

# THE HIEROPHANT;

OR

## MONTHLY EXPOSITOR OF SACRED SYMBOLS AND PROPHECY.

---

No. XI. APRIL, 1843.

---

PROPHETIC DESIGNATIONS OF TIME.

TO PROFESSOR STUART.—LETTER VII.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Following in the order in which you have arranged the several topics of your discussion, I come in the present letter to the consideration of the *prophetic designation of times*. This constitutes the longest and most elaborate part of your treatise, and that also which I believe is usually deemed the most valuable. Of those who are utterly at variance with your previous conclusions respecting the general principles of prophetic interpretation, I have met with numbers who are disposed to adopt your views in regard to the chronological calculus of Daniel and John; and the subjoined extract from the recent work of Mr. Davidson, published in Edinburgh, entitled "Sacred Hermeneutics," indicates that similar sentiments are entertained abroad.

"The accomplished writer of this valuable little book undertakes to prove three things. 1st, That there is no double sense in prophecy. 2dly, That it is intelligible before it is fulfilled, and that the writers themselves were acquainted with the meaning of what they uttered. 3dly, That the designations of time in the prophetic Scriptures are *ordinary* and not *peculiar*. The first two points are briefly treated, and to our mind not altogether satisfactorily. In objection to the *double sense*, he combats such a view of it as is held by no intelligent writer with whom we are acquainted. He contends against the *spiritualizing* of Scripture, a practice, which, if we mistake not, is reprobated by those who hold the double reference of various portions in the Bible. In maintaining that the prophets understood all that they were prompted to write, he takes a

very imperfect view of the state in which the prophets were when commissioned to utter predictions, and to reduce them too much to the condition of ordinary men. We believe that in many cases they had very obscure notions of the meaning of what they uttered; and that sometimes, at least, they could scarcely be said to understand their own predictions.

“The third part is the longest, and by far the ablest. Days are days, and years, years. So the writer maintains, with no small skill and power of argumentation. We do not see how his conclusions can be set aside. It is true that they are contrary to prevailing sentiments, but if the latter be unscriptural, the sooner they are abandoned the better. Let those who object to the sentiments of the learned author reply to them in the spirit of candor and impartiality.” pp. 717, 718.

For myself, I venture to regard this portion of your work as equally replete with error and open to refutation as any of the rest, and though my remaining limits will not allow of so full and detailed an exposé of its positions as I have given to the preceding, yet I shall hope to adduce sufficient reasons for a most decided rejection of your main averment, viz., that a day in prophecy always means a day, and is never, except in a few specified instances, used to denote a year or any longer period of time. The question involved I conceive to be one of the utmost moment to the interests of inspired prophecy. If your hypothesis be correct, not only has nearly the whole Christian world been led astray for ages by a mere *ignis fatuus* of false hermeneutics, but the church is at once cut loose from every chronological mooring, and set adrift in the open sea, without the vestige of a beacon, light-house, or star, by which to determine her bearings or distances from the desired millennial haven to which she had hoped she was tending. She is deprived of the means of taking a single celestial observation, and has no possible data for ascertaining, in the remotest degree, how far she is yet floating from the Ararat of promise. Upon your theory, the Christian world has no distinct intimation given it as to the date of the downfall of the Roman Despotism, civil or ecclesiastical, of Mahometanism, or of Paganism; no clew to the time of the conversion of the Jews, or of the introduction of the Millennium. On all these points the Church is shut up to a blank and dreary uncertainty, which, though it may not extinguish, will tend greatly to diminish, the ardor of her present zeal in the conversion of the world.

I am not indeed of the number of those who deem the consent of fathers or the current of tradition an infallible test of biblical interpretation; nor am I in the least a stickler for a punctilious specification of the dates of prophecy; but neither am I, on the other hand, inclined precipitately to discard an opinion long prevalent in the church, which has commended itself to those whose judgments are entitled to profound respect. That such is the case in regard to the year-day calculations of prophecy, I am abundantly satisfied, and I confess too at once to the pleasure that it affords me to find

that that which is sanctioned by age is also sustained by argument. How strong is the evidence of its truth from this source, it is the object of my present communication to evince, and I enter upon it without farther preliminaries.

I am not a little surprised at your remark in the following paragraph :

“It is a singular fact, that the great mass of interpreters in the English and American world have, for many years, been wont to understand the *days* designated in Daniel and in the Apocalypse, as the representatives or symbols of *years*. I have found it difficult to trace the origin of this general, I might say, almost universal custom. Without venturing on a positive statement, I am inclined to believe that we may trace it mainly to the distinguished Joseph Mede, who lived and wrote during the first quarter of the seventeenth century. His *Clavis Apocalyptica* (Key to the Apocalypse) excited much attention when it was published, and indeed for a long time afterwards. Many criticisms were made upon it by the learned; and in the explanation and defence of the positions which he had taken in that work, Mede wrote many comments, essays, and letters. The learning, piety, and (in general) sobriety of mind, which this distinguished work exhibited, gave it great influence in the religious community in England, and eventually in America. Abroad, Vitringa and others attacked some of its leading positions, and, as was generally conceded, overthrew them. Still the influence of this work on English commentary, has been felt down to the present hour. Particularly is it so in regard to the subject of reckoning *time*; the consideration of which is now before us.” p. 74.

The fact is, Mede is very far from being the first who adopted this solution of the symbolic term *day*. It is the solution naturally arising from the construction put in all ages upon the oracle of Daniel respecting the Seventy Weeks, which by Jews and Christians have been interpreted of *weeks of years*, on the principle of a *day's standing for a year*. This fact is obvious from the Rabbinical writers *en masse*, where they touch upon this subject, and Eusebius tells us, (Dem. Evang. L. VIII. p. 258, Ed. Steph.) that this interpretation in his day was generally, if not universally, admitted—*παντι που δηλον, everywhere manifest*. It is plain that this canon of interpretation is no modern novelty, and the universal consent which your own words ascribe to it, might at least suggest the propriety of a more rigid inquisition into its origin than you have seen fit to institute. I have in my own collection writers on the prophecies prior to the time of Mede, who interpret the 1260 days of so many years, and who are so far from broaching this as a new interpretation, that they do not even pause to give the grounds of it, but proceed onwards, as if no risk were run in taking for granted the soundness of a principle which came down to them accredited by the immemorial usage of their predecessors. I do not say that they were justified in this, for in a matter of this nature it is always well to lay an impregnable foundation for whatever sys-

tem of prophetic interpretation men are prompted to adopt; but, as the present question is merely a question of fact, as to the origin of a certain mode of exegesis, the statement I have made will be seen to be wholly in point.

You enter upon the process of proof by which your main position is to be established, by laying down the following as one of the plainest and most cogent of all the rules of hermeneutics, viz., *that every passage of Scripture and of every other book is to be interpreted as bearing its plain, and primary, and literal sense, unless good reason can be given why it should be tropically understood.* To the truth of this canon I cordially assent. I subscribe also with equal freedom and readiness to the connected remark, that "when we admit the tropical sense of a passage, we do it because, if literally understood, the subject and predicate would not harmonize, or because a literal sense would be frigid, unmeaning, or inappropriate." The only question is, whether in the department of prophecy sufficient reasons can be assigned to justify a departure from the literal, and an adherence to a tropical sense. In other words, are these designations of time to be taken *symbolically*?

The argument, I think, may be very summarily despatched. To one who has so long and so largely considered the genius and structure of inspired prophecy as yourself, it can scarcely be otherwise than superfluous to remark, that the Scriptures present us with two distinct classes of predictions—the *literal* and the *symbolical*. Where an event, or series of events, of a historical character, is *historically* announced, we naturally look for the announcement to be made in the plainest, simplest, and most literal terms. No reason can then be assigned for designating periods of time in a mystical or figurative diction. If the fate of nations or individuals is concerned, and those nations or individuals are literally and historically specified, we regard it as a matter of course that whatever periods of time are mentioned in connexion with them, they are to be understood also in their primary and literal sense. Thus, to advert to the cases which you have adduced, when God announces the deluge to Noah, as there is nothing figurative or mystical in the events, so the designations of *time* are to be construed in their natural and obvious import. When it is foretold that Abraham's posterity should be afflicted four hundred years—that seven years of plenty and seven of famine should succeed each other in Egypt—that Israel should wander forty years in the wilderness—that Nineveh should be overthrown within forty days—that Ephraim should be broken within sixty-five years—that the glory of Moab should be contemned within three years, and that Judah should be captive in Babylon seventy years—as all these communities are *literally* announced, we reasonably and rightly conclude that the several periods of time associated with them should be *literally* expressed.

