign, and in the seventeenth year

of his reign Cyrus captured the city.5 Thus the narratives of
the prophet Daniel and the secular historians seemed to be
contradictory at all points; and Rationalists and sceptics were
never tired of asserting that here at least the statements of Daniel
were plainly unhistoric and untrustworthy. But inasmuch as
Daniel was a contemporary witness of the facts he relates,
while Herodotus was one century, Berosus two centuries, and
Abydenus three later than Daniel, the sceptics invented a
theory that though a Daniel might have been a captive in
Babylon during the seventy years which intervened between
Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus, the writer of the prophecies of
Daniel lived in the Maccabæan age, about four centuries after
the time of Nebuchadnezzar's reign! This impossible theory
has been so well answered and so completely overthrown by
Dr. Pusey, in his Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures, delivered in
the Divinity School of the University of Oxford (third edition,
1869), that I believe no Rationalist has since ventured on a reply
to the cogent arguments which the late Regius Professor of
Hebrew has adduced in support of the genuineness and
authenticity of the prophet Daniel.

The discovery of an inscribed cylinder made a few years ago
by Sir Henry Rawlinson,6 in Lower Babylonia, proves that
Nabonedus' eldest son bore the name of Bel-shar-ezer, and that
he had associated him in the kingdom. Thus there were two
kings of Babylon at the time of the last siege; Nabonedus,
the father, who had escaped to Borsippa, a strong fortress about
seven miles from Babylon, and Bel-shar-ezer, or Belshazzar, his
son, who was at the head of the government, and was slain on
the night when the city was captured. Moreover, this discovery
satisfactorily explains what has hitherto been a great difficulty
with commentators. When Belshazzar saw the handwriting
on the wall, and found that his wise men could not in any way
explain it, he promised that whosoever could interpret it
should be "clothed in scarlet, with a chain of gold about his

5 Herodotus, lib. i., § 191; Berosus, ap Josephus, c. Apion. i. 21; Abydenus
6 See Athenæum of March, 1854, p. 341.

...
neck, and appointed third ruler in the kingdom” (Dan. v. 16, 29). Why was not Daniel treated like Joseph? who, when he had done a similar act for Pharaoh, was “arrayed in vestures of fine linen, with a chain of gold about his neck,” and made second ruler in Egypt—“only in the throne will I be greater than thou” (Gen. xli. 40—42). This is now satisfactorily explained by our present knowledge that Nabonedus was ruler No. 1; his son Belshazzar No. 2; and Daniel the prophet, who had interpreted the handwriting on the wall, according to the king’s promise, made “the third ruler in the kingdom.”

A difficulty has been found in the fact that both Daniel (v. 11) and Isaiah (xiv. 22) speak as if the King of Babylon, when the city was taken by Cyrus, was of the seed royal of Nebuchadnezzar, whereas Berosus says that Nabonedus, the last king of Babylon, was a usurper and successful conspirator. Hence, this may be explained by the ordinary use of terms in Holy Scripture. David succeeded Saul on the throne of Israel, and is called by Saul his son (1 Sam. xxvi. 21), whereas we know that David was the son of Jesse. So in the genealogies of Christ, one evangelist speaks of Salathiel as the son of Jeconiah the king of Judah (Matt. i. 12), and traces his pedigree through the kings of Judah and Solomon up to David; whereas we know that Jeconiah, or Coniah, or Jehoiakin, as he is variously called, the son of Jehoiakim king of Judah, was destined to die childless, and that his seed was to become extinct (Jer. xx. 30). Hence the other evangelist, who records our Lord’s genealogy, speaks of Salathiel as the son of Neri (Luke iii. 27), and traces his descent equally from David, though not through the royal line, but from Nathan, one of David’s sons. So Nabonedus, the last king of Babylon, and father of Belshazzar, may have called himself a son of Nebuchadnezzar, and have so appeared to the Jews and Daniel residing in Babylon.

With this necessary digression for the purpose of confirming the accuracy of Daniel and other Hebrew prophets respecting their account of the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, we proceed to notice some more points in proof of the harmony between the
prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, and the statements of the secular historians. Let any one carefully study the last three chapters of Jeremiah's prophecy, and bearing in mind that it was written partly before, and partly during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, when Babylon was at the height of her glory, and the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar had extended to Egypt in the south, and to Spain and the Pillars of Hercules in the west, nothing but inspiration could have enabled Jeremiah to foretell not only the complete destruction of the Babylonian power, and the subsequent desolation of the whole land, but such minute details respecting the mode by which Cyrus with the Medes and Persians was enabled to capture the city.

Isaiah foretold the destruction and perpetual desolation of Babylon about one and a half century before it became independent of Assyria; Jeremiah, upwards of a century later, gives some minute details, when Babylon was at the height of her splendour, and when Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest monarch of the East in all time, had made "Babylon the glory of kingdoms, the beauty of the Chaldees' excellency," foretelling that nevertheless it should become "as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation." 7

Jeremiah specifies that notwithstanding its "broad walls," the most stupendous the world had ever seen, as artificial protectors of the city according to Herodotus, the city would be captured by a very remarkable ruse on the part of the enemy. The broad walls were so strong that the Babylonians believed no power on earth could capture the city so protected. Yet in reality they were thus made a snare to them, as the prophet had predicted:—

"I have laid a snare for thee, and thou art also taken, O Babylon, and thou wast not aware." 8 For thus saith the Lord, "Behold, I will plead thy cause (Zion), and take vengeance for thee; and I will dry up her sea, and make her springs dry." 9

Herodotus and Xenophon have alike recorded the way by which Cyrus captured the city by draining the Euphrates, and

7 Isa. xiii. 19, 20. 8 Jer. l. 24. 9 Jer. li. 36.
enabling the Medes and Persians to enter into Babylon by means of the dried-up river. The extract from Herodotus has been already given, and the words which Xenophon puts into the mouth of Cyrus—

"The river, my friends, has yielded us a passage into the city, let us boldly enter and not fear any thing within, considering that these people are the same we defeated when they were awake, sober, armed and in order. But now we march against them at a time when many of them are asleep, many drunk, and all in confusion."¹

show the belief of the Greeks respecting the mode of its capture not very many years after its occurrence.

Jeremiah ² foretold how Babylon, under the name of "Sheshach," would be taken during the time of a feast; when the drunken Babylonians were unable to resist the stealthy onslaught of the watchful Persians. And Daniel relates how the night on which the ominous handwriting appeared "on the wall of the king's palace" and the city was taken, that "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, princes, wives and concubines;" who drank and revelled "with the golden and silver vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had brought from Jerusalem."³ And so continued their revels, until suddenly the Medes and Persians appeared in their midst, and their doom was complete.

So sudden was the inroad of Cyrus' army upon the doomed Babylonians, that it literally came to pass as Jeremiah predicted—

"The mighty men of Babylon have forborn to fight, they have remained in their holds... One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end."⁴

And, as we have already seen in Herodotus' history of the event, multitudes, owing to the immense size of the city, knew not, until some days later, that Babylon had fallen, and the glory of the Chaldees' excellency had for ever passed away.

There is only one thing more to notice in the prophecies of

¹ Xenophon, Cyropædia, lib. vii., § 5.
² Jer. li. 32—49.
³ Dan. v. 1—5.
⁴ Jer. li. 30, 31.
Isaiah and Jeremiah respecting the city of Babylon and the land of the Chaldees. God's purpose was to make Babylon—

"As Sodom and Gomorrha... and a desolation among the nations."
"Babylon shall become heaps, a dwelling place for dragons, an astonishment, and an hissing without an inhabitant"..."None shall remain in it, neither man nor beast, but that it shall be desolate for ever."5

Babylon, though it did not disappear as suddenly as Nineveh did after its capture by the Medes and Babylonians, gradually decayed, and withered away. With the conquest by Cyrus began the ruin of Babylon; and though its ruin was delayed from the fact of Babylon being one of the royal residences during the period of the Persian empire, yet Xerxes, on his ignominious retreat from Greece, about sixty years after the time of Cyrus, not only rifled the temples of Babylon, taking spoil from the golden images alone to the extent of £20,000,000 sterling, but, as Arrian 6 relates, he utterly destroyed the temple of Bel, or Belus, of which Herodotus has given such a glowing description, in accordance with the prediction of Jeremiah—

"I will punish Bel in Babylon; I will do judgment upon her graven images, and through all her land the wounded shall groan."7

Before the close of the Persian empire, Babylon was fast falling into decay. When Alexander the Great took it, two centuries after the time of Cyrus, he found the magnificent temple of Bel in so ruined a condition that it would have required 10,000 men for a period of two months merely to clear away the rubbish.8 The removal of the seat of empire to Antioch gave the finishing blow to the prosperity of Babylon; and the great city of Seleucia under one of Alexander's successors, not only drew away its population, but was chiefly constructed of materials derived from the buildings,9 just as in later days the Great Pyramid of Ghizeh was peeled of its casing stones in order to build Cairo. Since then the ruins of Babylon have afforded a fine quarry for the building of many cities in the neighbourhood. So that the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah

5 Isa. xiii. 19, 20; Jer. li. 23, 40; li. 37, 62. 6 Arrian, vii., § 17. 7 Jer. li. 44, 52. 8 Strabo, xvi., § 5. 9 Pliny, Nat. Hist. vi., § 30.
have been fully accomplished. The great city, of which Nebuchadnezzar so proudly boasted, suffered by its inhabitants in proportion to the judgments which they had once inflicted on Jerusalem. The voice of prophecy speaks very clearly on this point, when we read the denunciations of Jeremiah.

"The walls of Babylon are thrown down: for it is the vengeance of the Lord: take vengeance upon her; as she hath done, do unto her...Recompense her according to her work; for she hath been proud against the Lord, against the Holy One of Israel... I will render unto Babylon and to all the inhabitants of Chaldea all] their evil that they have done in Zion in your sight, saith the Lord." 1

The decline of Babylon and the desolation of the country of Chaldea was rapid after the building of Seleucia in the third century B.C. It became gradually a great desert. At the beginning of the Christian era, a small portion of the ruined city was still inhabited. In the fourth century A.D., Babylon was made an enclosure for wild beasts, and a hunting ground to enable the Persian monarchs to enjoy the pleasures of the chase. There is a blank after this for many ages in the history of its mutilated remains. Babylon seemed to have disappeared from the face of the earth, as completely as Nineveh had done 1000 years before. And modern travellers, from Benjamin of Tudela in the twelfth century, down to Porter, and Layard, and Rawlinson, and Oppert of the nineteenth century, one and all bear testimony to the truth of prophecy to the desolation which reigns on all sides, as expressed in the words of one of them—

"The abundance of the country has vanished as clean away as if the 'besom of desolation' had swept it from north to south; the whole land from the outskirts of Babylon to the furthest stretch of sight lying a melancholy waste. Not a habitable spot appears for countless miles." 2

Vast heaps are all that now remain of ancient Babylon; as Rauwolff, a traveller of the sixteenth century testifies, that in his time "not a house was to be seen;" or as Major Keppel, who records Rauwolff's testimony, adds—

1 Jer. 1. 15, 29; li. 24.
"It is impossible to behold the scene of desolation in Babylon, and not to be reminded how exactly the predictions of Isaiah and Jeremiah have been fulfilled, even in the appearance Babylon was doomed to present, that she should never be inhabited; that the Arabian should not pitch his tent there; that she should become heaps; that her cities should be a desolation, a dry land and a wilderness."

Such is the present state, and such has been the condition of Babylon for the last two thousand years. And yet, incredible as it may appear, there are persons at this present time in England, anything but sceptics, rather the reverse, but who nevertheless are so infatuated with their mode of interpreting prophecy in its most literal manner, that they do not hesitate to declare that the prophecies respecting Babylon have not yet been fulfilled, but that the city must be rebuilt; some of them add, Nebuchadnezzar will rise from the grave and reign in it as of yore, in order to the more complete accomplishment, as they say, of God's prophetic word!!!

The records of the human race do not present any contrast more striking than that between the magnificence of ancient Babylon, the golden city, the queen of the East, and its long desolation, now extending over 2000 years. Its ruins have been carefully examined by multitudes of explorers and travellers, especially those of our own time, by whose energy and skill so much has been recovered from the seats of these ancient empires, which has enabled Oriental scholars, not only to demonstrate the literal fulfilment of every prediction respecting Nineveh and Babylon, but also by the recovery of so much of the writings which once adorned the libraries of these two great cities of the ancient world, to throw a flood of light upon the unerring and infallible Word of Truth. And it is with no little interest that the Biblical student can reflect that in the solitary wilderness now covered, as Jeremiah predicted, by vast "heaps" of apparent rubbish, the first astronomical observations were made upwards of 4000 years ago, at a time when Britain was uninhabited, or else occupied by the first Japhetic settlers who had wandered from the plains of Shinar.

