

THE HIEROPHANT;

OR

MONTHLY EXPOSITOR OF SACRED SYMBOLS AND PROPHECY.

No. XII. MAY, 1843.

PROPHETIC DESIGNATIONS OF TIME.

TO PROFESSOR STUART.—LETTER IX.

REV. AND DEAR SIR :

ON a review of my last letter I am entirely conscious of having failed to present the argument respecting the prophetic sense of *day*, especially as built on the Seventy Weeks of Daniel, in its full strength. I am only surprised, upon comparing your confident assertion as to the import of שָׁבָעִים with the weakness of the grounds on which it rests, that I should have shown any quarter whatever to so faulty a mode of interpretation. "Our translation," you say, "renders the words שָׁבָעִים שָׁבָעִים *seventy weeks*. But through the Scriptures there is, if we except three instances in the book of Daniel, no such form as שָׁבָעִים, which means *weeks*. This is only and always שָׁבָעוֹת or שְׁבוּעוֹת. The form שָׁבָעִים, therefore, which is a regular masculine plural, is no doubt purposely chosen to designate *the plural of seven*." Upon this statement I must be allowed to say, that it approaches as near to an adroit specimen of philological finesse as any thing I recollect to have met with. Intent upon annihilating all evidence that שָׁבָעִים can signify *weeks of days*, you so exhibit the usage of the sacred writers on this head, as effectually to mislead the common reader who is ignorant of Hebrew. When you say that, with three exceptions, the only and invariable forms for denoting *weeks*, are שָׁבָעוֹת or שְׁבוּעוֹת, the English reader never dreams that these two words are the plural of the

same singular with שבוע itself, and that this singular, viz., שבוע, is the established Hebrew term for a *week of days*, as I have shown in my last by a most ample list of quotations. He would be surprised to learn that it is only by a shade that these forms differ from such English forms as *genii, geniuses; indexes, indices; memoranda, memorandums, &c.*, and that there was precisely the same ground for making שבועות the plural of seven as שבועים. Of all this the common reader of your pages is kept profoundly ignorant, and, as it strikes me, designedly so; and it is dealing the more unfairly with him, not only because he cannot be expected to question the *dictum* of a Hebrew professor, but because the whole *gist* of your argument depends upon your construction of this term. If you do not succeed in showing that the word in question denotes simply *sevens*, and may as well be understood of *sevens of years* as of *sevens of days*, you do nothing to the purpose. Now I take it upon me to deny, in the most point-blank manner, the soundness of your exegesis in regard to the term and the phrase under discussion. I deny that there is the least particle of evidence that שבועים is a regular masculine plural of the simple *numeral seven*, or that it is any thing more than a fixed, normal, appropriate plural form for the Hebrew term signifying *weeks*. It is true, as I remarked in my last, that it comes etymologically from a root signifying *seven*, and so does the equivalent Greek ἑβδομάς, *week*. But they both have, when applied to time, a restricted import. They denote, in their literal sense and their accredited use, a *week of days*, and nothing else. Admitting, as I of course do, that the idea of the *septenary number* is involved in each of the terms, I still affirm, that as it would be an outrage upon the Greek word ἑβδομάς to apply it to *seven hours, seven weeks, seven months, seven years*, or any thing else than *seven days*, so it is just as much an infraction of Hebrew usage to apply the corresponding term שבוע or its plural שבועים to any thing, as its primary sense, but *weeks of days*. This unqualified position I leave to your disposal, and proceed to some other views of the general subject.

After adverting in my last to the fact, that no principle of prophetic interpretation had been more generally received than that which recognizes a *day* as the symbolical term for a *year*, I observed that the rejection of this principle was in effect the subversion of all the grounds of those more definite anticipations in regard to the latter-day triumphs of the church, which good men have entertained throughout every period of her history. So far as I can see, the positions advocated in your pages go the full length of unsettling the entire foundation of these cherished hopes. By restricting the prophetic periods to the *literal* terms of the predictions of Daniel and John, you necessitate the conclusion, that the events intended have long since transpired, and that nothing remains to