All this is a dictate of common sense, and you are perfectly right in saying that in these cases "we never once even dream of putting a *day* for a *year*." Why should we? There is nothing at all in the circumstances to require it.

But the case is entirely reversed in regard to the *symbolical prophecies*, and that for the most obvious of all reasons—the very reason which you have yourself assigned, viz., that in prophecies so constructed "the subject and the predicate would not harmonize, —the literal sense would be frigid, unmeaning, and inappropriate." Nothing, you are aware, is more obvious, than that the prophets have frequently, under divine prompting, adopted the system of *hieroglyphic representation*, in which a single man represents a community, and a wild beast an extended empire. Consequently, since the mystic exhibition of the community or empire is in *miniature*, symbolical propriety requires that the associated chronological periods should be exhibited in *miniature* also. The intrinsic fitness of such a mode of presentation, is self-evident. In predicating of a nation a long term of 400 or even 4000 years, there is nothing revolting to verisimilitude or decorum; but to assign such a period to the actings of a symbolical man or a symbolical animal, would be a grievous outrage upon all the proprieties of the prophetic style. The character of the adjuncts should evidently correspond with those of the principal, or the whole picture is at once marred by the most palpable incongruity. When I find the Most High declaring in express language that the Jews should serve the king of Babylon seventy years, and that after the expiration of that time they should again be restored to their own land, I seek no other than a literal sense in the term *year*, inasmuch as all the other terms, *Babylon*, *Judah*, and *captivity*, are taken in their ordinary acceptation. But when I find "times and laws given into the hands of the Little Horn for a time, times, and half a time," or three years and a half, I naturally consider this period as mystical, because the Little Horn is so. So when I find "locusts tormenting men five months," I am as much prompted to inquire into the symbolical import of the *five months* as into that of the *locusts*. Why should one of these terms be *literal* and the other *tropical*?

Now this distinction in the character of the prophetic oracles you have seen fit to leave out of view altogether. Your whole train of reasoning goes on the assumption, that as periods of time are to be literally understood, in connexion with certain predictions, so they are in all. But the distinction is palpably obvious, and a glance of the mind's eye is sufficient to evince that we cannot legitimately reason from the one to the other. On the ground you have assumed the argument will stand thus:—The chronological periods attached to all *literally* expressed prophecies are found to be themselves *literally* and not *mystically* expressed. Therefore

the chronological periods attached to all *symbolically* expressed prophecies, must be themselves *literally* and not *mystically* expressed. Now this is a gross *non sequitur*. It is reasoning from *unlike to unlike*. More is put into the conclusion than had appeared in the premises. You will not be surprised therefore at the intimation that the whole force of your argument, based upon this ground, dissipates itself as completely as the famous waterfall in Switzerland, where the water is precipitated from so vast a height that it turns to mere vapor before it reaches the bottom of the declivity.

The grand principle into which the usage of employing a day for a year is to be resolved, is that of *miniature symbolization*. As the *events* are thus economically reduced, the *periods* are to be reduced in the same relative proportion. What that proportion is, we cannot positively determine without some antecedent information touching the *rate* or *scale* of reduction. But the probability is, that such scale will be at the rate of a day or minor revolution of the earth round its axis, for a year or greater revolution of the earth round the sun. In adducing the proof of the principle upon which this prophetic usage depends, you will of course read at once the answer which I return to your construction of Ezek. 4 : 5, 6, and Num. 14. As to the first, we are informed that Ezekiel was commanded to "lie on his left side 390 days, that so he might bear the iniquity of the house of Israel." This was a typical action constituting a symbolical prophecy, and so far as its chronological purport is concerned, Jehovah himself adds, "I have appointed *each day for a year*." Ezekiel is in this transaction a *miniature hieroglyphic* of Israel; a man, of a nation. Hence as the man represented the nation in miniature, so the 390 days represented the period of 390 years in miniature. In like manner, his lying forty days on his right side symbolized the foreseen iniquity of Judah through the period of forty years. Again, when the land of Canaan was to be searched, twelve spies were appointed out of the twelve tribes to make the purposed explorations and report the result on their return. The tenor of their report and the subsequent conduct of the people was such that God was highly displeased, and consequently declared that Israel should wander in the desert for forty *years*, each year corresponding to one of the forty *days* of the espial. In this case, also, we recognize the same principle as in the preceding. The twelve selected spies jointly constituted a *miniature symbol* of the entire nation. Accordingly, the predicted term of the national wanderings was analogously represented in miniature also.

Your remarks upon these cases, viewed in their bearing upon the question at issue, are contained in the following extracts :

"The prophet is *expressly told*, in this case, that *one day is to be the symbol of a year*. Why? Plainly because it would never enter the mind

of himself or of any other man, that such could be the case, unless he were expressly informed of it. What bearing then, in the way of analogy, does or can this have upon the designations of time in Daniel and in the Apocalypse? Certainly none; for in these books we have no information given of such a nature. The writers never once hint at such a mode of interpretation. What follows, then, except that we must interpret these books in the usual way? A special communication to Ezekiel was deemed necessary in order to his understanding that *days* would or could be the symbols of *years*. Such a communication was in fact necessary; for nothing can be more natural to all men, than to interpret plain designations of time in the simple and usual way. To prevent Ezekiel from doing so, the symbolic significancy of *days* is a matter of express injunction. This of course constitutes a good and adequate reason for adopting the symbolical meaning of the word *day* in the passage before us.

"But how is it with the designation of times in Daniel and in the Apocalypse, where no such injunction or explanation is given? There can be, as it seems to me, but one answer to this question; which is, that *those times are of course to be reckoned in the usual manner*. Instead of being aided, then, by an appeal to Ezek. 4: 5, 6, we find that a principle is in fact recognized there, which makes directly against the interpretation which we are calling in question. The express exception as to the usual mode of reckoning, which is there virtually made, goes, under such circumstances, directly to show that the general rule would necessitate us to adopt a different interpretation." pp. 76,77.

In like manner as to the case of the spies in Numbers 14:

"We perceive at once that the whole is dependent on special divine appointment. Had the declaration been that 'Israel should wander in the desert according to the time in which the spies had been absent,' would any one have ever supposed that forty *years* were meant? It is conceded that they would not, in the very fact that *express* mention is made, that *days* are to stand as the symbols of *years*. Without a declaration of this import, no one would ever have surmised that the case was such. Now as neither Daniel nor the Apocalypse ever mention such a mode of counting days for years, what else can we do, except to follow the common laws of language in the interpretation of their predictions?" p. 78.

The obvious reply to all this is, that the instances now adduced are to be considered as merely giving us a clew to a general principle of interpretation. Here are two or three striking examples of predictions constructed on the plan of *miniature symbolic representation*, in which the involved periods of time are reduced to a scale proportioned to that of the events themselves. What then more natural or more legitimate, than that when we meet with other prophecies, constructed on precisely the same principle, we should interpret their chronological periods by the same rule? Instead of yielding to a demand to adduce authority for this mode of interpretation, I feel at liberty to demand the authority for departing from it. *Manente ratione manet lex*, is an apothegm which is surely applicable here if anywhere. You repeatedly in the course of your pages appeal to the oracles of *common sense* as the grand arbiter in deciding upon the principles of hermeneutics. I make

my appeal to the same authority in the present case ; I demand, in the name of common sense, a *reason* why the symbolical prophecies of Daniel and John should not be interpreted on the same principle with other prophecies of precisely the same class. But however loud and urgent my demand on this head, I expect nothing else than that hill and dale will re-echo it even to "the crack of doom," before a satisfactory response from your pages falls on my ear.