Major Rennell, one of the earliest explorers of Shinar in modern times, has justly remarked, that "the delineation and description of the site and remains of Babylon would prove one of the most interesting pieces of information ever given to the world," which has been fully verified in our own time by the discoveries of Layard, Sir Henry Rawlinson, Loftus, Botta, Rassam and others.

Ezekiel's prophecy respecting the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, which is not mentioned by any secular historian, and which in consequence has given infidels an opportunity of denying the trustworthiness of Ezekiel as a prophet of Jehovah, will be considered in the chapter relating to the prophecies concerning Egypt. It will be sufficient here to say that recent discoveries have produced two contemporary documents, cuneiform and hieroglyphic, confirming the truth of Ezekiel's prophecy, and putting sceptics to an open shame.
CHAPTER XVIII.

PROPHECIES RELATING TO TYRE.

Tyre was the capital of Phœnicia, and the greatest commercial city of the ancient world. For several centuries, both before and after the Christian era, it occupied a similar proud position by means of its marine with that which England does in the present day. There is reason to believe with Sir Edward Creasy that the ships of Tyre were employed to convey the tin which was used in the building of Solomon's Temple, from the Cornish mines in the south-west of England, showing the early date of the Tyrian naval supremacy. A noted sceptic observes concerning Tyre that—

"It was the theatre of an immense commerce and navigation, the nursery of arts and science, and the city of perhaps the most industrious and active people ever known." 4

It is disputed which city was first built, Palætyrus on the mainland or insular Tyre, close adjoining, which Alexander besieged. It was certainly in existence when the Israelites entered Canaan in the fifteenth century b.c., as it is described at that time as "the strong city Tyre." 5 And although Isaiah speaks of it as a "joyous city, whose antiquity is of ancient days," 6 and Arrian speaks of the temple of insular Tyre as "the most ancient of all temples within the memory of mankind," 7 there is no reason to accept the fabulous history which the Tyrian priests related to Herodotus of its temple having been built "2300 years" before their time, 8 which would throw it back to the twenty-eighth century b.c., and make it not only much older than Babel, but about three centuries before the Noachian flood!

---

6 Isa. xxiii. 7. 7 Arrian, History, ii. 16. 8 Herodotus, lib. ii., § 44.
A brief sketch of the history of Tyre may be useful previous to our consideration of the prophecies respecting it. Hiram, king of Tyre, the contemporary of David and Solomon, who aided in the building of the Temple of Jerusalem, is the first of whom Scripture makes mention as king of that country. Josephus also, in quoting the testimony of Menander the Ephesian, who wrote his history from the Tyrian records, begins his citations with King Hiram, and mentions that "the whole time from the twelfth year of the reign of Hiram, when the Temple was built, until the building of Carthage was 143 years and 8 months." As Tyre was situated about 180 miles from Jerusalem, and only five miles from the borders of Asher, the most northern of the twelve tribes, it is remarkable that Tyre should have enjoyed her naval supremacy for so long a period unquestioned.

We have no knowledge of Tyre having been attacked previous to the eighth century B.C., when the kings of Assyria began to deport the children of Israel from the land of their fathers. After about the same period which has elapsed in the history of England since the Norman Conquest, Tiglath-Pileser II. began to carry captive "all the land of Naphtali," A few years later, B.C. 730, Tiglath-Pileser attacked Metenna of Tyre, not in person, but by sending one of his generals, who bore the title of "Rabshakeh," against the city; and though Tyre at the time was the greatest maritime city in the world, and her wealth is shown in the fact that the Assyrian general assessed her contribution at a sum equivalent to £400,000 sterling, she submitted, and paid her ransom without a murmur.

It was different, however, in the following reign; for when Shalmaneser IV., he who is mentioned in the book of Kings, invaded Canaan, he attacked Tyre in the year B.C. 725, and again in B.C. 724. In the following year Shalmaneser suffered a severe defeat from Eluleus king of Tyre. The Assyrian fleet of 60 vessels and 800 men was defeated and destroyed by a Tyrian fleet of only twelve ships. The siege of Tyre was

---

nevertheless continued by the Assyrians on the land side, simultaneously with the siege of Samaria during the "three years" mentioned in the Scriptures. After a brief reign of five years, Shalmaneser either died or was deposed by Sargon, his successor on the throne of Assyria; and of this we have a very remarkable confirmation of the accuracy of the historical details mentioned in the Book of Kings, where it is said that "Shalmaneser king of Assyria came up against Samaria, and besieged it. And at the end of three years they took it. Now what does "they" mean? It can only be explained by supposing that during the "three years" siege, there was a change of kings, which was actually the case, as we have already shown. Sargon, the successor of Shalmaneser, has recorded in his Annals the capture of Samaria, and the number of Israelites which he then deported to Assyria.

The Annals of Sargon king of Assyria, engraved in the two halls of Khorsabad, which are the largest and most complete of all the Assyrian texts, afford an instance of the value of critical accuracy in the reading of history aright. In an interesting historical essay on Phoenicia and Israel, which gained the Burney Prize at Cambridge in 1870, the author quotes, apparently on the authority of Lenormant, one of the Khorsabad inscriptions, in which Sargon is represented as saying—

"I crossed the sea of Jamnia in ships, like a fish. I annexed Kin and Tyre;" and he wisely adds, "The annals of Tyre, preserved by Josephus (Ant. ix. 14, 2, which I have quoted above), give a very different and probably truer story." Lenormant certainly quotes Sargon as saying—

"Je traversai la mer de Jamnia dans les vaisseaux, comme un poisson. J'annexai Kouit et Tyr." He likewise refers to Josephus, and considers Josephus' account more worthy of credence than the Annals of Sargon. But here criticism comes to our aid, and makes it doubtful

3 2 Kings xvii. 5, 6. 4 History of Assyria, by G. Smith, p. 91.
5 2 Kings xviii. 9, 10. 6 See p. 357.
7 Phoenicia and Israel, by A. S. Wilkins, M.A., pp. 75—77.
whether these Annals make any mention of Sargon attacking Tyre. Probably M. Lenormant depended on the learned Dr. Oppert's first rendering of Sargon's Annals; but in the revised edition, of which Oppert thus speaks, "I have corrected in this English edition a great many of the errors which existed in my former version," he translates the passage thus:—

"I plundered the district of Samaria, and the entire house of Omri, (i.e., the ten tribes of the house of Israel): I entered the Tamna swimming like a fish. I took away the lands of Kaska, Tabal," &c.9

Here we have Jamnia altered to Tamna, Kui to Kaska, and Tyre to Tabal, when the King of Assyria entered on his naval expedition, "swimming like a fish," and no allusion to Tyre, the queen of the seas. Josephus' account of the siege of Tyre by Shalmaneser, the king of Assyria, which continued for five years, in which he says, on the authority of the Tyrian archives, that the Tyrians "drank of the water they had out of the wells they dug," may have been confined to the reign of that king, and Sargon, his usurping successor, may have been satisfied with completing the siege of Samaria, and declined to continue that of Tyre, which had so long resisted and once defeated the powerful navy of Shalmaneser, king of Assyria.

Isaiah, the contemporary of both Shalmaneser and Sargon, was the first to utter denunciatory predictions against Tyre, when at the height of her maritime splendour and renown. The thirteenth chapter begins with the ominous words "The Burden of Tyre;" and then the prophet proceeds to show that "the crowning city of Tyre, whose merchants were princes, and whose traffickers were the honourable of the earth," should be visited in judgment by "the Chaldees," and, 'forgotten for seventy years, according to the days of one king," i.e., the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar, after which Tyre would recover her maritime supremacy, and like Babylon the Great of the Apocalypse, or Rome of Papal times, would—

"Commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth."1

1 Isa. xxiii. 8, 13, 15, 17, cf. Rev. xvii. 2.
This comparison with the Church of Rome is further alluded to by the prophet Ezekiel, to whom the word of the Lord came, saying—

"Son of man, say unto the prince of Tyrus, Thus saith the Lord God; Because thine heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God, in the midst of the seas; yet thou art a man, and not God, though thou set thine heart as the heart of God." 2

In the same way St. Paul was inspired to foretell the rise of the "man of sin," or "the lawless one," in the professing Church of Christ, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 3

It has been considered doubtful by some whether Isaiah's prophecy against Tyre relates to Shalmaneser's siege of five years, or Nebuchadnezzar's siege of thirteen years upwards of a century later. It is difficult to understand how such doubt should have arisen save in the minds of those who deny all predictive prophecy, and consequently refuse to accept St. Peter's definition of the "more sure word of prophecy," that "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 4 For the predictions of Isaiah in reference to Tyre have no resemblance to any thing which occurred in Shalmaneser's time, as far as the history of the two kingdoms is known to us; whereas the fact of Tyre being punished for a period of seventy years, and then recovering her maritime supremacy, exactly accords with what prophecy and history combined tell us did occur during the times of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors on the throne of Babylon.

When Nebuchadnezzar had captured Jerusalem, we might naturally infer that the people of Tyre, which was not two hundred miles distant, would be greatly alarmed for themselves, and this eventually proved to be the case; but at first their feeling seems to have been one of exultation, as we gather from the words of the prophet Ezekiel previous to the fulfilment of his denunciatory predictions against Tyre, which is thus expressed:—

2 Ezek. xxviii. 2. 3 2 Thess. ii. 4. 4 2 Pet. i. 19, 21.
"The word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, because that Tyrus hath said against Jerusalem, Aha, she is broken that was the gates of the people: she is turned unto me: I shall be replenished, now she is laid waste: Therefore thus saith the Lord; Behold, I am against thee, O Tyrus, and will cause many nations to come up against thee...And they shall destroy the walls of Tyrus, and break down her towers: I will also scrape her dust from her, and make her like the top of a rock. It shall be a place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea: for I have spoken it, saith the Lord God... Behold, I will bring upon Tyrus Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, a king of kings, from the north, with much people....I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord God."

The exultation of Tyre at Nebuchadnezzar's successful invasion of Judæa, is explained by events in Jewish history which had occurred within half a century previous to the destruction of Jerusalem. The famous reformation effected by the previous king Josiah, b.c. 622, so fully recorded in 2 Kings xxii. and xxiii., explains the exultation and malevolence of the Tyrians. In that reformation Josiah had pointedly insulted the idol gods of Tyre. He had burnt their images and defiled their high places—not excepting the high place which Solomon had erected near Jerusalem in honour of Ashtoreth, the Queen of Heaven, "the abomination of the Zidonians," in order to please one of his many heathen wives. In Samaria, Josiah did his utmost to exterminate the religion of the Tyrians by destroying all their priests. These acts must have been regarded by the Tyrians as a series of sacrilegious outrages, just as Papists regard our Reformation of the sixteenth century by Edward VI. and Elizabeth. The death, therefore, of Josiah at Megiddo, and the subsequent destruction of the city and Temple of Jerusalem, were hailed by them with triumphant joy, as instances of divine retribution.

Such feelings, however, must have undergone a signal change, when Nebuchadnezzar invaded Phœnicia, and laid siege to Tyre. Josephus quotes the Phenician archives in proof that "Nebuchadnezzar began the siege of Tyre in the seventh year of his reign," and that it "lasted for thirteen years.""6 Josephus

---

does not state that Nebuchadnezzar actually captured the city, and the matter has been keenly discussed by modern critics. Gesenius, and those sceptically inclined, decide it in the negative, while Hengstenberg and the more orthodox school argue strongly on the other side. The language of Ezekiel has been understood to imply that the King of Babylon, whose siege of Tyre ended within a year after his taking Jerusalem, which took place "in the nineteenth year" of his reign, did not capture the city, as it is written—

"Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon caused his army to serve a great service against Tyrus: every head was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: yet had he no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus, for the service that he had served against it: therefore, thus saith the Lord God, Behold I will give the land of Egypt unto Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon."8

We shall have occasion to show in the following chapter how recent discoveries in Egyptology have confirmed this prophecy of Ezekiel respecting Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt. It will be sufficient now to notice the apparent meaning of Ezekiel's words, that, as the King of Babylon and his army failed to obtain any "wages," i.e., spoil, and "every head was made bald," on account of the length of the siege, which lasted, according to the national archives, "thirteen years," Nebuchadnezzar was to have as a recompense and a reward the spoils of Egypt instead. But, previous to this, there is historical evidence that one of the kings of Egypt named Apries, the Pharaoh Hophra of Jeremiah, whom Herodotus pronounced "the most prosperous of all the kings that ever ruled over Egypt, excepting his grandfather Psammeticus," made a campaign against Tyre and Sidon, compelled the Chaldeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem, as Jeremiah (xxxvii. 5—11) states, and reduced the whole coast of Phœnicia for a time unto the obedience of Egypt, until he in his turn was overthrown by the all-powerful King of Babylon.9

Whether Nebuchadnezzar actually captured Tyre or not is immaterial in respect to the prophecies concerning it; though