All the answer I obtain is the following: "Instead of being aided, then, by an appeal to Ezek. 4: 5, 6, we find that a principle is recognized there, which makes directly against the interpretation that we are calling in question. The *express exception* as to the usual mode of reckoning, which is there virtually made, goes, under such circumstances, directly to show that the *general rule* would necessitate us to adopt a different interpretation." I may possibly be over sanguine in my anticipations, but I cannot well resist the belief that the reader will perceive that that which you regard as the *exception* is in fact the *rule*.\*

But you proceed, after having disposed of these *exceptions*, as you term them, to demolish what has perhaps generally been deemed the grand fortress of the defenders of the *year-day* calculation in Daniel's prediction of the seventy weeks. As to this passage I will say here, that even if your interpretation of it should be admitted to be correct, which however I do *not* admit, still I shall not consider the principle established above to be at all invalidated thereby. It would merely be subducting one from the catalogue of proofs. The position by no means rests upon this passage alone, though I have no doubt that this, when rightly interpreted, goes unequivocally in support of it. But let us come directly to the point. Your argument I give in your own words :

"Daniel had been meditating on the accomplishment of the seventy *years* of exile for the Jews which Jeremiah had predicted; Jer. 25: 12. 29: 10. Dan. 9: 1-3. At the close of the fervent supplication for his people which he makes, in connection with his meditation, Gabriel appears, and announces to him that "*Seventy sevens* are appointed for his people," as it respects the time then future, in which various and very important events are to take place. Our translation renders the words שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים, *seventy weeks*. But through the Scriptures there is, if we except three instances in the book of Daniel, no such form as שְׁבַעִים which means *weeks*. This is only and always שְׁבַעִיּוֹת or שְׁבַעִיּוֹת. The form שְׁבַעִים, therefore, which is a regular masculine plural, is no doubt purposely chosen to designate the *plural of seven*; and with great propriety here, inasmuch as there are many *sevens* which are to be joined

\* The following passage from Aulus Gellius, (*Noct. Att. L. III. c. 10*), shows that this mode of computation was sometimes used by other nations besides the Jews. Speaking of M. Varro, he says, "Scribit se jam undecimam annorum hebdomadam ingressum esse," *he writes that he had entered into the eleventh WEEK of his years, i. e. his eighty-fourth year.*



together in one common sum. The manner in which I have translated the words in question, therefore, gives an exact representation of the Hebrew original. Daniel had been meditating on the close of the seventy years of Hebrew exile, and the angel now discloses to him a new period of *seventy times seven*, in which still more important events are to take place. "*Seventy sevens*," or (to use Greek phraseology) "*seventy heptades* are determined upon thy people." Heptades of what? Of days, or of years? No one can doubt what the answer is. Daniel had been making diligent search respecting the seventy years; and, in such a connection, nothing but seventy heptades of years could be reasonably supposed to be meant by the angel. But independently of this, the nature of the case is sufficient. Years are the measure of all considerable periods of time. When the angel speaks, then, in reference to certain events, and declares that they are to take place during *seventy heptades*, it is a matter of course to suppose him to mean years. If he had not meant so, then some word would have been added in order to render it plain what his meaning was. And so it actually happens, in Dan. 10: 2, 3, where he again employs the peculiar plural, שְׁבַעִים. But as the period designated in this last passage has respect to a season of fasting which the prophet had kept, and as this could not be a period of three years, so the writer adds, after the words *three sevens* (in our version, *three whole weeks*), the word יָמִים, *days*. He fasted "*three sevens as to days*" is a literal and grammatical version. This means, indeed, *three whole weeks*, as our version has it; but the shape of the Hebrew expression is different from this.

"These examples render it quite plain, therefore, that when, in Dan. 9: 24, the angel speaks of *seventy heptades* he must of course be understood as meaning so many heptades of years=490 years. He has not made *days* at all the representative of *years*, in this case, but merely and simply designated the number of years. And as to chap. 10: 2, 3, surely no one will contend that Daniel fasted twenty-one years; which must be the conclusion, however, if days are to be regarded as the representatives of years, in the writings of this prophet. But in 9: 24, as has been said, *days* are not brought at all into question. The phraseology employed (*seventy heptades*) is indeed elliptical; yet it is not at all obscure, for every mind spontaneously supplies the word *years*, in such a connexion. The appeal to Daniel, then, for an example of employing *days* for *years*, is certainly not well directed, when made to the passage in question. Indeed, the exact contrary of such a usage is manifest, when we read onward only six verses more; for in 10: 2, 3, the ground assumed would necessarily make Daniel say, that he fasted in the most rigid manner for twenty-one years! The credibility of this, on any ground, needs not to be argued against."—p. 79.

We have here to determine a question of pure philology. You maintain that the original Hebrew phrase rendered *seventy weeks* (שְׁבַעִים שָׁבָעִים) properly signifies *seventy sevens*, and may as legitimately be understood of weeks of *years* as of *days*. Now even granting for a moment that this is correct, still it would seem that some consideration should have been given to the fact, that the phrase has been otherwise understood in all ages of the church. The whole current of the ancient versions and interpretations, Jewish and Christian, agrees in the rendering *seventy weeks*. Ἑβδομάδες,

*weeks*, and not *intradec*, *heptades*, as might be *inferred* from your language, is the rendering of the Greek, and the same is the sense put upon it by the early fathers. This is a fact to be accounted for, and one which no thoroughgoing discussion of the subject is at liberty to overlook. Yet to this fact not the slightest allusion is made in your critique. As if the case were one which admitted no manner of doubt, you say that as שָׁבְעִים is a regular masculine plural, it is purposely chosen to designate the *plural of seven*, and of course *seventy sevens* must denote *seventy heptades of years* without any implication whatever of *weeks of days*. But who has a right to take this for granted? Every Hebrew scholar will of course admit that the word שָׁבְעִים is derived from a root signifying *seven*; but שָׁבְעִים is not the normal plural of the Hebrew term for *seven*. This is שִׁבְעִים from the singular שֶׁבַע, and this you are well aware is the appropriate term, not for the simple plural of seven, but for *seventy*; the *tens* of the Hebrew numerals being expressed by the plural forms of the corresponding *units*. In the nature of the case, the last thing we should expect to find in the language would be a regular plural for a number of which the singular itself is virtually a plural, as is evidently the fact in all languages when we get beyond *one*. Nobody would look in Latin for a plural to *duo*, *quatuor*, *six*, or *septem*. I know that the structure of the Hebrew is different, and that very rare cases of the use of such terms as 'thousands,' 'hundreds,' 'fifties,' and 'tens,' occur; but still such a kind of plus-plural for seven is not to be expected in the economy of Hebrew forms.

It is indeed true, as you say, that "throughout the Scriptures there is, if we except three instances in the book of Daniel, no such form as שָׁבְעִים which means *weeks*." But what then? There are *no* instances elsewhere in which שָׁבְעִים is used as a simple *plural of seven*, and I contend, therefore, that the license of assumption is far greater on your side than on that of the established version. In other words, there is fuller evidence that שָׁבְעִים is rightly translated *weeks* than there is that it ought to be translated *sevens*.

The current Scriptural term for *weeks*, you say, "is only and always שָׁבְעוֹת and שִׁבְעוֹת." This, understood with the exceptions mentioned in Daniel, is no doubt correct; but it is unquestionable that שָׁבְעִים is quite as nearly related in form and signification to those words as it is to שִׁבְעִים the plural form of שֶׁבַע *seven*, and we have just as good authority for rendering it *weeks* as you have for rendering it *sevens* in the sense of *sevens of years*. From this we learn how much weight to attach to your assertion, that the manner in which you have translated the word in question "gives an exact representation of the Hebrew original." But I will array more distinctly before the reader the Hebrew usage as to the term

weeks, that he may have still more definite data for forming a judgment on the question at issue.