---

7 2 Kings xxv. 8—10. 8 Ezek. xxix. 18, 19. 9 Herodotus, ii., § 161; Diodorus, i., § 88.
it is certain that the Babylonian kingdom extended over Syria and Phoenicia alike. Isaiah had predicted "that Tyre should be forgotten seventy years, according to the days of one king (or dynasty); and after the end of seventy years, Tyre would sing as an harlot." The "seventy years" predicted by Isaiah for the humiliation of Tyre, are the same seventy years spoken of by Jeremiah (xxv. 12) as the duration of Israel's captivity in Babylon; and which represent, as I have already shown (see p. 370), the duration of Nebuchadnezzar's dynasty. And Herodotus mentions that when Cyrus took Babylon, the Phœnicians, which included the people of Tyre and Sidon, who had been "forgotten for seventy years," i.e., had been forced to admit the Babylonian supremacy, readily submitted to the Persian sway. They thereby were enabled to recover their maritime supremacy, as Persia, being at that time exclusively an inland kingdom, had no need of a fleet at sea. Thus Tyre was enabled to fulfil the prophecy which Isaiah between two and three centuries previously had predicted concerning her, that at the termination of the seventy years, "the Lord would visit Tyre;" she would—

"Sing as an harlot, and commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth." 3

Centuries, however, were to elapse before the judgment pronounced upon Tyre by the prophet Ezekiel would be fully accomplished, when Tyre would become, as it is now—

"A place for the spreading of nets in the midst of the sea.... I will make thee like the top of a rock: thou shalt be a place to spread nets upon; thou shalt be built no more: for I the Lord have spoken it, saith the Lord God." 4

As long as the Persian empire lasted, the Tyrians had not only regained their former naval supremacy, but they were unmolested by any external enemy. It is interesting to know that as Hiram, king of Tyre, contributed so largely towards the building of Solomon's Temple on Mount Zion, so the Tyrians, five centuries later, assisted the Jews in rebuilding the second Temple after their return from Babylon, as Ezra tells us—

---

1 Isa. xxiii. 16.  
2 Herod. iii., § 19.  
3 Isa. xxiii. 16, 17.  
4 Ezek. xxvi. 5, 14.
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"When the seventh month was come, the children of Israel gathered themselves together as one man to Jerusalem. Then stood up Jeshua, and his brethren the priests, and Zerubbabel, and his brethren, and builded the altar of the God of Israel... But the foundation of the temple of the Lord was not yet laid. They gave meat, and drink, and oil unto them of Zidon, and to them of Tyre (these two cities being only 20 miles apart), to bring cedar trees from Lebanon to the sea of Joppa, according to the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia."

No sooner was the Persian empire overthrown, than Alexander the Great, B.C. 322, two centuries and a half after the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, commenced that memorable siege of Tyre, which has been so well described by Arrian and Quintus Curtius, and which lasted for seven months. At that time, Tyre was situated on an island about half-a-mile from the mainland, and completely protected by strong walls, which are said to have reached a height of 150 feet; and the place itself was so well fortified, that Alexander never would have succeeded in taking the city, though the isle was blockaded on the north by the Cypriotes, and on the south by a Phoenician fleet, had he not been enabled to raise an artificial mole, thus uniting the island to the mainland.

The results of Alexander's conquest were most disastrous to the Tyrians. In accordance with the barbarous policy of the age, Alexander, whose character was such as to reduce him to the condition of a cruel savage, put its brave defenders to death; and 30,000 of its inhabitants were sold as bond slaves. Tyre, notwithstanding this treatment of the Grecian conqueror, gradually recovered its former prosperity; and under the Romans it was privileged to retain its ancient freedom; for Josephus relates that when Cleopatra urged Marc Antony to include Tyre and Sidon in a gift which he had made to her of Jewish territory, he steadily refused, because they had been "free cities from their ancestors."  

Strabo describes the great wealth of Tyre at the beginning of the Christian era, which it derived chiefly from the dyes of

---
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the celebrated Tyrian purple. And Pliny incidentally mentions that the circumference of the walls of Tyre included nearly 20 Roman miles.

For the succeeding five centuries, the prosperity of Tyre continued unabated. And it was not until the conquests of the Saracens, under the Caliph Omar in the 7th century, that the decadence of Tyre in reality commenced. The triumph of the Mohammedan power throughout the whole of Palestine, Syria, and Western Asia, had its natural effect upon those countries which had received and acknowledged Christianity. But even this conquest did not cause the overthrow of Tyre. It was reserved for another Mohammedan power at a later period to effect that judgment on Tyre, which the prophets Isaiah and Ezekiel had foretold many centuries before. At the time of the Crusades, in the 12th century, Tyre was still a flourishing city. It had early been the seat of a Christian bishopric. A bishop of Tyre is named as having been present at the Council of Cæsarea, A.D. 381. In the year succeeding the capture of Tyre by the Crusaders in 1124, a Frenchman, who was known in later ages as "William of Tyre," was made its archbishop, and in his history of the city has left on record an interesting account of its great wealth and military strength. Benjamin of Tudela, who visited it about half a century after its possession by the Crusaders, writes of Tyre—

"I do not think any city in the world has so good a haven as this. The city itself is a very grand one, and in it there are about 400 Jews, who have merchant ships at sea for the sake of gain. There are artificial workmen in glass there, who manufacture the Tyrian glass, which is most excellent, and held in the highest esteem in all countries."

Such was the state of Tyre at the close of the 12th century, and so continued a century later, 2500 years after the time when King Hiram assisted David and Solomon in the building of the Temple at Jerusalem. There was no city in the known world which had a stronger claim to that title, which Rome has proudly appropriated to herself, of "Eternal." For Tyre had been the parent of colonies, just as much as our own country has been in

9 Pliny, Nat. Hist. v. 17.
the 19th century; which at a distant period had enjoyed a long life, much celebrity, and then passed away without leaving scarcely a sign of their existence. It had outlived its greatest colony, Carthage (so long the rival, and at one time, under Hannibal, the greatest general perhaps which the world has ever seen, the conqueror of Rome), by upwards of 15 centuries. Thebes, the capital of the mightiest empire on earth during the first millennium of its post-diluvian existence, and very powerful for centuries before Tyre was heard of, had long ceased to exist. Nineveh and Babylon had each attained their culminating point of splendour centuries after Tyre was in the height of her renown; but they had passed away, and left nothing but "heaps" of rubbish and a desolate wilderness to attest their departed glory. Tyre had seen the rise and fall of numberless cities of Greece, like Sparta and Athens; and though far older than them all, was still in a state of great prosperity, when an illustrious Roman, who had been sailing by the coasts of Greece, wrote to Cicero\(^1\) an account of the "carcases of cities," by which, during the voyage, he had been surrounded on every side.

At length, however, the time had arrived which "the sure word of prophecy" had foretold, when the threatened judgments on Tyre were to be fully accomplished. The city had been possessed by the Christians for the greater part of two centuries, when in the year 1291, the Sultan of Egypt invested Ptolemais, where the modern Acre now stands, which was so gallantly defended five centuries later by Sir Sydney Smith, against the French, and made memorable as the place where Napoleon Buonaparte received his first defeat. Ptolemais was taken after a siege of two months; and the progress of the Mohammedan arms was such as to determine the Christians of Tyre to retreat, in place of attempting any longer to resist the invader. This unusual feat in the history of nations is related by a Venetian writer of the name of Marinus Sanutus in the following way:—

\(^{1}\)Cicero, Ep. ad Familiar, iv. 5.

"On the same day on which Ptolemais was taken, the Tyrians, at Vespers,
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leaving the city empty, without the stroke of a sword, without the tumult of war, embarked on board their vessels, and abandoned the city to be occupied freely by their conquerors. On the morrow the Saracans entered, no one attempting to prevent them, and they did what they pleased."²

The exode of the Christians from Tyre was similar to that of the Christians from Jerusalem twelve centuries earlier, when, in remembrance of our Lord's words,³ they escaped to Pella previous to the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans. The result in both instances was the same. Soon after the destruction of Jerusalem the plough literally passed over the site of the city of Zion, in accordance with the sure word of prophecy.⁴ In the course of time, after Tyre was deserted by the Christians and possessed by the Mohammedans, Ezekiel's prophecy respecting Tyre being a place used by fishermen for the purpose of drying their nets began to be fulfilled. In the fourteenth century it was visited by one of the earliest of modern travellers, Sir John Maundeville, who says—

"Here was Tyre, now called Sur, once a great and goodly city of the Christians; but the Saracens have destroyed it in great part, and they guard that haven carefully for fear of the Christians."⁵

Sandys, another English traveller, who followed Maundeville after an interval of three centuries, found the destruction had been so rapid during that interval, that he relates—

"This once famous Tyre is now no other than a heap of ruins; yet they have a reverent aspect, sufficient to instruct the pensive beholder with their examplary frailty."

And Maundrell, who visited the ruins at the close of the seventeenth century, says of Tyre—

"On the north side it has an old Turkish castle, besides which there is nothing here but a mere Babel of broken walls and pillars, &c., there being not so much as an entire house left. Its present inhabitants are only a few poor wretches harbouring themselves in vaults, and subsisting chiefly upon fishing, who seem to be preserved in this place by Divine Providence, as a visible argument how God hath fulfilled His word concerning Tyre."⁶

² Liber Secretorum fidelium Crucis, lib. iii., c. 22.
⁴ Micah iii. 12; Jer. xxvi. 18, see p. 29.
⁵ Wright's Early Travels in Palestine, p. 141.
⁶ Maundrell's Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, p. 82.
Half a century after Maundrell’s journey, Hasselquist, the Swiss naturalist, visited Tyre, and his testimony, appears to mark the lowest point of depression which the once famous “queen of the seas” had reached. Hasselquist was there in 1751, when he describes the city in the following way:

“We came to Tyre, now called Zur, where we lay all night. None of these cities, which formerly were famous, are so totally ruined as this except Troy. Zur can scarcely now be called a miserable village, though it was formerly Tyre the queen of the sea. Here are about ten inhabitants, Turks and Christians, who live by fishing.”

A curious instance of the rise and fall of cities in relation to Tyre may be thus stated. We have already mentioned the evidence which makes it tolerably certain that the tin used in the construction of Solomon’s Temple was brought nearly 3000 years ago by the fleets of Hiram king of Tyre from the tin mines of Cornwall. We have seen how that Tyre, after an existence of nearly 2500 years in her splendour as queen of the seas, began at last to decline; and the prophecies of Isaiah and Ezekiel were literally accomplished by her utter ruin, before the middle of the last century, so that when the visit of the Swedish naturalist took place in 1751, there were only ten inhabitants left amid the ruins of the once mighty Tyre, who were gaining

---

"Hasselquist, Voyages and Travels in the Levant; London, 1766. Bruce, who followed Hasselquist after a few years in visiting the same locality, describes Tyre as “a rock whereon fishers dry their nets.” The author, when at Cambridge in 1839, was acquainted with an intelligent Christian from Beyrount, named Assaad Yakoob Kayat, who acted as interpreter to the Persian princes on their visit to England, and who told him that he had often witnessed the fulfillment of Ezekiel’s prophecy respecting Tyre in her desolation, being “like the top of a rock, a place to spread nets upon.” The Rev. T. Rowlands, Rector of Grimston, who visited Tyre a few years ago, writes to me as follows respecting it, “Having arrived in the evening at the modern village of Tyre, I saw all the houses on each side of me, having flat roofs, were covered with nets hanging over to dry, and when I came to the shore, found the whole rocky beach spread over with fisherman’s nets, so that it may truly be said that Tyre is become literally and strikingly a place for fishermen, a place for the spreading of nets, made like the top of a rock, a place to spread nets upon” (Ezek. xxvi. 5, 14)."
a precarious subsistence by what Volney justly termed "a trifling fishery;" and accustomed to dry their nets "on the top of a rock," on which the famous city once stood.

At a distance of less than a hundred miles east of those Cornish mines, where the fleets of Hiram king of Tyre formerly came on their voyages of commerce and trade, there existed in the middle of the last century, at the very time when Hasselquist was making researches among the ruins of Tyre, on the south coast of Devon, a few fishermen's huts, about half a dozen in number, belonging to the parish and village of Tor Mohun. Who could have supposed it possible that a few years later the site of those fisherman's cottages would be transformed into the most charming watering place in England, the far-famed and populous Torquay. Its rise can scarcely be said to have commenced before the present century; by the census of 1851 its population amounted to 6185, and by the last one of 1881 this had increased to between 20,000 and 30,000.

Such is a brief notice of two noted maritime cities as they existed during the last hundred years of the world's history—Tyre in her fall, according to the prediction of the Word of God, and Torquay in her rise, as one of the favoured cities of the greatest empire which the world has ever seen; for neither Thebes nor Nineveh, Babylon nor Rome, when respectively at their culminating height, approached either in greatness or in worth the power of the British empire, of which one of our own poets has so well sung in his Ode on a British Queen, and which have been so amply fulfilled in the present day during the reign of the greatest of her successors.