Gen. 29: 27, "Fulfil her week (מָלֵא שָׁבֻעַ זֹאת) and we will give," &c.

V. 28, "And Jacob did so, and fulfilled her week (שָׁבֻעַ זֹאת וַיִּמְלֵא)." &c.

Lev. 12: 5, "But if she has a maid-child, then shall be unclean two weeks (שְׁבַע יָמִים, dual of שָׁבֻעַ=שְׁבַע־יָמִים)." &c.

Num. 28: 26, "In the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat-offering unto the Lord, after your weeks be out (בְּשִׁבְעֵי הַיָּמִים)," i. e. as appears from Lev. 23: 15, after numbering seven sabbaths (שִׁבְעַת שַׁבְּתוֹת).

Deut. 16: 9, "Seven weeks (שִׁבְעָה שָׁבָעִים) shalt thou number unto thee; begin to number the seven weeks (שִׁבְעָה שָׁבָעִים) from such time," &c.

V. 10, 16, "And thou shalt keep the feast of weeks (חַג שִׁבְעוֹת) unto the Lord thy God," &c. Compare Ex. 34: 22. 2 Chron. 8: 13.

Jer. 5: 24, "He reserveth unto us the appointed weeks (שְׁבַע־חֻקוֹת) of the harvest."

Dan. 9: 24, "Seventy weeks (שִׁבְעִים שָׁבָעִים) are determined."

V. 9: 25, "Unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks (שִׁבְעָה שָׁבָעִים) and threescore and two weeks (שִׁבְעִים וּשְׁנַיִם וּשְׁנַיִם)." &c.

V. 27, "And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week (שָׁבֻעַ אֶחָד), and in the midst of the week (בְּתוֹךְ הַשָּׁבָעִים) he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."

Ch. 10: 2, "In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks (שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבָעִים יָמִים)." &c.

V. 3, "Neither did I anoint myself at all till three full weeks (שְׁלֹשָׁה שָׁבָעִים יָמִים) were fulfilled."

The results of the foregoing induction will be found of no small importance in enabling us to pronounce intelligently upon the main averment of your essay. It appears beyond debate that the Hebrews had a distinct term for the conventional designation of time which we call a week. This term is שָׁבֻעַ, or more fully written, שְׁבַע־יָמִים, derived from the radical שָׁבַע seven. The form, as Hengstenberg remarks, is participial, and properly indicates a septemized period, like *ἑβδομας* in Greek, *septimana* in Latin, *settimana* in Italian, and *semaine* in French, all which are severally derived from roots denoting seven. No analogy of Hebrew forms affords the least countenance to the idea you have suggested of its plural being the plural of seven, for the plain reason, that its singular does not import the number seven, nor have any of the Hebrew numerals a form approaching to that of שָׁבֻעַ. Established usage does indeed give to this word for the most part the feminine plural form שְׁבַע־יָמִים, שְׁבַע־יָמִים; but in Daniel the masculine שְׁבַע־יָמִים=שָׁבֻעִים

uniformly appears. But as this form has confessedly no other singular than שְׁבִיעִי, and as שְׁבִיעִי uniformly stands as the representative of *a week of seven days*, what else can שְׁבִיעִים properly denote than *weeks of seven days*? You may reply, indeed, that this is giving both a masculine and feminine form to the plural of שְׁבִיעִי. True enough: but is it not the obvious fact that neither of these plurals has any other singular than שְׁבִיעִי? And to the author of a Hebrew grammar I need not observe, that a large class of words occur in that language having a twofold gender, and consequently form, in their plural. Among these Ewald (Heb. Gram. § 373. Lon. 1836) expressly enumerates this very word, along with a multitude of others, which place the truth of the grammatical canon beyond controversy.

On the ground, therefore, of the above exhibition of the *usus loquendi* in regard to this term, I shall venture to consider your interpretation of it as the *plural of seven* as completely set aside. The field of debate is accordingly narrowed down to the simple and single question, whether in Daniel's use of it it is to be understood as implying *weeks of days* or *weeks of years*; for that the sense of *weeks* of some kind is its true import here, we are no longer at liberty to doubt. But here we are met at once by the incontrovertible fact of the *usage* being uniformly in favor of the sense of *days*, and Mede's reply to the objection which you have urged is perfectly satisfactory:—"The question lies not in the *etymology*, but in the *use*; wherein שְׁבִיעִי always signifies *sevens of days*, and never *sevens of years*. Wherever it is absolutely put, it means of *days*; it is nowhere thus used of *years*." (*Works*, Book III. ch. ix. p. 599.) If this be so, it is obvious that we need express authority for interpreting it of *sevens of years*, without the implication of *days*. Such authority does not exist.

Still your assertion stands in unqualified assurance, that Daniel "has not made *days* at all the representatives of *years* in this case, but merely and simply designated the number of *years*." Of this position you find a proof in Dan. 10: 2, 3, where the prophet speaks of his fasting three weeks of days;—"Surely no one will contend that Daniel fasted twenty-one *years*; which must be the conclusion, however, if days are to be regarded as the representatives of years, in the writings of this prophet." But I have already adduced evidence that the true purport of שְׁבִיעִים is always primarily *weeks of days*, and I see nothing more conveyed by the addition of יָמִים *days* in this passage, than a casual but appropriate intimation that such is its actual primary meaning wherever it occurs in the course of this prediction. I look upon it as inserted expressly for the purpose of barring any such conjectural interpretations as yours, that would assign to it, as its first sense, the meaning of years. It is to me therefore nothing more nor less than a direct authentica-

tion of the version which has always been so generally admitted, making the native and original sense of the Hebrew term for *week*, a *week of days*. At the same time, as the usage of prophecy employs a *day* as an involved or miniature expression for a *year*, and as the historical event has shown that the seventy weeks of this oracle covered the space of 490 years, we feel that we are building on a sure foundation, when we take these seventy weeks of days to be a symbolical and not a literal designation of seventy weeks of years.

I here suspend the train of inquiry with a view to introduce in my next and closing letter, additional evidence of the use, in the sacred writings, of a *day* for a *year*.

Very respectfully,

Your friend and brother,

GEORGE BUSH.

THE JUDGMENT OF THE BEAST AND THE LITTLE HORN, SUCCEEDED BY THE EVERLASTING KINGDOM OF THE SAINTS.

EXPOSITION OF DANIEL VII. 9-28.

[CONTINUED.]

Ver. 17.

CHAL.

אַלִּין דִּי־תִּתָּא רַב־בְּתָא דִּי אַמְיִן  
אַרְבַּע אַרְבַּעוֹת מַלְכִין יִקְוּמוּן  
מִן־אַרְעָא :

ENG. VERS.

These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.

GR. OF THEOD.

Τὰ ἅτα τὰ θηρία τὰ μεγάλα τὰ τέσσαρα, τέσσαρες βασιλῆαι, ἀναστήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, αἱ ἀρθῆσονται.

LAT. VULG.

Hæ quatuor bestiæ magnæ, quatuor sunt regna, quæ consurgent de terra.

*These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth.* We have in this and the subsequent verse a condensed and compendious exposition of the drift of the vision. In the words themselves there is nothing that calls for special annotation, excepting perhaps that the symbolical sense of 'kings' may require to be made out with some particularity of proof. That it is here equivalent to 'kingdoms,' as rendered both by Theodotius

and the Vulgate, is all but universally acknowledged, even by the most frigid and rationalistic class of interpreters. The proof of it in fact grows directly out of the resumed and amplified explication of the angel, as in ver. 23 he says, "The fourth beast is the fourth *kingdom* (not *king*) upon earth." Evidence equally explicit is to be seen in a previous chapter, 2: 38, 39, where the prophet, after declaring that Nebuchadnezzar was the head of gold, immediately adds, "And after thee shall arise another *kingdom* (not *king*) inferior to thee, and another third *kingdom* of brass, which shall have rule over all the earth. And the fourth *kingdom* shall be strong as iron." Dan. 7: 24, "And the ten horns are ten *kings* that shall arise," i. e. ten *kingdoms*. "And he (the eleventh horn) shall subdue three *kings*," i. e. three *kingdoms*. The same usage prevails extensively in other portions of the symbolical prophecies, particularly the Apocalypse, where it forms the true clew to the bearing of the following passages: Rev. 16: 12, "And the sixth angel poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of the *kings* of the East might be prepared;" i. e. that the way *to or towards* the *kingdoms* of the East might be prepared. Rev. 16: 14, "For they are the spirits of devils, 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;" i. e. which go forth to the *kingdoms* of the earth. Rev. 19: 19, "And I saw the beast, and (even) the *kings* of the earth, and their armies, gathered together to make war," &c.; i. e. I saw the beast even the *kingdoms* of the earth gathered, &c. A striking confirmation of this usage is found also in a passage, 1 Sam. 10: 18, where it would be little expected *a priori* either by the learned or unlearned reader: "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I brought up Israel out of Egypt, and delivered you out of the hands of the Egyptians, and out of the hand of *all kingdoms* (and) of them that oppressed you (מְלָכוֹת הַלְּזָרִים אֲרָבָם *all kingdoms even (the kings) oppressing you*)." That this is the true construction is evident from the fact, that the gender of the participle being different from that of the noun, requires the word 'kings' to make out the proper grammatical concord. The term 'kingdom' is not, however, to be pressed in this connexion to the idea of a purely regal form of government, but to be taken rather as the designation of any form of national existence in which we can recognize an established ruling power. Havernick remarks, that "*kings* here stands in the concrete for *dynasties* or *kingdoms*, the representative of kingdoms for the kingdoms themselves." The peculiar form of expression in the original shows that special emphasis is laid on the number *four*: *four* monarchies of the earth, and *one* of heaven, are here brought to view. The grand cycle of all prophetic dominion is embraced in the succession of these empires.

In the angel's explanation these kingdoms are said to 'arise out of the earth,' whereas in the prophet's vision they are represented as rising out the sea. But it is evident that 'sea' in that connexion is taken metaphorically for a turbulent state of the nations, for a multitude of peoples agitated by wars and commotions. As the sea, however, is a part of the earth, there is no infraction of the laws of symbolic diction in making use of the more general term, where its employment would more significantly set forth a particular shade of thought which the other could not so well convey. Here the design is to show a latent contrast between the kingdoms of the earth and the kingdom of heaven, which was to succeed. "My kingdom," said the Savior, John 18: 36, "is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence." These kingdoms were '*from hence*,' were carnal, secular, and belligerent. Thus Jacchiades in loc. ; "These four beasts denote four kings (kingdoms) which shall arise out of the earth ; and the cause why they shall arise shall be terrestrial and not divine ; because they shall not be governed by the Providence of God ever to be lauded. But the rise of the fifth kingdom shall be from God out of heaven."

The rise of each of these four kingdoms is indeed spoken of as future, although at the time of the vision the Babylonian monarchy had *already* arisen and was in the zenith of its power. But it is altogether in accordance with the structure of prophecy as elsewhere developed, to adopt this generalizing mode of expression in respect to the themes of announcement. They make frequent use of the rhetorical figure called *denominatio potiore*, or *telling from the chief*. When any thing is predicated of a class of subjects which holds true of the most of them, though of not every one, it is not usual for the sacred writers to be very exact in their discriminations. This is left to the intelligence of the reader. He will have no difficulty in making the requisite limitations. Repeated instances occur where matters of a *retrospective* nature are mingled with those that are *prospective* ; and in the present case we could hardly expect that where the object of the interpreting angel is simply to declare that the symbolic import of the four beasts was the rise of four great kingdoms, he should deem it necessary to advert to the fact that one of them had already made its appearance on the stage of action. This remark is of importance in interpreting the parallel prophecy of the Apocalypse, (ch. 13,) where John speaks of the emergence of the Roman Beast from the sea, an event which had taken place ages before he wrote, though from his language it might appear to be future.

Ver. 18.

CHAL.

וְיִקְבְּלוּן מַלְכוּתָא קְדִישִׁי עֲלֵיהֶון  
וְיִרְשֻׁנוּן מַלְכוּתָא עַד עָלְמָא  
עַד עָלְמָא עָלְמָא :

ENGL. VERS.

But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.

GR. OF THEOD.

Καὶ παραλήφονται τῆν βασιλείαν  
αὐτοὶ ὑψίστου, καὶ καθέξουσιν  
αὐτήν ἕως αἰῶνος τῶν αἰῶνων.

LAT. VULG.

Suscipient autem regnum sancti  
Dei altissimi; et obtinebunt regnum  
usque in sæculum, et sæculum  
sæculorum.

*But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom, &c.* Chal. קְדִישִׁי עֲלֵיהֶון Gr. ἄγιοι ὑψίστου. The phraseology employed is somewhat peculiar, as this title of the predicted possessors of the kingdom does not occur in the present form except in this chapter. Thus, v. 22, "Judgment was given to the *saints of the Most High*, and the time came that the *saints* possessed the kingdom;" v. 25, "Shall wear out the *saints of the Most High*;" v. 27, "And the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the *saints of the Most High*." As to the first of these terms, קְדִישִׁי, it occurs as an epithet of Divinity in the following passages: Dan. 4; 8, 9, "In whom is the spirit of the *holy gods* (אֱלֹהִין קְדִישִׁין)." "Because I know that the spirit of the *holy gods* (אֱלֹהִין קְדִישִׁין) is in thee." Ch. 5: 11, "There is a man in thy kingdom in whom is the spirit of the *holy gods* (קְדִישִׁין אֱלֹהִין)." This language was uttered by those who had no distinct conceptions of the divine existence, and is doubtless to be taken as simply equivalent to *powers above*, without any clear distinction in their minds between *angels* and the *Supreme Deity*. This appears still more clearly from ch. 4: 13, "And behold a watcher and an *holy one* (קְדִישִׁי) came down from heaven." Ver. 17, "The demand (is) by the word of the *holy ones* (קְדִישִׁין)." Ver. 23, "And whereas the king saw a watcher and an *holy one* (קְדִישִׁי) coming down from heaven." In each of these cases the idea conveyed is unquestionably that of an *angel*, a designation often used in Scripture to which *holy one* is equivalent, and with which, though somewhat loosely, the attributes of Divinity were associated. It is moreover worthy of remark, that the people of God, the truly sanctified, when set before us in visionary representation, are designated by terms that seem to identify them with angels. Indeed, as *angel* is a mere term of office, and not of nature, it would perhaps be difficult to show, that many of those who are employed as ministering spirits are not in truth human beings raised to an angelic condition, which is unquestionably the final lot of the righteous. However this may be, the usage in such passages as the following is to be especially noted;



Deut. 33 : 2, "The Lord came from Sinai with ten thousands of *saints* (קִדְּשִׁים *holy ones*).” Zech. 14 : 5, "The Lord my God shall come, and all the *saints* (קִדְּשִׁים) with thee.” Other instances might be adduced where it is equally difficult to show the precise line of distinction between *saints* and *angels*, nor in the prophetic visions is it at all necessary, for in the decorum of symbolic transactions, the human agents employed in accomplishing the designs of Providence would naturally be represented by angels, and designated by a term more strictly appropriate to them. The scenery we are now considering is altogether of this character, and therefore, although the kingdom to be possessed is a kingdom on earth, and its destined possessors mortal men in the flesh, yet they are represented by titles and attributes that are more usually ascribed to *angels*. Still, that they are not in reality such is evident upon recurrence to ver. 21, 25, where we find it is these same ‘saints’ against which the Little Horn makes war and carries on persecution for the space of a time, times, and the dividing of time, which of course precludes the idea of their being, in the earthly realization of the scene, *angels*. The grand fact of importance in this connexion is, that they are called by a name that is frequently applied to the angelic order of beings, and that because they are presented to us in *vision* and not in *verity*.