"Regions Caesar never knew
Thy posterity shall sway,
Where his eagles never flew,
None invincible as they.

Rome shall perish—write that word
In the blood that she has spilt;
Perish hopeless and abhor'd,
Deep in ruin as in guilt."
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Rome for empire far renown'd,
    Tramples on a thousand states;
Soon her pride shall kiss the ground—
    Hark! the Gaul is at her gates!

Ruffians, pitiless as proud,
    Heaven awards the vengeance due:
Empire is on us bestow'd,
    Shame and ruin wait for you.”

This most remarkable testimony to the ruin of the great empires of the ancient world in general, and that of Tyre in particular, is to be found in the works of a celebrated French infidel, whose unbelief is so strong, that notwithstanding his learning and experience as a great traveller, he had the folly to declare that “the existence of Jesus Christ is no better proved than that of Osiris and Hercules, or that of Fot, with whom the Chinese continually confound Him, for they never call Jesus by any other name than Fot. There are absolutely no other monuments of the existence of Jesus Christ as a human being, than a passage in Josephus, a single phrase in Tacitus, and the Gospels!”

Such is M. Volney’s idea of the proof at our command for the existence of the Founder of the Christian religion. Any educated person in the present day putting forth such an argument in favour of infidelity, might justly be pronounced more fit for Bedlam than any place else. Its reckless folly sufficiently refutes itself.

8 Volney’s Ruins of Empires, p. 355.
CHAPTER XIX.

PROPHECIES RELATING TO EGYPT.

If archaeology has brought to light much in the cuneiform inscriptions relating to the histories of Assyria and Babylon, this is still more evident in the information which the Egyptian monuments with their numerous hieroglyphic and hieratic inscriptions afford to the student, not only in respect to its history, but also in the Scripture prophecies relating to the land of Ham.

We pass on, therefore, to consider what three of the greater prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, were inspired to foretell respecting the calamities which were destined to overtake the cities of that doomed land. We must not forget that Egypt, for upwards of a thousand years after the dispersion at Babel, and the formation of different nations in Europe, Asia and Africa, was the mightiest kingdom on the face of the earth. The Pyramids, which were the mausoleums or tombs of the kings of the first six of Manetho's dynasties, as Job appears to state, are the only buildings which have stood the wear and tear of time. The Great Pyramid of Ghizeh is the only one of the seven wonders of the ancient world which still remains; and the corpse of King Mykerinus, brought by Col. Howard Vyse about half a century ago from the third Pyramid of that same locality, and now in the British Museum, is one of the very few relics which can claim an undoubted antiquity of at least 4000 years.

ISAIAH.

This prophet begins by announcing God's judgment in the usual formula—
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"The Burden of Egypt. . . . The idols of Egypt shall melt at the presence of Jehovah. I will set the Egyptians against the Egyptians: and they shall fight every one against his brother, and every one against his neighbour. . . . And the Egyptians will I give over into the hands of a cruel lord; and a fierce king shall rule over them, saith Jehovah. . . . Surely the princes of Zoan are fools, the counsel of the wise counsellors of Pharaoh is become brutish. . . . Where are they? Where are thy wise men? Let them know what the Lord hath purposed upon Egypt. . . . Jehovah hath mingled a perverse spirit in the midst of them: and they have caused Egypt to err in every work thereof. . . . In that day Egypt shall fear because of the shaking of the hand of the Lord of hosts." (ch. xix. 1—16).

"And the land of Judah shall be a terror unto Egypt. . . . In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to (by) the Lord of hosts; one shall be called, The city of destruction. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto Jehovah in the land of Egypt. . . . And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day. . . . And the Lord shall smite Egypt and heal it: and they shall return to the Lord." (ch. xix. 17—22).

"In that day shall there be a highway out of Egypt to Assyria, and the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land: Whom Jehovah shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance" (ch. xix., 23—25).

I have divided the nineteenth chapter of Isaiah's prophecy into three divisions, as each of these prophecies appear to refer to different epochs.

The first portion foretells the civil war in Egypt, and ends with the Persian conquest of Egypt by Cambyses. The second seems to speak of a great change taking place among the Egyptians, when they are brought to the knowledge of the true God. The third may be understood either as applicable to the same period, or, as some suppose, to a time yet future, when the children of Israel will be restored "a second time" to the land which God gave to Abraham and his descendants as "an everlasting possession." 9

Isaiah commences his predictions against Egypt by alluding to the "idols being moved at the presence of Jehovah," when

9 Gen. xvii. 8.
"it shall fear because of the shaking of the hand of the Lord of hosts over it (xix. 1—16). Isaiah prophesied in the middle of the eighth century B.C., when, as Herodotus says, a dynasty of priests was ruling in Egypt; and it seemed the most unlikely thing in the world that the system of idolatry, which had so long stood the test of time, having then existed for sixteen centuries, or about double the period which separates the Norman Conquest from our own day, should be so completely overthrown as it was by the Persian conquest of Egypt, which happened about two and a half centuries after Isaiah wrote.

Moreover, Isaiah predicted the coming desolation of Egypt by the civil wars which ensued shortly after this time, first by the invasion of the Ethiopians, and then by the subsequent conquests of the Assyrians, the Babylonians, and the Persians. The Assyrian conquest has been already considered in our notice of the prophecies relating to Nineveh (see pp. 356—361); Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt will be noticed presently; but that of the Ethiopians is so remarkable a confirmation of Isaiah's prophecy, that we may profitably consider the subject at some length. Until the recent decipherment of the Egyptian monuments, Biblical students were unable to reconcile many of the statements recorded in Scripture with those of secular historians on the latter times, or the last days of the Pharaohs.

Canon Cook, the editor of the Speaker's Commentary, has given to the Church most interesting information respecting the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, by his two essays which enrich the first volume of that commentary; but in the pamphlet which he has published, entitled The Inscription of Pianchi-Mer-Amon, King of Egypt, in the eighth century B.C., he has thrown a flood of light on the prophecies of Isaiah as bearing upon that very confused period of Egyptian history, not only by his skill in translating the lengthy hieroglyphic

---

1 For the condition of Egypt at this period of her history, see Records of the Past, ii., pp. 79—104; Brugsch-Bey's History of Egypt under the Pharaohs, ch. xviii.; Rawlinson's History of Egypt, chaps. xxv. and xxvi.; Birch's History of Egypt, p. 159, et seq.
inscription, but also by his valuable "Introductory Remarks" with which the inscription is accompanied.

While referring our readers to this valuable pamphlet for a complete understanding of the history of Egypt in the eighth century B.C., and to show how well it harmonizes with what Isaiah had predicted concerning the civil war, when "the Egyptians were set against the Egyptians, and every one fought against his neighbour; city against city, and kingdom against kingdom" (v. 2); it will be sufficient to mention that at this period when the Ethiopian dynasty commenced to rule in Egypt, there was no prince or Pharaoh in Lower Egypt who could be regarded as an independent sovereign. The civil war may be said to have begun by the revolt of a certain chieftain named Tafnecht, against the authority of Pharaoh Pianchi, the Ethiopian, about the year B.C. 740—730, a few years before the capture of Samaria, the capital of the kingdom of Israel, by Sargon king of Assyria, the first of that nation who invaded the hitherto unconquered kingdom of Egypt.

We learn from the inscription that Pharaoh Pianchi Mer-amon, although residing chiefly in Nubia, with his capital at the ancient Napata, the "Noph"² of Isaiah's prophecy, now termed Gebel, where the inscription was found, was a native Egyptian prince of royal birth, devoted to the idol gods of Egypt, and connected with the priestly family which had obtained supremacy in the Thebaid under a previous dynasty; and which, as Canon Cook considers, answers to Manetho's twenty-first dynasty, adding that "he (Pianchi) derived his right partly through his father representing the priestly line of Theban kings, and partly through his mother; hence he calls himself king from the egg." The chief point, however, in the inscription is the confirmation which it affords to Isaiah's prophecy respecting the civil war, and which before its discovery, as Canon Cook remarks—

"Was considered by commentators to be incompatible with any date preceding the Dodecarchy.... At present it proves that the divisions which culminated in the Dodecarchy, existed before and during the predominance

² Isa. xix. 13.
of the Ethiopian dynasty." Hence he argues justly that "the prophecies of the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of Isaiah (relating to Ethiopia and Egypt), may be assigned to the period intervening between the capture of Samaria and the expedition of Sargon against Egypt."

Canon Cook adds:—

"The date of the prophecy in the twentieth chapter of Isaiah is distinctly marked, 'In the year that Tartan (the commander of the Assyrian army) came to Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria had sent him.' This must have taken place B.C. 712—711. But the conquest of Egypt by the Assyrians, which Isaiah announces in this chapter, did not take place before the reign of Esarhaddon, B.C. 672. We have, therefore, a prophecy of which the date is precise, determined by a fact historically certain, and announcing events of which the accomplishment did not take place till forty years afterward. M. Lenormant, whom I saw at Paris in the summer of 1870, spoke to me of this combination, to which he justly attached great importance, as an instance of a special prophecy literally fulfilled within a limited time, yet one which certainly lay beyond the sphere of human vision."

To compare such a prophecy with a well-known historical event of our own time, what would have been said, if in the year 1812, when Napoleon was at the culminating point of his earthly grandeur, before he commenced the Moscow campaign, when at Dresden monarchs were waiting in his antechamber, and Prussia was at her lowest depression, being a mere tributary king to the proud Corsican despot, if a prophet had then arisen and told the world, that in less than sixty years from that date, the despised Prussia would arise Phœnix-like from her ashes, and in one short month, unassisted by any earthly power save the brave soldiers of her own German fatherland, would so completely overthrow and crush the French empire at Sedan (the greatest victory, numerically speaking, ever known in the annals of modern warfare), that the Napoleon dynasty was instantly banished from France (never again, it is to be hoped, to return), the King of Prussia accepted the sovereignty of the revived German Empire in the palace of the proud Bourbon kings at Versailles, and Paris, "the beauty and excellency," to use the language of Scripture, of modern Europe, lay at the mercy of the conqueror! Who
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would not have ascribed such an unlikely prediction to the supernatural, to divine inspiration? Yet this is what Isaiah predicted in reference to Egypt, when foretelling her doom and her disgrace. Moreover, when compared with other prophecies recorded in Holy Writ, such, e.g., as the condition of the race of Abraham since the Roman destruction of Jerusalem, or the year, day, and hour when the promised Messiah would be "cut off" for the sins of men; or a multitude of other predictions of a like nature found in Scripture, the overthrow of the Egyptian idols, the civil war of the eighth century B.C., the destruction of the Pharaohs, and their being given into the hands of a "cruel lord," which was literally fulfilled by Cambyses' conquest of Egypt, Isaiah's prophecy in relation to these matters seems almost insignificant beside them.

Nevertheless, the judgment of Jehovah upon the once splendid palaces and cities of Egypt, whose architecture still excites the admiration of European travellers, and the utter destruction of the idolatrous system of the most powerful kingdom of the ancient world, the desolation of Zoan and Memphis, and other capitals of the Pharaohs, whose princes for nigh two thousand years swayed the destinies of mankind—have all combined to the fulfilment of those prophecies, which Isaiah was inspired to proclaim against Egypt. A recent traveller writes of "Zoan" as being—

"In stark, silent devastation, one of the grandest ruins in the world.... I cannot recollect any ruin (he adds) which impressed me so deeply with the sense of fallen and deserted magnificence."  

When God executes His judgments upon any people, whether heathen, Israel, or Christian, He is said to punish them for their idolatrous tendencies, and their preferring to worship the senseless images of wood and stone to Him, who is revealed to us as a Spirit, and who requires those that worship Him to do so "in spirit and in truth." This was equally seen at the time of the Exodus, when He said, "Against all the gods of Egypt I will execute judgment: I am Jehovah." It was the same a thousand years later, when Cambyses, by his conquest of Egypt,

\[4\] Macgregor's *Rob Roy*, pp. 75, 78.  \[5\] Exod. xii. 12.
inflicted so heavy a punishment upon the worshippers of Apis and other idol deities which swarmed in the land of Ham. It was the same sin which brought down the judgment of God upon guilty Israel in the days of Nebuchadnezzar; and it was for a like folly amongst nominal Christians which has been visited upon them both in Constantinople and Rome, by the various invasions of Saracens and Turks on the former, and the Goths and Vandals on the latter, as well as the striking contrast between the Church of Rome at the beginning of the sixteenth century, when she proudly boasted that all opposition to her authority had ceased, with the fallen condition to which she is reduced at the present day.