The other word עֲלִיּוֹן signifying *high, exalted, pre-eminent*, is for the most part employed as an epithet of Jehovah, founded upon his infinite *pre-eminence* as the Creator, Upholder, and Ruler of the universe. Thus Gen. 14 : 18, speaking of Melchizedek, "He was the priest of *the Most High God* (אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן)." Comp. v. 19, 20. So also Num. 24, 16, "He hath said, which heard the words of God, and knew the knowledge of *the Most High* (אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן)." Deut. 32 : 8, "When *the Most High* (אֱלֹהֵי עֲלִיּוֹן) divided to the nations their inheritance." With a palpable reference to this title, we learn from Philobibulus that the Phœnicians had a deity which they called 'Elioun.' But the following passages disclose a peculiar use of the term, which is highly important in this connexion. In the promises made to the chosen people of future blessings and grandeur in case of obedience, Deut. 26 : 18, 19, it is said, "And the Lord hath avouched thee this day to be his peculiar people as he hath promised thee, and that thou shouldest keep all his commandments, and to *make thee high* (אֲרִמְךָ עֲלִיּוֹן לְכָל הָעַמִּים Gr. ἐλθαί σε ὑπεράνω παντῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν) above all nations which he hath made." So again Deut. 28 : 1, "And it shall come to pass, if thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe and to do all his commandments which I command thee this day; that the Lord thy God *will set thee on high* (אֲרִמְךָ עֲלִיּוֹן לְכָל הָעַמִּים Gr. δώσει σε ὑπεράνω) above all nations of the earth." It would seem, therefore, that *the Jews* are indicated as forming a part, at least, of the 'saints' who are to be the pos-

sessors of the kingdom here spoken of, though we are aware of no grounds for restricting the promise to them. That they, however, are to be recognized as holding a prominent place among the destined heirs of the kingdom is certified to us by the whole tenor of the correlate prophecies throughout the Scriptures, and is moreover, we think, expressly intimated in the phraseology of the parallel passage, ver. 27, where it is said that "the kingdom and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the *people* (עַם) of the saints of the Most High." This is a term by which the chosen race are frequently designated in the Scriptures, and set in opposition to the גוֹיִם or *Gentile* nations, including all other tribes and kindreds of the earth. Israel was emphatically 'the *people* of God's pasture;' their name was 'Ammi,' *my people*, Hos. 1, 10, and he threatened, Deut. 32 : 21, to "move them to jealousy, with those which were *not a people*." So also in Dan. 18 : 24, and 12 : 7, we think there are strong grounds for believing that the '*holy people*' (עַם קְדוֹשִׁים) which were to be 'destroyed' and 'scattered,' were the Jews. Indeed, we know not upon what other passage the question of the disciples to our Savior, Acts 1 : 6, was founded if it were not this; "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom again to Israel?" They doubtless had this prophetic intimation of Daniel in their minds, and our Lord does not declare that their expectations were a fallacy. Still, while we recognize a latent allusion in this term to the Jews, we do not say that it is to be confined to them; for Peter, 1 Epist. 2 : 10, doubtless has allusion to Gentile believers when he says, "Which in time past were *not a people*, but are now *the people of God*." We may suppose that Daniel's grief was occasioned in great measure by a foresight of the cruel oppressions to which *his own people* were to be subjected during the dominance of the Beast and Little Horn. The form of the word עַמְלֵי־יִיְיָ, it will be observed, is plural in the original, which nowhere else occurs, and though general usage will admit of its being considered as a *pluralis majestatis*, and thus applied to Jehovah, yet it may still be rendered, as it is by several commentators, '*sancti altissimorum*,' *the saints of the most high ones*, that holy and devoted people who are born from above, whose spirit, aims, and destiny are all heavenly, and who are thus brought into near conjunction with him who is "God *over* (Gr. ἐπάνω, *above*) all, blessed forever." It is that called and chosen people, gathered out of all kindreds, and nations, and tongues, that are to inherit the predicted kingdom, not as original and independent possessors, but as possessors under Christ, and holding their dominion in virtue of his right.

*Shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever and ever.* Chal. יִקְבְּלוּן shall receive; Gr. παραλήψονται; whence the apostle, in allusion to this passage, Heb. 12 : 28, "Wherefore we

receiving (παράλαμβάνοντες) a kingdom which cannot be shaken, let us have grace," &c. But this is a kingdom which the saints were not only to receive, but also to possess, to hold in perpetuity by a sure and unassailable tenure, although it does not follow that the possession was to commence simultaneously with the receiving it. The saints received the kingdom in the right of their Lord and head, when he ascended to heaven and sat down on the throne of God. And for this reason Paul, in the above passage, speaks of their receiving it in the present tense. But neither he nor they enter into full possession till after all opposing kingdoms are done away, and this is not for many ages after its reception. In the particulars here specified, the fifth or spiritual empire differs from its predecessors. The previous kingdoms were received but not possessed. They passed away one after the other as types of the mutability of all things worldly and human. The spiritual empire of Christ and the saints, on the other hand, is to be an ever-during possession. The original word קָבַץ, from the involved idea of strength which enters into the root, corresponding with the Heb. חָזַק, is strictly expressive of firm possession, retained with a vigorous grasp in opposition to any attempt to invade or wrest it. The supplementary phrase 'for ever, even for ever and ever,' goes to heighten to the utmost the idea of the prolonged continuance of this glorious reign. It is to endure through a period of which God has not seen fit to reveal the end. Yet we may here repeat the remark, that the leading idea indicated by the language is not that of simple eternity. The angel expressly declares, ver. 27, that the kingdom here spoken of is to be a kingdom under the whole heaven, and consequently upon the earth. The duration of the one, therefore, would seem to be most intimately related to that of the other, as far as the ultimate destiny of either of them comes within the scope of express revelation. As God has not been pleased to inform us how long the earth shall endure, so we can set no limits to the earthly duration of that kingdom which is here prophetically adjudged to the saints.

As to the term kingdom (מְלִכְוּתָא) in the present and numerous other passages, both in the Old and New Testament, it may be questioned whether the exact shade of meaning intended to be conveyed by it, is not often lost sight of by the readers of the Bible, owing to one of those imperceptible changes which frequently come over the use of words. There can be no question that in strictness of definition the original term מְלִכְוּתָא or מְלִכְוּתָא, from the root מָלַךְ, to reign; signifies kingship rather than kingdom; the regia potestas, the right, power, or prerogative of royalty, the actual exercise of dominion. This probably was the original import of kingdom, but in process of time, as the idea of a ruling power stands closely related to that of ruled subjects and the territory which they occupy, so the

import of the term became by degrees complex, and the primary and more legitimate sense of the word was lost sight of.

## VERSES 19-21.

CHAL.

אֲדַן צְבִית לִצְבָאָה לִחַיֹּתָא  
 רְבִיעִיתָא דִּי־חַיֹּת שְׁנִיָּה מִן  
 כְּלֵהוֹן הַחֵלְהָ הַיְתִירָה שְׁפִיָּה  
 דִּי־פְרוֹל וְשַׁפְרִיהָ דִּי־נַחַשׁ  
 אֲכָלָה מִדְּקָה וְשִׁאָרָא בְּרַגְלֶיהָ  
 רַפְסָה; וְעַבְרִיָּתָא עֲשָׂרָה דִּי  
 בְּרֵאשֵׁה אֲחֵרֵי דִי סֻלְחָת  
 וְנִפְלִי מִן־קַרְמִיָּה תִּלְתָּ וְקַרְנָא  
 דִּכְן וְעֵינֵין לָהּ וְפִם מִמְלַל  
 רְבִירָן וְחֻזָּה רַב מִן־חַבְרֹתָהּ;  
 חֻזָּה הָיִית וְקַרְנָא דִּכְן עָבְדָא  
 קַרְבַּ עַם־קְדִישֵׁין וַיִּכְלָה לָדֵן;

GR. OF THEOD.

Καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀκριβῶς περὶ  
 τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ τετάρτου, ὅτι ἦν  
 διάφορον παρὰ πᾶν θηρίον, καὶ  
 φοβερόν περισσῶς· οἱ ὀδόντες  
 αὐτοῦ σιδηροῖ, καὶ οἰάνυχες αὐ-  
 τοῦ χαλκοί, ἐθίον, καὶ λεπτόνον,  
 καὶ τὰ κατάλοιπα τοῖς ποσὶν  
 αὐτοῦ συνεπάτα.

Καὶ περὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ  
 τῶν ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ  
 ἑτέρου τοῦ ἀναβάλλοντος, καὶ ἐκτι-  
 νάξαντος τῶν προτέρων τρία,  
 καὶ τὸ κέρας ἐκεῖνο, ᾧ ὀφθαλ-  
 μοὶ αὐτῷ, καὶ στόμα λαλοῦν με-  
 γάλα, καὶ ἡ ὄρασις αὐτῶν μέ-  
 ζων τῶν λοιπῶν.

Ἐθεώρουν, καὶ τὸ κέρας ἐκεῖ-  
 νο ἐποίησε πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν  
 ἁγίων, καὶ ἔχουσε πρὸς αὐτούς.

ENG. VERS.

Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet:

And of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.

I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them.

LAT. VULG.

Post hoc volui diligenter discere de bestia quarta, quae erat dissimilis valde ab omnibus, et terribilis nimis; dentes et ungues ejus ferrei; comedebat, et comminuebat, et et reliqua pedibus suis conculcabat.

Et de cornibus decem, quae habebat in capite; et de alio, quod ortum fuerat, ante quod ceciderant tria cornua; et de cornua illo, quod habebat oculos, et os loquens grandia, et majus erat ceteris.

Aspiciebam, et ecce! cornu illud faciebat bellum adversus sanctos, et praevalebat eis.

Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, &c. Chal. לִצְבָאָה לִחַיֹּתָא lit. I longed for the truth upon, or respecting, &c. The Greek represents the leading idea, but not so expressively, by ἐζήτουν ἀκριβῶς, I sought diligently. The original indicates rather

an emotion of the heart, the Greek rather an exercise of the mind. The former explanation had failed to satisfy the mental cravings of the seer, in respect to the true-meant significance of the fourth Beast, whose aspect was so formidable, and whose instincts and actions were so tremendously ferocious. He had indeed learned the general symbolical design of the four beasts, but there was something about this fourth beast so marked and peculiar, and his actions had such relation to the people of the saints, that the prophet could not refrain from a more minute interrogation in respect to the various particulars described, ver. 7, 8. His curiosity was moreover especially excited in regard to the import of the horns that sprouted from his head, and in a particular manner respecting the eleventh little horn which seemed to draw the attributes of the whole head, and indeed of the whole beast into itself, and after eradicating three of its fellow horns, to make war and prevail against the saints. These inquiries are subsequently answered at full length by the interpreting angel, and we are strongly disposed to elicit from the circumstance a practical intimation which we believe has been overlooked by former commentators. It is, that we have graphically set before us in this incident what usually happens in prophetic investigations. The mass of pious readers of the inspired oracles, like Daniel, their representing person, usually gain at first some more general and indefinite notions of what is intended by the mystic visions, which, although correct perhaps as far as they go, still leave the mind on a closer survey unsatisfied as to the scope of numerous minor items, which they perceive to enter into the materiel of the imagery. The consequence is, that they are affected as Daniel was on the present occasion. They long for a clearer, deeper insight into the veiled mysteries before them. They wish to have *every thing* explained. They cannot be satisfied with a superficial view of matters of such vast moment. The result usually is, that a fuller disclosure waits on a more patient and prying research. They ask, in the use of all appointed means, for further light, and they receive it.

*And of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell.* The ten horns springing from the head of the fourth Beast, are the ten kingdoms that rose out of the fragments of the Roman empire after its overthrow by the Goths. These horns constitute the leading sovereignties of modern Europe. It is of no consequence whether we are able or not to make out the precise number 'ten.' A definite is often used by the sacred writers for an indefinite number, and yet it is certain that the most elaborate historical researches have established 'ten' as *about* the number of independent sovereignties which arose on the Roman platform between the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian era, of which John says, Rev. 12: 13, "The ten horns

which thou sawest are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet." That is, they had received no kingdom in the days of John when the Apocalypse was written; and if they had not arisen then, they cannot be supposed to have arisen till after the unity of the empire was broken up in the time of Augustulus, A. D. 476. The eleventh or little horn, which sprung up after and among the other, is the ecclesiastical power of the Roman Pontificate, which alone answers to the conditions of the symbol. Upon an extended array of proof in regard to the mystic import of the horns, we do not at present enter, as this may be found readily accessible in all the popular works on prophecy. Our more specific purpose warrants us to take for granted whatever points we consider to have been fully made out by the labor of others, and this leaves us room for enlarging on matters which have hitherto gained less attention from commentators.

On the plucking up of the three horns from among the ten by the agency of the eleventh, we know of no better solution than that of Faber, who regards them as the Heruli, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards. "If," says he, "we turn to history, we shall find that these three identical kingdoms were successively eradicated in the immediate presence of the papacy, before which they were geographically standing, and that the temporal principality which bears the name of *St. Peter's Patrimony*, was carved out of the mass of their subjugated dominions." *Sac. Calend. of Proph.* Vol. 2, p. 102.

*Even of that horn that had eyes.* With these eyes it is to be conceived as keenly overlooking the actions of all the other horns. The symbolic bearing of the imagery cannot easily be mistaken. The well-known claim of the head of the Roman church is that of being *universal Bishop*; but the very term *bishop* (*επισκοπος*) is derived from a root (*επισκοπειν*) which signifies *to see, to inspect, to superintend*, so that in the very title of his office is implied the prerogative of general or universal oversight. In this character he challenges the right to take under his cognizance the entire spiritual concerns of the church—a surveillance that formerly extended itself also to the temporal concerns of the whole western empire.

*And a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows.* In accordance with this," says Faber, "the Roman Pontiff, in his asserted capacity of Christ's Vicar upon earth, has at various times anathematized all who dared to oppose him; has laid whole kingdoms under interdict; has thundered forth the most lordly bulls from the Vatican; has excommunicated kings and emperors; has absolved subjects from their allegiance; has affected greater authority, even in temporal matters, than sovereign princes; and has pronounced that the dominion of the whole earth rightfully belongs to him." If this be not a mouth speaking great things, it is difficult to conceive what is.

On a close consideration of the emblematic portraiture, we can scarcely resist the impression, that a horn which has a 'look,' or face, and 'eyes,' and a 'mouth,' must be in fact a kind of *ill-shaped head*. And that it was a head furnished with brains is obvious from the speaking, acting, and ruling, which is ascribed to it. It evidently controlled the whole body in which it inhered, and is thus, from exercising the same power, identified with the harlot-rider of the beast, Rev. 17: and with the false prophet, who in like manner governs, by suggesting the grand movements of the symbolical monster. Accordingly it is not a little remarkable that the triple tiara of the pope, composed of the three crowns, indicative of the three kingdoms whose insignia he has thus transferred to himself, bears a striking resemblance to a conical-shaped horn, which at the same time would require but a slight alteration to make it resemble a deformed head. The engraved representation of the coronal costume of the pope's have only to be consulted to verify the truth of this remark. It is one among the thousand instances in which the providence of God has so ordered it, that a confirmation of his prophetic truth should be read in apparently trivial circumstances and objects, which owed their origin to any thing but an express design to fulfil the inspired oracles. The anti-christian personages of prophecy have been strangely made, when little aware of it, to emblazon their title to the character given them by the Holy Spirit.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

---

#### NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THE fifth and sixth parts of the "Biblical Cyclopedia" of Mr. Kitto have just appeared, carrying on the series of articles from *Berosh* to *Creation*. Every article, however familiar its title, appears to be written anew for this work, and is illustrated by all the light to be derived from the most accurate researches of modern times. But little use is made of the labors of Calmet or his editors, but every thing is drawn from the most original sources, by the ablest scholars, and is therefore presented with a freshness of interest which is looked for in vain in nearly every other work of the kind.