Though Cambyses, the Persian king, was fanatically opposed to the idol-worship of the Egyptians, far more efficacious in the way of their destruction was the silent influence of the race of Israel, who, after the return from the Babylonish captivity, began to settle in large numbers in Egypt, and who, by their translation of the Old Testament into the vernacular of the most civilized parts of the world, opened the way for the subsequent introduction of the Gospel; and the existence for some centuries of one of the most flourishing branches of Christ's Catholic Church, which produced such men as Clement of Alexandria; Pantaenus, the celebrated missionary to India; and Athanasius, the brave upholder of the doctrine of the Trinity, in which is contained the sum and substance of the Christian religion.

It is this which alone enables us to understand the latter portion of this prophecy, where Isaiah speaks of "an altar" being erected to Jehovah in the midst of Egypt; and "a pillar" at the border thereof, "for a sign and witness;" and when "five cities in the land of Egypt should speak the language of Canaan, and one shall be called, The city of destruction." 6 Many interpretations have been propounded of this rather difficult passage in the prophecies of Isaiah. Of all the various commentaries which I have had an opportunity of consulting on the subject, I think that by Professor Birks of Cambridge to be the

6 Isa. xix. 18, 19.
most satisfactory. It is certain that the Hebrew word translated in the Authorised Version, "city of destruction," becomes by a very slight change of ropolis, where twelve centuries earlier Joseph received his bride as a gift from Pharaoh, and two centuries later Moses was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. And inasmuch as this prophecy appears to have a double fulfilment in respect to Egypt, first in the punishment of her idol gods, and secondly in her subsequent blessing, when "five cities would speak the language of Canaan, and one of them would be called, The city of destruction," On, or Heliopolis, had the name of Ha-ra, the abode of the sun, its great temple having been dedicated to Athom, the setting sun, and one of the main centres of Egyptian idolatry. It is to this Jeremiah refers, when he predicts that "Nebuchadnezzar shall break the images of Beth-shemesh (i.e., the house of the sun) that is in the land of Egypt, and the gods of the Egyptians shall he burn with fire."7 The word one in Hebrew often means "the first," as this text is so explained in the Chaldee Targum; Heliopolis being the first or most famous of the five cities of Egypt, which were to adopt the religion or speak the language of Canaan, as the Targum says, "One of them shall be called the city of the house of the sun, which is to be destroyed." Thus in the prophecy of Isaiah one of Egypt's chief cities, for so many centuries dedicated to the worship of the sun, became indeed "The city of destruction," when it was burnt with fire, and all its images or idol gods scattered to the winds.

But the ruins of Beth-shemesh and the destruction of Heliopolis did not proclaim the overthrow of Egyptian idolatry so plainly as the existence of the Hebrew Scriptures in the country of the Pharaohs, and the subsequent growth of a Christian Church in the land of Ham. Josephus and other Jews have understood this prophecy to have been literally fulfilled, when in the second century B.C. Onias, the son of Onias the high priest, asked permission from Ptolemy and Cleopatra to build a temple in Egypt like that in Jerusalem,

7 Jer. xliii. 13.
and to appoint there a complete Levitical service, which, says Josephus, he did, because—

"He saw that Judæa was oppressed by the Macedonians, and chiefly in reliance on a prophecy of Isaiah, who foretold that there certainly was to be a temple erected to the true God in Egypt by a Jew."

Hence Onias wrote to Ptolemy to tell him that—

"The prophet Isaiah predicted that there should be an altar in Egypt to the Lord God, and many other such things did Isaiah prophesy relating to that country."

To which Ptolemy replied—

"Since thou desirest to purge the temple of Leontopolis in the district of Heliopolis, which is fallen down, we wonder that it should be pleasing to God to have a temple erected in a place formerly so unclean, and full of animals worshipped by the Egyptians. But since thou sayest that Isaiah the prophet foretold this long ago, we give thee leave to do it, if it may be done according to your law, that we may not seem to have offended against God." 8

The "pillar at the border of Egypt" mentioned by Isaiah, appears to be distinct from the "altar" in the midst of the land: and inasmuch as at one time the Jews at Pelusium, Josephus says, were sufficiently numerous and powerful to be appointed "guardians of the entrances of Egypt," it may refer to some memorial pillar, erected by them in commemoration of this incident, just as Bohun, the son of Reuben, a thousand years before, had erected a memorial stone to mark the border of his paternal tribe.9

The closing part of the prophecy of Isaiah, in vv. 23—25, may possibly refer to a time yet future. Professor Birks justly observes concerning it, that—

"Earnests of this promise were seen largely even before the Christian era, and also in the times of the apostles. The dwellers in Mesopotamia and Egypt on the day of Pentecost, the Ethiopian eunuch, the converts like Apollos from Alexandria (Acts vi. 9; xviii. 24), were its partial fulfilment. But its fulness seems reserved for the day when 'nation shall not lift up sword against nation,' and when the recovery of Israel shall be life from the dead to the Gentile world. Rom. xi. 15."1

8 Josephus, Antiq. xiii. 3, § 1, 2; also B. J. vii. § 10.
9 Judges xv. 6; Jos., Antiq. xiv., § 2.
1 Birks' Commentary on Isaiah, p. 107.
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JEREMIAH.

What Jeremiah was inspired to foretell respecting Egypt is contained in two chapters of his memorable prophecy, relating chiefly to the condition of the Jews when in the land of Ham, the punishment of "Pharaoh-hophra king of Egypt," and the conquest of the country by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. The last-named prophecy, which is also foretold by Ezekiel, assumes a peculiar interest at this present time, on account of two contemporary documents which have recently been discovered, and to which I shall presently allude, which confirm in a remarkable way this prophecy, notwithstanding the boast of modern infidels, that as no contemporary evidence of Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt had ever yet been found, as related in Scripture, therefore, "even on the theological side, men had ceased to defend" what was clearly in their estimation an unlucky guess, predicted by two Hebrew prophets, who were no longer worthy of trust!

Chapter xliv. opens thus:—

"The word that came to Jeremiah concerning all the Jews which dwell in the land of Egypt" (v. 1). The prophet then proceeds to describe "the wickedness" of the chosen race of Israel, in "burning incense" unto other gods, and especially to the "queen of heaven," exactly as the Church of Rome has done for so many centuries, notwithstanding the solemn warning mentioned by Jeremiah—for "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel, Oh, do not this abominable thing that I hate." The perverted Jews, like a skilful Papal controversialist of the present day, replied to the prophet's reproaches, that they did not deny that it was "the word of the Lord" which Jeremiah had spoken (v. 16), but that inasmuch as their forefathers had "burnt incense unto the queen of heaven," in the days of Judah's prosperity, proving that her favour was more efficacious than that of Jehovah, therefore they rebuked the faithful servant of God by saying, "We will not hearken unto thee." And the chapter concludes with these words of warning—"And this shall be a sign unto you, saith Jehovah, that I will punish you in this place, that ye may know that my words shall surely stand against you for evil: Thus saith the Lord; Behold, I will give Pharaoh-hophra king of Egypt into the hand of his enemies, and into the hand of them that seek his life; as I gave Zedekiah king of Judah into the

hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, his enemy, and that sought his life" (vv. 29, 30).

The exact and literal fulfilment of this prophecy, as may be proved from Herodotus (lib. ii., §§ 161, 169), is such that Hitzig and other sceptics have endeavoured to lessen its force by rejecting these two verses as later interpolations, declaring them, as others have treated the prophecies of Daniel, "a prediction after the event," i.e., a mere historical statement; and asserting that the fulfilment respecting Pharaoh-hophra was too remote for a sign to those whom Jeremiah was addressing. But a sign need not be immediate; and Jeremiah's contemporaries had had their sign that the prophet's words were true in the fulfilment of all that he had said about Jerusalem. History tells us very clearly that Pharaoh-hophra (called "Apries" by Herodotus, and "Vapris" by Manetho) ascended the throne shortly before Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadnezzar, B.C. 589; and for a time was a very prosperous monarch. Herodotus says he was "the most prosperous of all the kings that ever ruled over Egypt, excepting his great-grandfather Psammetichus." Moreover, Hophra thought himself so secure on his throne that the historian relates the king's belief—

"That there was not a god who could cast him down from his eminence, so firmly did he think that he had established himself in his kingdom." 3

Nevertheless, the word of the Lord standeth sure; and the prophecy of Jeremiah became literally true about a quarter of a century after the Jews fled to Egypt, contrary to the advice and warning of their faithful prophet. For we learn from Herodotus, that after having reigned for twenty-six years a revolt took place among the native troops, in consequence of Hophra having been defeated by the Cyrenians, when a suspicion arose that Pharaoh had betrayed his native troops in order to establish a tyranny by means of his mercenaries. The king having sent Amasis, one of his generals, to quell the revolt, the treacherous servant, just like Nobopalasar, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, acted towards his sovereign, as did the

3 Herodotus, lib. ii., §§ 161, 169.
last king of Assyria a century before, who betrayed his master and turned his arms against him. A severe engagement took place at Momemphis, on the edge of the desert, between the mercenaries which adhered to the king and the revolted troops, under the command of Amasis, which ended in the total defeat of the former, and Pharaoh-hophra became a prisoner to his former servant. Amasis ascended the vacant throne, and after treating Hophra for a short time with unusual kindness, was constrained to give him up to his enemies, by whom he was strangled; and thus the words of Jeremiah, "I will give Pharaoh-hophra king of Egypt into the hands of them that seek his life," became literally and strictly true.

Moreover, Jeremiah's prediction concerning him, by whose hand the punishment of Pharaoh was to be effected, has received a remarkable confirmation from a hieroglyphic inscription recently brought to light. Thus speaks the prophet:

"The daughter of Egypt shall be confounded; she shall be delivered into the hand of the people of the north. The Lord of hosts saith; Behold, I will punish the multitude of No, and Pharaoh, and Egypt, with their gods, and their kings; even Pharaoh, and all them that trust in him: and I will deliver them into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar king of Babylon, and into the hand of his servants: and afterward it shall be inhabited, as in the days of old, saith the Lord."  

In the same way speaks the prophet Ezekiel:

"Son of man, take up a lamentation for Pharaoh (Hophra) king of Egypt, and say unto him . . . . Thus saith the Lord God; The sword of the king of Babylon shall come upon thee. By the swords of the mighty will I cause thy multitude to fall, the terrible of the nations, all of them; and they shall spoil the pomp of Egypt, and all the multitude thereof shall be destroyed."

Here we have a distinct prophecy by two Hebrew prophets respecting God's judgment upon the idols of Egypt in general, and on a certain Pharaoh in particular, by the hands of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon. The term "multitude of No," reads literally "Amon of No," or Thebes, the capital of Upper Egypt, and better known as "Jupiter Ammon." He

---

4 Jer. xlvi. 24—26. 5 Ezek. xxxii. 2, 11, 12.
6 In Nahum iii. 8, he is called "No-Amon."
was the first of the supreme triad of Thebes, and confessedly his form was the most elevated and spiritual under which the Egyptian priesthood represented the divinity to the adoration of the people. Thus in the prophecy the anger of Jehovah is represented as falling upon the idolatrous emblems of the highest divine and human powers, Amon of Thebes and Pharaoh-hophra, king of Egypt; Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, being named as the executor of God's vengeance.

There are two monumental tablets preserved at Florence and Leyden on the Apis Steles, which record the death and succession of certain sacred bulls which were worshipped at Thebes, and which show the perfect synchronism of the chronology of Scripture and of Egypt at this period of history, and its agreement with that of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, which will work out as follows:

B.C.

610. Accession of Pharaoh Necho.
607. Ditto of Nebuchadnezzar.
589. Ditto of Pharaoh-hophra.

, Jerusalem destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar.
571. Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Egypt.

, Accession of Amasis as tributary king of Egypt.
525. The conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, king of Persia.

It is sometimes assumed by sceptics that because no Egyptian records have been discovered of the judgment of Jehovah on the Egyptians and the Pharaoh whose army was destroyed in the Red Sea, therefore the story of the Exodus, as related in Scripture, is untrustworthy, unhistorical, and nothing more than a compound of legend and myth. But these objectors forget that there is no instance of any nation recording their own shame; and there is sufficient evidence from the Egyptian monuments to confirm the truth of history respecting the Israelites in Egypt, notwithstanding all that Bishop Colenso has asserted to the contrary.

So in reference to an historical event which happened 1000

---

years later than the exodus of the Israelites, no historian, from Herodotus downwards, has related the conquest of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon; and no commentator (not even the most modern one, known as the Speaker's Commentary) has adduced any evidence in explanation of the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel relating to that event. It is true that Abydenus, in his history of the Assyrians, has preserved the following fragment of Megasthenes, who says—

"That Nebuchadnezzar having become more powerful than Hercules, invaded Libya and Iberia, and when he had rendered them tributary, he extended his conquests over the inhabitants of the shores upon the right of the sea." 8

It is difficult to understand the exact meaning of Megasthenes' words as reported by Abydenus; for though Nebuchadnezzar must have passed through Lower Egypt in his invasion of Libya, the historian does not mention the King of Babylon's conquest of the land of Ham.

This confirmation of Fulfilled Prophecy was reserved for our own time. Two inscriptions, cuneiform and hieroglyphic, have been recently discovered, which remarkably confirm the prophecies respecting the conquest of Egypt by the King of Babylon, the one Babylonian, the other Egyptian. The former is of so interesting a character that it deserves a brief description. In the month of September, 1878, a small collection of Babylonian inscribed tablets was purchased by the trustees of the British Museum. On examination a small fragment was found, about 2 inches long by 1½ broad, containing an allusion to "the thirty-seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar," and giving a fragmentary account of his invasion of Egypt. From this most valuable historical record, we learn that after Nebuchadnezzar had finished his siege of Tyre, which occupied him, according to the Phoenician records, "for thirteen years," 9 he proceeded to chastise Egypt, which had long fomented every rebellion in Palestine against the mighty King of Babylon. 571 B.C., Nebuchadnezzar marched at the head of

---

8 Eusebius, Praep. Evang., lib. x.
9 Josephus, Contra Apion, i., § 21; Antiq. x., xi., § 1.
his army into Egypt, overrunning the country, and deposing Pharaoh-hophra, who had then reigned "nineteen years," according to Manetho (B.C. 589—571). The King of Babylon acted towards Egypt as he had first done towards Jerusalem, replacing one king by another. As Zedekiah took the place of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, so Pharaoh-hophra was replaced by an Egyptian general named Aahmes, or Amosis, as the Greeks termed him, and ruled the country as a vassal of the King of Babylon, and continued on the throne about twelve years after Cyrus' capture of the city, down to within one year of the conquest of Egypt by Cambyses, king of Persia, son of Cyrus the Great.1

The second inscription, which is Egyptian, confirms the truth of the Babylonian record. It states that Nebuchadnezzar, after overrunning the greater part of Egypt, penetrated into what Herodotus calls "the far Syene;" and there engaged the Egyptian army under the command of a distinguished general named "Horus," who, though he claims the merit of having inflicted a check upon the Babylonian arms, and caused Nebuchadnezzar to retire, does not dispute the fact that all Egypt was virtually under the sway of the powerful King of Babylon.2 Hence these two contemporary inscriptions render it certain that Nebuchadnezzar did invade and conquer Egypt, thereby fulfilling those prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel respecting Pharaoh-hophra's punishment by Nebuchadnezzar, which have often been paraded by the sceptical school as specimens of "unfulfilled prophecy," of which one of them, as we have already noticed, has been venturesome enough to write that "even on the theological side men had ceased to defend it," or to quote it, which we are now able to do, as a striking specimen of "FULFILLED PROPHECY," and a signal rebuke to the premature boastings of infidelity in the present day.

---

1 For a copy of this most valuable fragmentary record of Nebuchadnezzar III., and a translation by Mr. Theo. G. Pinches, see Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology, vol. vii., pp. 210—225.

2 See Zeitschrift für Ägyptische Sprache for 1878, pp. 2—6, 87—89; also Professor Rawlinson's History of Egypt, vol. ii., pp. 483—488.
Ezekiel’s prophecy relating to Egypt, besides that referring to Nebuchadnezzar’s invasion and conquest of Egypt, which has been already noticed, includes these three points—that the country should be desolated for a period of “forty years”—that it should become “the basest of kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more among the nations,” and that “there shall no more be a prince in the land of Egypt, and I will put a fear in the land of Egypt.”

1. Let us notice these three prophecies seriatim. First, Egypt was to be subjected to invasion by Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and to be desolated for a period of “forty years.” It is possible that these “forty years” spoken of by Ezekiel in relation to Egypt’s desolation may be the same as the “forty years” mentioned by the same prophet, when commanded by God to “take an iron pan” as “a sign to the house of Israel,” and to lie upon “thine left side 390 days” for their iniquity. “And when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah forty days: I have appointed thee a day for a year, a day for a year.”

There is ample evidence that during the times of Nebuchadnezzar in the sixth century B.C., the Babylonian power held Judah in captivity for seventy years, of which the “forty years” spoken of by Ezekiel may have formed a part; and we have already considered the monumental evidence in proof of Nebuchadnezzar having effected the conquest of Egypt, and held the Egyptians in captivity during the greatest part of his forty-five years’ reign. This captivity, although not mentioned by Herodotus, is specified by the Chaldean historian Berosus, who followed Herodotus within a century, as we learn from a fragment of his history related by Josephus to the following effect, that when Nebuchadnezzar’s father heard that the Egyptians were in revolt he sent his son, then very young, with an army to subdue them. Nebuchadnezzar easily reduced

---

3 Ezek. xxix. 1—15; xxx. 13. 4 Ezek. iv. 3—6.
Egypt to subjection, and made it, as Berosus says, "a branch of his own kingdom." It is probable that the "forty years" specified by the prophet Ezekiel are meant to be reckoned B.C. 610—570, from the time when the Egyptians revolted at the close of the reign of Nabopolazor, the father of Nebuchadnezzar, down to the year when Pharaoh-hophra was slain, and Amasis became king of Egypt, and when "the forty years'" predicted desolation may be said to have come to an end.

2. That portion of Ezekiel's prophecy relating to Egypt becoming "the basest of the kingdoms, neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations," had a signal fulfilment, as secular history and the contemporary monuments of Assyria and Babylonia plainly prove. From the eighth century B.C. to the close of the eighteenth century A.D., embracing a period of upwards of 2500 years, Egypt has been one continued series of conquests, of desolation, and ruin and woe. First there was the conquest of Egypt by the Ethiopians under Pianki; then by the Assyrians, commenced by Sargon at the close of the eighth century B.C., and completed by his grandson Ashurban-pul. This was followed by Nebuchadnezzar's conquest in the following century; and by the more effectual Persian conquest under Cambyses B.C. 525. Two centuries later this was repeated by the Greeks under Alexander the Great. Then, three centuries after Alexander's conquest, Egypt became a province of the Roman empire. It continued for nearly seven centuries tributary, first to Rome, afterwards to Constantinople, until the Saracens took possession of the country A.D. 641. The Saracens retained possession nearly the same length of time as the Romans had done, until A.D. 1250, when the Mamelukes deposed their rulers, and usurped their power over the whole country. This was the most singular and extraordinary form of government ever adopted by any nation since the beginning of time. Each successive ruler was raised

---

6 Josephus, Antiq. x., xi., § 1.
6 Ezek. xxix. 10—14. For an explanation of this special prophecy see the Speaker's Commentary, vol. vi., pp. 129—133.
to supreme authority from being a stranger and a slave: no son of the former ruler, no native of Egypt was permitted to succeed to the sovereignty; but a chief was chosen from a new race of imported slaves. When Egypt became tributary to the Turks at the beginning of the sixteenth century, the Mamelukes retained much of their power, while every Turkish pasha appointed to rule over the Egyptians became oppressors and cruel lords. And it is not a little remarkable respecting the predicted desolation, unlike those of Assyria and Babylon, whose cities, the finest the world has ever seen, were to become, according to prophecy, a waste howling wilderness, Egypt, according to the same Divine word, was to continue, as it has done down to the present time, "the basest of kingdoms." 7

3. Moreover, Ezekiel was inspired to foretell that though Egypt should continue to exist ages after Nineveh and Babylon had perished for ever, the desolation of her wasted cities should be visible to the world:—

"The pride of Egypt's power shall come down.... her cities shall be in the midst of the cities that are wasted.... I will sell the land into the hand of the wicked. I the Lord have spoken it.... And there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt.... It shall be the basest of the kingdoms; neither shall it exalt itself any more above the nations: for I will diminish them, that they shall no more rule over the nations." 8

The proof of this prophecy having been accomplished is so strong, that we are enabled to quote the testimony, unwilling and unconscious it may be, of two noted sceptics of the last century in confirmation thereof:—

"A more unjust and absurd constitution," says the historian Gibbon when describing the Mamelukes 9 of Egypt, A.D. 1250—1517, "cannot be

---

7 How strikingly has this been fulfilled in our own time by the conduct of the rebel Arabi Pasha, said to be a Spanish gipsy by birth, yet one of the vilest miscreants in point of treachery, cruelty, and deceit, that ever rose to power in Egypt.

8 Ezek. xxx. 6, 7, 13; xxix. 15.

9 For an excellent account of the reign of the Mamelukes see Ebers' Egypt, Descriptive, Historical and Picturesque, published by Cassell and Petter, in two vols., 1882, and magnificently illustrated by a large number of well-executed plates.
devised than that which condemns the natives of a country to perpetual servitude under the arbitrary dominion of strangers and slaves. Yet such has been the state of Egypt above 500 years. The most illustrious sultans of the Baharite and Borgite dynasties were themselves promoted from the Tartar and Circassian bands; and the twenty-four beys, or military chiefs, have ever been succeeded, not by their sons, but by their servants. With some breathing intervals of peace and order, the two dynasties are marked as a period of rapine and bloodshed; but their sway extended over Egypt, Nubia, Arabia and Syria; their Mamelukes were multiplied from 800 to 25,000; and their numbers were increased by a provincial militia of 107,000 foot."1

Volney bears still clearer testimony to the truth of prophecy respecting Egypt becoming "the basest of kingdoms," as in his description of the land of Ham he says—

"Deprived twenty-three centuries ago of her natural proprietors, Egypt has seen her fertile fields successively a prey to the Persians, the Macedonians, the Romans, the Greeks, the Arabs, the Georgians, and at length the race of Tartars, distinguished by the name of Ottoman Turks. The Mamelukes, purchased as slaves and introduced as soldiers, soon usurped the power, and elected a leader. If their first establishment was a singular event, their continuance is not less extraordinary. They are replaced by slaves brought from their original country. The system of oppression is methodical. Every thing the traveller sees or hears reminds him he is in the country of slavery and tyranny. In Egypt an universal air of misery, manifest in every one whom the traveller meets, points out to him the rapacity of oppression and the distrust attendant upon slavery. Nothing is talked of but intestine troubles, the public misery, pecuniary extortions, bastinadoes and murders. Justice herself puts to death without formality."2

Such was the state of Egypt under the Mamelukes when Volney visited Egypt at the close of the last century. Nor was the state of the poor wretched natives improved when the power of the Mamelukes was destroyed early in the present century by the treachery of that great despot Mohammed Ali, one of the most noted of the many "cruel lords" with which Egypt has been afflicted, according to Ezekiel's prophecy, since the time when Pianchi-Meramon, the sovereign of Ethiopia, commenced his invasion of the land of Ham twenty-six centuries ago.

1 Gibbon's *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, c. lix.
2 Volney's *Travels*, vol. i., pp. 74, 190, *et seq.*
A more recent traveller than Volney, who visited Egypt in 1835, has drawn a graphic picture of the destruction of the Mamelukes, and the way by which the unhappy inhabitants of the country were compelled to exchange one species of tyrant master for another:—

"The life and character," says the American traveller, George Stephens, "of Mohammed Ali are a study and a problem. He has risen by the usual road to greatness among the Turks—war, bloodshed, and treachery. In early life his bold and daring spirit attracted the attention of beys, pachas, and the sultan himself; and having attained a prominent position in the bloody wars that distracted Egypt under the Mamelukes, boldness, cruelty, intrigue, and treachery placed him on the throne of the caliphs; and neither then nor since have these usual engines of Turkish government, these usual accompaniments of Turkish greatness, for a moment deserted him. The extermination of the Mamelukes, the former lords of Egypt, as regards the number killed, is perhaps nothing in comparison with the thousands whose blood cries out from the earth against him; but the manner in which it was effected brands the pacha as the prince of traitors and murderers. Invited to the citadel on a friendly visit, while they were smoking the pipe of peace he was preparing to murder them; and no sooner had they left his presence, than they were pent up, fired upon, cut down and killed, bravely but hopelessly defending themselves to the last. . . . Mohammed's cruelty and treachery can neither be forgotten nor forgiven; and when in passing out of the citadel, the stranger is shown the place where the unhappy Mamelukes were penned up and slaughtered like beasts, one only leaping his gallant horse over the walls of the citadel, he feels that he has left the presence of a wholesale murderer." 3

Surely the most determined sceptic to the "Truth of the Bible," must admit that the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, respecting the condition of Egypt, both in the past as well as in the present day, have been fulfilled in a most remarkable way; and as such they are valuable evidence respecting what the apostle Peter calls "a more sure word of prophecy . . . which came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." 4

3 Incidents of Travel in Egypt, &c., by George Stephens, vol. i., pp. 32, 33. Ebers' Egypt contains a fine picture of the last of the Mamelukes taking this memorable leap.

4 2 Pet. i. 19, 21.
CHAPTER XX.

PROPHETIES RELATING TO THE RACE OF ABRAHAM.