The third number of Prof. Robinson's "Bibliotheca Sacra" has appeared, enriched with a variety of Biblical, Historical, and Geographical matter. The leading article is an elaborate account of the Jewish War under Trajan and Hadrian, embodying all the scattered notices relating to the fates of that devoted nation down to the reign of Severus (A. D. 200.) It forms an exceedingly valuable supplement to Josephus, and the

Editor deems it especially important in connexion with our Saviour's predictions, Matt. 24, which he thinks received their accomplishment rather in the final catastrophe of the *Jewish nation* than in the destruction of the *city of Jerusalem*.

Professor Stuart has contributed two expository essays, the positions of which we have no disposition to controvert. They strike us as very happy and well-considered critiques; the one on the White Stone and the new name written thereon, mentioned by John in the Apocalypse, the other on various points connected with the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian church, in which, among other things, he discusses very judiciously in our opinion, the import of the apostle's language in regard to "eating and drinking unworthily." The only abatement to our commendation of these articles is in respect to the manner in which he all along speaks of the authorship of the Apocalypse; as if John in writing it was as completely *sue potestatis* as was Homer in penning the Iliad. It is John that forms his purpose—John that chooses his diction—John that presides throughout. With this mode of speaking of the inspired books we have little sympathy, and desire less.

An article by the editor on our Lord's prediction in respect to his Second Coming, enters learnedly and ably into the question, whether the language is properly to be referred to the last judgment, or to the impending destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. Professor R. adduces very plausible reasons for adopting the latter view. The 'coming,' announced by the Saviour, was unequivocally to take place during the life-time of some of the then existing generation. The analogies of Scriptural diction evince that no violence is done to philology by applying this language to such an event as the utter destruction of the holy city. But as this event does not, in his opinion, exhaust the drift of the prophecy; as there is good reason to believe that the final catastrophe of the *nation itself* is included in the oracle; therefore he finds it necessary to extend somewhat the import of the term 'generation,' which he suggests may as properly be understood to embrace the period of a hundred years as of thirty. This would enable us to include the final fate of the nation in the scope of the prophecy, as well as that of the city. This, we think on the whole, very probable, though we are still at a loss, on the principle of the author's dissertation, to discover the precise *vinculum* that connects a discourse on the last judgment in the 25th chapter, with one on the destruction of Jerusalem and Judaism in the 24th. These chapters certainly have the air of being one connected train of prediction, and the emphatic *τοτε, then*, with which the 25th chapter opens, would seem to preclude all doubt as to their having reference to one and the same period of time. We incline, therefore, to believe, that the grand *nodus* of this remarkable prophecy remains yet unsolved.

B.



## BUSH ON THE MILLENNIUM.

THE demand for this work having induced the publication of a second edition, M. H. Newman keeps a supply on hand, price 75 cts. per copy. The value of the work may be judged of from the following testimonials:

"This is a work of great research, the fruit of long-continued lucubration, and will repay the attention even of those who entirely dissent from the author's conclusions. Indeed, it may be regarded as a highly valuable book, if we have reference only to the history which it presents of all the opinions concerning the Millennium which have prevailed in the church. Mr. Bush is master of a style which can invest with intense interest the most abstruse speculations; and though he has seldom consulted the popular taste in the choice of his subjects, we should find it difficult to name a writer who has more ready access to the stores of rich and copious English, or who better understands the pomp and majesty of language. \* \* \* Let the book be read by all those who prize the oracles of God. It is of stirring interest, and pregnant with instruction, apart from the main theory which it advocates; and it would be matter of just regret if the few who are qualified and willing to enter upon these perplexing walks, should be frowned upon by prejudice, and denied that public countenance without which their labors cannot be prosecuted."—*Presbyterian*.

"Mr. Bush brings to his task the result of much reflection and of extensive reading. His pages evince an ardor of research, a closeness and continuity of argument, a fulness of biblical and historical lore, a familiarity with the idiom of Scripture, and a certain tact of apposite and striking annotation, in a high degree creditable to himself and to the theological literature of our country. The work is written throughout in an elegant style, occasionally rising into true eloquence."—*New-York Observer*.

"In the line of accurate and thoroughgoing interpretation, it is a production of standard character. No man can read it without gaining more new and interesting and striking ideas on the subject of prophecy, than from any book of the same size which is accessible to the ordinary American reader. And in addition to the intrinsic interest of the subject, the author has invested it with the graces of so captivating a style that the reader is carried forward, particularly in the few last chapters, with the pleasure of a traveller over a fine country in a fair day." \* \* \* —*Rochester Observer*.

"Were it only as a writer, Mr. Bush deserves distinction. Our literary journals and our current works of fancy might be searched in vain for finer specimens of rich and nervous English than we have met in this slender duodecimo. If his style ever languishes it is not from debility, but from plethora. He often wastes enough in one distended paragraph to furnish, if adroitly spun and woven, the entire material of a tolerable Annual; and we sometimes find more poetry in one of his expressive solecisms, than falls to the lot of many a poet by profession. The cardinal excellence of Mr. Bush's style is, that it has a soul. It is sometimes heavy, but never dull. What he writes is not a lifeless carcass, every now and then convulsed by the galyanic impulse of affected animation. There is a quickening influence pervading all its parts, which makes it always readable, and almost always interesting. Indeed we are aware of no contemporary writer more remarkable for uniform and unre-mitted vigor. We cannot conclude without an expression of our satisfaction, that on this occasion we have found our countryman as much superior to the "prophetic school" of England in sobriety and sense, as in the graces of his style. We take leave of him with unfeigned wishes for his rich success in this delightful occupation, and shall look with some impatience for the maturer fruits of his attempt to rend the veil of the Apocalypse."—*Biblical Repertory*.

"The view taken by Mr. Bush deserves attention, and the arguments by which he attempts to establish his positions are not to be passed over lightly. The volume is ably, and in some parts eloquently written, and we heartily recommend it to our readers."—*Boston Recorder*.

THE HIEROPHANT is designed as a monthly publication, devoted mainly to the subject of Scripture Prophecy, but embracing in its plan other topics of Biblical exposition.

The Terms are \$1 50 per annum, *in advance*; payment to be forwarded (free of charge) to the Editor, 136 Nassau-st., New-York. As the sum is one of rather inconvenient transmission by mail, it is desired that private opportunities should be embraced whenever practicable; or if the amount of two or more subscriptions could be sent in one inclosure at the same time, it would obviate the difficulty in question. Subscribers living in the neighborhood of agents will treat with them, unless opportunities occur for communicating directly with the Publishers or the Editor.

Postmasters are authorized to remit subscription monies free of postage.



WE can furnish the back Nos. to new subscribers to a small—and but a small—extent, as a thousand copies is the limit of our impression. When the volume is completed, there is not at present the least probability that a *single copy* can be obtained by purchase. To those who may wish to possess themselves of a series of Biblical discussions upon which unusual care has been bestowed, the present is probably the only opportunity. The sequel of the exposition of the 7th chapter of Daniel, we do not hesitate to say, will be of deep interest to the student of prophecy; and such of necessity is every one who is a student of the Bible. This portion of the prophetic visions sweeps into its comprehensive range that whole class of disclosures which relate to the Second Coming of Christ—the End of the World—the Judgment—the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints, etc., together with many kindred predictions of the Apocalypse. These are topics to which no reflecting Christian mind can be indifferent; and they are treated in our pages, not with overweening confidence, but according to the measure of light which a somewhat patient and prolonged investigation has afforded.

Orders to be addressed to the Editor or Publisher.

---

---

#### LIST OF AGENTS.

MAINE.—*Portland*, William Hyde.

*Bangor*, E. F. Duren.

MASSACHUSETTS.—*Boston*, Saxton & Pierce.

*Salem*, Henry Whipple.

*Andover*, W. Wardwell.

RHODE-ISLAND.—*Providence*, O. Wilmarth.

CONNECTICUT.—*Hartford*, James W. Judd.

NEW-JERSEY.—*Princeton*, S. N. Howell.