Although we have fully considered the prophecies relating to the children of Israel, especially in regard to their sufferings in the past at the hands of professing Christians during the darkness of the middle ages, and which, alas! are in a measure repeated with more or less of mob violence both in Germany and Russia at the present time, there remain several other prophecies to be noticed, all of which bear upon the fortunes of the descendants of the great patriarch who was honoured with the double title of "Father of the Faithful" and "The Friend of God;" and which may therefore be succinctly described under the head of prophecies relating to the descendants of the race of Abraham.

1. The prophecy which relates especially to the descendants of Ishmael, the first-born son of Abraham by Hagar the Egyptian, whom Sarai gave to her husband "to be his wife," is thus stated—

"The angel of the Lord said unto Hagar in the wilderness: I will multiply thy seed exceedingly, that it shall not be numbered for multitude. Thou shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael, (i.e., 'God shall hear'); because the Lord hath heard thy affliction. And he will be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren... And God said to Abraham, As for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation."

These "twelve princes" of the race of Abraham are mentioned by name a little further on.

"These are the names of the sons of Ishmael, according to their generations:

---

5 Gen. xvi. 3, 10—12; xvii. 19, 20.
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The first-born of Ishmael, Nebajoth, &c. These are their names, by their towns, and castles; twelve princes according to their nations. These twelve princes or tribes inhabited a country, which is thus specially marked in v. 18. "They (the descendants of the twelve tribes of Ishmael) dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria."

It is clear from this statement that the descendants of Ishmael stretched in very early times across the desert to the Persian Gulf, occupying the north and the west of the Arabian peninsula, and eventually forming the chief element of the Arab nation. The Arabian peninsula may be said to have been divided by the descendants of Eber; Abraham and Ishmael being descended from Peleg, the eldest son of Eber, whose descendants occupied the north, while the descendants of Joktan, the younger son of Eber, are said to have colonized the south of Arabia. And this division serves to explain an important portion of the prophecy.

As the inhabitants of southern Arabia are a very different class from the Arabs of the north, being the reverse of wild, like the Bedouin Arabs, therefore scepticism has thought to find in this fact a contradiction to the truth of the prophetic word, through ignorance of the ethnographic fact that all Arabs are not descended from Ishmael; whereas the characteristics of the Ishmaelites are plainly visible in all the more northern tribes of Arabia, fulfilling exactly the prophecy that Ishmael, by his descendants, would "be a wild man; his hand will be against every man, and every man's hand against him."

Such has been the striking characteristic mark of the Bedouin Arabs during nigh 4000 years, as the historical evidence of the fact, universal tradition, and the boast of the Arabs themselves, confirm the truth of the prediction, which the historian Gibbon has tersely expressed in the term that they are "armed against mankind." The Bedouin Arabs not only subsist unconquered to this day, but the primitive wildness of the race remains just as it did thousands of years ago. Plundering is their sole profession, their only trade. They do not cultivate agriculture; they have no merchandize. Their

6 Gen. xxv. 13—16.
alliance is never courted, and can never be obtained; and all that the neighbouring empires of Turkey and Persia can stipulate for is a partial and purchased forbearance.

A modern traveller, in the account of his travels in Arabia, has well illustrated the force of this prophecy when speaking of the peculiarities of an Arab tribe:

"On the smallest computation such must have been the manners of those people for more than 3000 years: thus in all things verifying the prediction given of Ishmael at his birth, that he in his posterity should be a wild man, and always continue to be so, though they shall dwell for ever in the presence of their brethren. And that an acute and active people, surrounded for ages by polished and luxurious nations, should from their earliest to their latest times be still found a wild people, dwelling in the presence of all their brethren—as we may call those nations—unsubdued and unchangeable, is indeed a standing miracle—one of those mysterious facts which establish the truth of prophecy."

2. If prophecy is sufficiently instructive respecting the descendants of Ishmael, the first-born son of Abraham, no less distinct is it respecting another of that mighty race, as set forth in the judgment upon the descendants of Esau, the eldest son of Isaac, and the twin brother of Jacob, the ancestor of the children of Israel. Three of the greater prophets have delivered their testimony respecting God's judgments, and the reason of such judgments upon the country of Edom, which had been conquered and held for so many centuries by the descendants of Esau.

The prophets Isaiah (xxxiv. 5, 14), Jeremiah (xliv. 13, 17), and Ezekiel (xxxv. 1, 15), alike tell the same tale, of having been inspired of the Spirit to foretell the perpetual desolation of the land of Idumea. "From generation to generation it shall lie waste; none shall pass through it for ever and ever." The name Edom, or in its better known Greek form Idumea, included the country between the valley of Arabah and the shores of the Mediterranean. Hence the prophet's warning—"Bozrah shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste and a curse, and all the cities perpetual wastes. And Edom shall be a desolation:

7 Sir Robert Ker Porter's Travels, p. 304.
every one that goeth by it shall be astonished, and shall hiss at all the plagues thereof."

The Crusaders of the twelfth century made several expeditions into Edom without passing through it. They penetrated as far as Petra, to which they gave the name it still bears of Wady Mùsa, i.e., "the Valley of Moses." About twelve miles north of Petra they built a strong fortress called "Mons Regalis," now Shòbek, under the mistaken idea that it was the ancient capital of Edom. From that time until the present century Edom remained an unknown land. In 1812, the famous traveller Berckhardt entered Edom from the north, and was the first to discover the wonderful ruins of Petra. Since that date several European travellers, chiefly English and French, have reached the famous capital of the descendants of Esau, though with much difficulty, and all of them bear testimony to the complete desolation of the country, according to the word of prophecy.

I give the testimony of two travellers, an Englishman and an American, who have visited Petra, the famous capital of Edom, and who both bear witness to the truth of Fulfilled Prophecy.

"We left the valley of Petra," says Lord Lindsay, "after exploring several of the excavated dwellings, for it is clear, both from the language of Scripture and the appearance of the caves themselves, that the majority, if not all of them, were the abodes of the living, not of the dead . . . . Such is Petra, the Selah of Scripture, the Hagar of the Arabs, each word implying the same, 'Thy terribleness hast deceived thee, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the Rock; though thou make thy nest as high as the eagle, though thou set thy nest among the stars, thence will I bring thee down, saith the Lord.'"

"On leaving Petra, we traversed a country of the most utter desolation, hills succeeding hills, without the slightest picturesque beauty, covered with loose flints, sand and gravel; sterility in its most repulsive garb; it made the very heart ache and the spirits sink: such is Edom now, 'most desolate,' as prophecy foretold it should be."8

Mr. George Stephens describes more fully "the excavated city of Petra," which he visited with great difficulty and at some risk, but was fortunate enough to find it unoccupied, save by a solitary Bedouin Arab, by which means he was enabled

---

to pass one whole night within the city, the only instance of a western traveller having spent so many hours at Petra since the Crusaders of the thirteenth century.

"For about two miles," he says, "Petra lies between high and precipitous ranges of rocks, from 500 to 1000 feet in height, standing as if torn asunder by some great convulsion, and barely wide enough for two horsemen to pass abreast. . . . Wild fig trees, oleanders and ivy were growing out of the rocky sides of the cliffs: the eagle was screaming above us: all along were the open doors of tombs, forming the great Necropolis of the city; and at the extreme end was a large open space, with a powerful body of light thrown down upon it, and exhibiting in one full view the façade of a beautiful temple, hewn out of the rock, standing out fresh and clear, as if but yesterday from the hands of the sculptor. Though coming directly from the banks of the Nile, where the preservation of the temples excites the admiration and astonishment of every traveller, we were roused and excited by the extraordinary beauty and excellent condition of the great temple at Petra . . . . Even now that I have returned to the pursuits and thought-engrossing incidents of a life in the busiest city in the world, often in situations as widely different as light from darkness, I see before me the façade of that temple; neither the Coliseum at Rome, grand and interesting as it is, nor the ruins of the Acropolis at Athens, nor the Pyramids, nor the mighty temples of the Nile, are so often present to my memory. The whole temple, its columns, ornaments, porticoes, and porches, are cut out from and form part of the solid rock; and this rock, at the foot of which the temple stands as a mere print, towers several hundred feet above, its face cut smooth to the very summit, and the top remaining wild and unshapen as nature made it. . . .

"Amid all the terrible denunciations against the land of Idumea, 'her cities and the inhabitants thereof,' this proud city among the rocks, doubtless for its extraordinary sins, was always marked as a subject of extraordinary vengeance. 'I have sworn by myself, saith the Lord, that Bozrah (i.e., the strong city) shall become a desolation, a reproach, a waste and a curse, and all the cities thereof shall be perpetual waste. Lo, I will make thee small among the heathen, and despised among men.' . . . I would that the sceptic could stand, as I did, among the ruins of this city among the rocks, and there open the sacred book and read the words of the inspired penman, written when this desolate place was one of the greatest cities in the world. I see the scoff arrested, his cheek pale, his lip quivering, and his heart quaking with fear, as the ruined city cries out to him in a voice loud and powerful as that of one risen from the dead; though he would not believe Moses and the prophets, he believes the handwriting of God Himself in the desolation and eternal ruin around him." 9

3. If prophecy speaks thus clearly respecting one line of the race of Abraham through Ishmael, and another through Esau, no less clearly does it speak respecting a third in the judgment which overtook that portion of the children of Israel, or descendants of Jacob, which separated from the kingdom of Judah in consequence of the mad and reckless policy of King Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, and formed for themselves another kingdom, known for nigh three centuries (B.C. 977—721) as the kingdom of the ten tribes or house of Israel, as distinct from that of Judah, whose capital was eventually the city of Samaria, and which was destined to become as desolate a heap of ruins never more to rise as the cities of Babylon, Nineveh or Tyre. Two of the Hebrew prophets, both of them writing in the middle of the ninth century B.C., were inspired to foretell the judgment of Jehovah upon this guilty portion of the children of Israel in the following words:—

HOSEA.

"When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel; but when he offended in Baal, he died... O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in Me is thy help... I gave thee a king in my anger, and took him away in my wrath... I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death... Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God: they shall fall by the sword" (xiii. 1—16).

MICAH.

"What is the transgression of Jacob? is it not Samaria? and what are the high places of Judah? are they not Jerusalem? Therefore I will make Samaria as an heap of the field, and as plantings of a vineyard: and I will pour down stones thereof into the valley... And all the graven images shall be beaten to pieces, and all the idols will I lay desolate.... For her (Samaria's) wound is incurable; for it is come unto Judah; he is come unto the gate of my people, even to Jerusalem" (i. 5—9).

1 "I will ransom them," &c. The Jews have a tradition that this ransom was to be accomplished in Christ. One of the Rabbinical works explains the text thus: "I went with the angel Kippad, and Messiah son of David went with me, until I came to the gates of hell. When the prisoners of hell saw the light of the Messiah, they wished to receive Him, saying, This is He who will bring us out of this darkness, as it is written, I will redeem them from the hand of hell" (Bereshith Rabba, f. 605, 6).
Such was to be the end of the pride and the ambition, the luxury and self-enjoyment, the idolatry and "rebellion against her God" of the city which formed the capital of the house of Israel. As a city of God's chosen people, it was never to be restored. The spot with its heathen colonists, with which Esarhaddon king of Assyria repeopled it, was still the abode of a mixed religion. But corruption still clung to its site. Hence John Hyrcanus, as Josephus relates, the ruler of Judah in the second century B.C., was forced to destroy it. It was, however, rebuilt by the Romans after Pompey's capture of Jerusalem; Herod fortified it strongly as a check upon the Jews, repeopled it with a mixed multitude, and revived the ancient idolatry of Samaria by building for them a magnificent heathen temple, remarkable for size and beauty, giving to the city the name of "Sebaste," in honour of his heathen patron, the Emperor Caesar Augustus.

The prophecies respecting Samaria have a very marked distinction from those relating to Nineveh and Babylon. For though Samaria was to "become desolate" according to the language of Hosea, it was not to be so in the same way as Fulfilled Prophecy shows to have been the case with the two great heathen empires of Assyria and Babylonia. For though Micah equally with Hosea predicted the desolation of Samaria under the term that the city would become like a "heap" of stones in a field, utterly ruined and desolate, he was also inspired to foretell that it would be "as a planting of a vineyard." The "heaps," broken ruin; the "vineyard," fruitfulness cared for by God.

The evidence of modern travellers prove that such has been God's dealings with guilty, idolatrous Samaria, which Isaiah referred to when he described the state of the kingdom of Israel under the term of "drunkards of Ephraim:"

"Woe to the crown of pride, to the drunkards of Ephraim, whose glorious beauty is a fading flower, which are on the head of the fat valleys of them that are overcome with wine ... The crown of pride, the drunkards

2 Jos., Antiq. xiii. 10, § 3.
of Ephraim, shall be trodden under feet: and the glorious beauty shall be a fading flower, and as the hasty fruit before the summer.'

Three centuries ago, according to the testimony of Cotovicus, a traveller of the 16th century, and of Von Troilo in the century following, the ground on which the proud and luxurious city of Samaria formerly stood was strewed with "heaps" of stones and masses of ruins. Now these have all disappeared; and as a recent traveller tells us, the site of Israel's ancient capital presents a totally different appearance, being now in exact accordance with the words of the prophet Micah, as is now seen in the planting of a rich vineyard:

"The stones of the temples and palaces of Samaria," he says, "have been carefully removed from the rich soil, thrown together in heaps, built up in the rude walls of terraces, and rolled down into the valley below."

Another recent traveller speaks of the present condition of Samaria in the following way:

"About midway of the ascent, the hill is surrounded by a narrow terrace of woodland like a belt; higher up are the marks of slighter terraces, once occupied perhaps by the streets of an ancient city."

While a third traveller of our own time says:

"Samaria stood on an oval hill, stretching east and west, and separated from the hills that encircle it by a very deep valley. Our guide led us along the southern part of the hill, planted with olives and fig trees, through and alongside of the remains of a handsome colonnade, running east and west, near the town; the pillars are mostly overthrown; some have rolled off the terrace on which they stood. We returned by the north side of the hill through a plantation of fig trees, as the southern is planted with olive trees. There are the remains of many fine pillars in a grove of fig trees, on the highest of the broad terraces into which the hill has been cut; and in the plain below are several more, forming two sides of a quadrangle. I have seldom been so forcibly struck with the fulfilment of prophecy as when walking over the hill of Samaria."

Probably, Samaria is at this time in a very similar condition to what it was twenty-eight centuries ago, before Omri king of Israel, "bought the hill of Samaria of Shemer for two talents of silver, and built on the hill, and called the name of the city

3 Isa. xxviii. 1—4.
5 Robinson's Travels in Palestine and Syria, ii., p. 304.
which he built, after the name of Shemer, owner of the hill, Samaria." 7 And the physical celebrity of the hill, arising from its fig and olive trees and vineyards, may have given rise to the poetical description in the Song of Solomon, to one portion at least of the land of promise, as it is written:

"For, lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land; the fig tree putteth forth her green figs, and the vines with the tender grape give a good smell." 8

Such are the prophecies and such the fulfilment respecting certain portions of the race of Abraham, such as the descendants of Ishmael, Esau, and the ten tribes, when separated from their brethren of the kingdom and house of Judah, who form the more important subjects of prophecy in respect to their past sufferings and their present condition throughout the world, and which have been considered at length in the foregoing pages. And it may not be amiss, before we bring our treatise on Fulfilled Prophecy to a close, to point out that the valuable evidence, which a careful study of this subject affords as regards the past, is a most comforting assurance respecting the future.

The return of the twelve tribes of Israel to the land of their fathers, from which they have been ejected, either in part or in whole, for the last twenty-six centuries, may be almost regarded as an article of faith on the part of the Church of Christ at the present time. The marvellous change which has come over the most enlightened part of Christendom in the present century towards the outcasts of Israel—the increasing attempts to colonize the promised land which God gave to Abraham and his seed "for an everlasting possession"—the altered position of the Jews amongst the great ones of the earth in the most civilized nations of the world—all these things combine to show that they are still, as St. Paul says, "beloved for the fathers' sakes," 9 and may yet prove a blessing to the world, when they are restored to their own land, and

7 1 Kings xvi. 24. 8 Canticles ii. 11—13. 9 Rom. xi. 28.
Mount Zion again becomes, as in the time of David, "the joy of the whole earth."¹

The Hebrew prophets appear to teach in a way that is impossible to be mistaken that in God's own appointed time the outcast children of Israel will be restored to the land of their fathers; and that this restoration will be attested by divine power, as was the case when their ancestors passed miraculously through the Red Sea, seems to be shown in the language of Isaiah, when Jehovah is represented as "shaking His hand over the river, and smiting it in the seven streams, and making men go over dry shod." That this can only refer to the river Nile is clear from the context, when the prophet foretells likewise "the destruction of the tongue of the Egyptian sea," and likewise in the well-known fact that the Nile has "seven streams" or branches, which are expressed in the words of Virgil as the

"Septem ostia Niti;"

and was the only river known to the ancients which was so distinguished.

Moreover, this mode by which the children of Israel will be brought back to the promised land appears to have been foretold by Isaiah in the following prophecy:—

"Rejoice ye with Jerusalem, and be glad with her, all ye that love her....For thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will extend peace to her like a river, and the glory of the Gentiles like a flowing stream....I will set a sign among them, and I will send those that escape of them unto the nations that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles. And they shall bring all your brethren for an offering unto the Lord out of all nations, upon horses, and in chariots, and upon swift beasts, to my holy mountain Jerusalem, saith the Lord, as the children of Israel bring an offering in a clean vessel unto the house of the Lord."²

There is one term in this remarkable prophecy which speaks of the means used for bringing back the children of Israel, and which helps to confirm the truth of the prophetic word. The term used by the translators of the Authorized Version as "swift beasts" is כבשים, which, according to our greatest

¹ Ps. xlviii. 2. ² Isa. lxvi. 10—20.
linguists, denotes that most wonderful discovery of modern times, the application of steam and railway locomotion. The Arabian lexicographers translate the word as "machines turning round with the swiftness of the clouds." Cardinal Mezzofanti, who knew a greater number of languages than any man, rendered the term simply as "carriages," from which our English word is probably derived. The Osbechs of Bokhara, and the Turcomans, as the missionary Dr. Joseph Wolff informs us, call their "swift carts" by the Hebrew name "Kirkaroth." This criticism seems to point out, as we naturally assume from the present condition of the world, that when the children of Israel are again for "the second time" brought from all countries, whither the Lord hath scattered them for so many ages, "swift carriages," drawn by railway locomotives, will be the principal means for the purpose. And it is curious to contrast the difference between the time consumed by the Israelites in their journey from Goshen to the land of promise at the Exodus, and the time required by a locomotive to perform the same distance in the present day. Passing over the fact that the Israelites were kept wandering in the wilderness for the space of forty years on account of their repeated transgressions, it would have taken a traveller to perform the journey from Goshen to Canaan very many days. The Great Western Railway would perform the distance in about two hours' time.

On comparing this passage of Isaiah with other passages of the different Hebrew prophets, one and all of whom "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," relative to the future restoration of the children of Israel, I think we may conclude that a portion of the twelve tribes will return, just as a portion of the nation did after the seventy years' captivity in Babylon, and as they have been, in some measure, during the last twenty-five years of the present century, in unbelief; and that after they are nationally settled in the land of their fathers, and they become the objects of jealousy to the surrounding nations, especially to Russia, and they undergo that terrible siege predicted in the fourteenth chapter of Zechariah, those that
escape will be sent to their brethren in far distant countries, and then will take place the far greater restoration miraculously attested by divine power in belief.

In order to show the marvellous change which has recently come over the Jewish people in relation to the land of promise, I recollect about thirty years ago meeting the then Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem in London, and in answer to my enquiry learning from him that there was at that time no sign of any thing like a national return of the Jews to the land of their fathers, notwithstanding that an attempt had been made in Germany a few years before to promote such an object, as a sort of commercial speculation.

During the last fifteen years the case has been altered. The sultan's permission to the children of Israel to possess land, as conveyed in an imperial command to Reuf Pasha, the Governor of Jerusalem, in the autumn of 1881, the growing desire to be buried in the land of their fathers; the facilities for colonizing Palestine; the awakening of Christendom generally to the duty of helping forward such a movement, and likewise, what is at this present moment one of the remarkable "signs of the times," the sufferings of the poor outcast Jews from mob violence in different parts of the Austrian, German and Russian empires, and which has called forth such strong expressions of sympathy for the sufferers throughout England,—all these things seem to tell that the predicted treading down of Jerusalem by the Gentiles is drawing to a close, and the appointed time to favour Zion is almost come.

In the beginning of 1882, a letter appeared in the Jewish Chronicle, an able representative of the national feeling in the present day, respecting the expected result of the persecutions to which the children of Israel have been recently exposed in Russia, which speaks as follows:—

"The movement for emigration to this country appears to extend more and more in Russia. From divers places envoys have arrived here (Jerusalem), charged to secure eligible sites for their brethren who are to follow next spring. A Russian gentleman has assured me that many Jewish capitalists of his country were firmly resolved to settle at Jaffa, in order to erect factories there. I have seen letters from old Rabbis of the strictest orthodoxy,
declaring that whoever puts his hand to working the soil of the Holy Land, acts more meritoriously than he who passed his time, day and night, with study in the Beth-Hamedrash. This is most extraordinary. A strange tenderness for their ancient inheritance—for, according to Jewish law, no mere ownership, however long continued, can ever give the least title to legal possession—has taken hold of the heart of our people. And indeed, when thousands of families are girding their loins to bid a final farewell to the tombs of their ancestors in Europe, and to places endeared by the memories of their youth, more powerful motives must be at work than the tepid waters of philanthropy, or the short-sighted yearning of common egotism. The deep instinctive feeling of the masses has struck out another path than that prescribed by experienced and well-meaning men of the world, and there is no doubt that if our people are earnestly resolved, they will carry every thing before them as they have always done. In ancient times, the despots knew full well the value of Jewish energy and enterprise. The lesson will be taught again in our own days."

Such are the intentions of multitudes of the race of Abraham belonging to the house of Israel at this present time,—a more hopeful sign of restoration than any which has occurred during the last twenty-six centuries since "the days of Pekah king of Israel, b.c. 740, when Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria came and took all the land of Naphtali (the first of the twelve tribes deported from the land of their fathers), and carried them captive to Assyria."

What, then, are we warranted in believing from the sure word of prophecy will be the eventual result of the restoration of the children of Israel to the promised land? The answer may be made without hesitation by comparing the Old and the New Testament, the language of Isaiah with that of St. Paul, both of whom spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, that the eventual result will be—

The Evangelization of the World.

During the coming age, which is described in the Apocalypse as Christ's reign with His bride of a "thousand years" duration, we learn from two of the Hebrew prophets, that "the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea;" and St. Paul's argument, as contained in the eleventh chapter of the Romans, implies that if at the casting away of the Jews 18 centuries ago such blessings became the lot of the Gentiles,
how much greater will be the blessing when they are restored to that land which God gave to Abraham and his seed as "an everlasting possession." Hence we may fairly assume that God will then have some important work for restored and repentant Israel to perform. And what more important to the eternal welfare of unborn myriads, than in being instrumental in conveying to those nations, which Isaiah (lxvi. 19) describes as "not having heard my fame, neither seen my glory," the knowledge of the one only name "given under heaven among men, whereby we must be saved." 3 Hence the prayer of the Psalmist in reference to this very time—"Return, O Lord, how long? And let it repent thee concerning thy servants. O satisfy us early with thy mercy; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days. Make us glad according to the days wherein thou hast afflicted us, and the years wherein we have seen evil. Let thy work appear unto thy servants, and thy glory unto their children." 4

Although prophecy seems to show that great blessings are yet in store for the nations of the earth through the instrumentality of Israel in the future, it appears equally clear that this millennial age will be preceded by heavy judgments, when Jews and Gentiles will alike experience the wrath of God, while the faithful who form the "Church of God," like Noah and his family at the flood, will be taken away from the evil to come. For Moses and other Hebrew prophets distinctly declare "the day of Jacob's trouble" would be "of long continuance," which began with the "Times of the Gentiles," when Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem, which has continued with more or less severity during the last 2500 years, and which will terminate, according to Zechariah, when all nations shall be gathered against Jerusalem, and when the mighty power of Jehovah will be manifested on behalf of His long afflicted and then repentant people. 5

It has been well said by a devout French author in reference to the future restoration of the children of Israel:—

"The Jews, banished and dispersed, bear witness to Christ. The Jews,

3 Acts iv. 12. 4 Ps. xc. 12—16.
5 Compare Zech. xii.—xiv. with Rev. xix. 11—21.
recalled and converted, will render Him testimony still more awful and striking. The Jews, preserved by a continual miracle, bear witness to Him continually. Had they been only punished, they would have proved His justice only; had they only been preserved, this could have proved nothing but His power; had they not been reserved to worship one day, they could not have proved His mercy and veracity, nor have made Him any reparation for their outrageous crimes. Their dispersion proves that He has come, but they have rejected Him: their preservation shows that He hath not rejected them for ever, and that they shall one day believe in Him, and declare by both, that He is the Messiah and the promised Saviour, that their miseries proceed from not being known to Him, and that the only hope they have left is, that they shall one day come to the knowledge of Him. The change will be in their persons, and not in His religion, that will remain what it is; but they will then begin to see it. Jesus Christ will take away the veil from their eyes, but He will be the same: He will cure their deafness; but He will speak the same things" (Principes de la Foy Chretienne, tom i., c. 10).
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