answer the present expectations of the Christian world, but a vague prospect, at some distant day, of a state of blessedness, prosperity, and security, to succeed the conflicts and commotions of the ages elapsed. As to the era, however, of this happy condition of the world, it is left, on your theory, wholly indeterminate and unknown. Hundreds or thousands of years may roll away before the hearts of pious expectants are to be gladdened with a view of the ushering in of that halcyon reign of righteousness and truth. Though you professedly hold to a Millennium, yet being left by your hypothesis without any intimation of the time of its occurrence, you are equally in the dark as to the *manner* in which it is connected with the antecedent order of events that are to lead to it, and to result in it. Confining, as you do, nearly the whole of the predictions of the Apocalypse to the earlier ages of the church, you are obliged to leave a yawning chasm of unlimited extent between the destruction of Jerusalem and the final prosperity of Zion. To this view of the great outlines of prophecy, not myself only, but the mass of the Christian Protestant world is entirely and utterly opposed. While the established principles of interpretation authorize no one to fix with absolute precision the commencing date of the glorious consummation announced, yet by resting upon the soundness of the canon that takes a *day* for a *year*, we trace an orderly sequence of events leading infallibly to the conclusion, that the opening of that august dispensation is *near at hand*. Of this we are as certain as we are that years are represented by days in the prophetic chronology. Though we may not be able accurately to define the epoch of the state termed millennial, we can yet approximate to the determination of certain periods assigned by prophecy to the anti-Christian powers, whose removal is to precede the introduction of that state, which will bring us sufficiently near the truth for all practical purposes.

All decisions, however, of this nature depend upon the truth of the position that, in symbolical prophecies, a *day* stands for a *year*. Let this be given up, and we are completely thrown out of our reckoning. Such a result appears to occasion no trouble to your mind, but the great body of Christians, I imagine, will find themselves wholly unable to sympathize with such indifference. The earnest hope, the assured confidence, which they have so long cherished, of the *speedy* approach of the better days of Zion's destiny, possess a *sacredness*, in their estimation, which will not permit them to look with composure upon an indefinite postponement of a consummation so devoutly to be wished. They will cling pertinaciously to the great principle in question, till they are convinced, upon the most solid grounds, that the principle itself is a fallacy. And this I will venture to say they have not been, and will not be, by any considerations you have as yet adduced ; although, if your

reasonings on this head have failed to satisfy them, it certainly is not owing to any lack of confident zeal or assurance on your part. But I trust that the arguments of my previous letter went sufficiently into the merits of the question to evince, that Daniel's prophecy of the Seventy Weeks is constructed on this principle; and, if so, the grand point must be considered as established. A single decided instance will suffice to make out the principle, and there can be no material difficulty in respect to other applications of it. Yet it must be admitted to be very seldom that any point of such moment rests upon a single passage of Scripture; we usually find it confirmed by parallel modes of diction, occurring, it may be, in connexions in which we should little expect to find them, but when found, bearing with most convincing potency on the usage in question.

My object, therefore, in the present communication, is to accumulate still farther evidence of the use of the word *day* for *year* in the sacred writers. I hope, at any rate, to be able to establish such a peculiar relation between these two terms, that it shall be seen that to the mind of a Jew nothing would be more natural than the impression of one being employed for the other, when the design of the Spirit was to adopt a mode of speech that should, like the symbolical prophecies in general, throw a veil of partial obscurity around the ultimate import. This principle is well stated by Hengstenberg. It is referred by him directly to the "effort after concealed definiteness. This, in respect to what was concealed, could not be realized, if he used the ordinary mode of reckoning." (*Christol. Vol. I. p. 299.*) Let me solicit your attention, then, to the following passages, in citing which I would not be considered as relying upon them as absolutely demonstrative of the point at issue, but as affording a striking indirect warrant for the sense for which I contend.

Gen. 4: 3, "And in process of time (מִן־הַיָּמִים *at the end of days*) it came to pass that Cain brought," &c. The phraseology here is doubtless somewhat indefinite, but the current of interpreters understand it as equivalent to the *end of the year*.

Gen. 41: 1, "And it came to pass at the end of two full years (מִן־הַיָּמִים שְׁנַתֵּי־יָמִים, Greek μετά δύο ἔτη ἡμερῶν), that Pharaoh dreamed," &c. Here we notice that the literal rendering both of the Hebrew and the Greek is, *at the end of two years* (of) *days*.

Ex. 13: 10, "Thou shalt keep this ordinance therefore in his season from year to year," (בַּיָּמִים הַיָּמִיּוֹת, *from days (to) days onward*. Greek, ἀπὸ ἡμερῶν εἰς ἡμέρας *from days to days*.)

Lev. 25: 29, "And if a man sell a dwelling-house in a walled city, then he may redeem it within a whole year, (בְּרֵאשִׁית שָׁנָה, *to the completion of a year*) after it is sold: within a full year shall he redeem it (בְּיָמִים חֲדָרָה נְאֻלָּהוּ, *a year of days shall be the redemption thereof*)." Nothing is more obvious than the equivalency of *days* and *year* in this passage.

Num. 9: 22, "Or whether it were two days, or a month, or a year (שָׁנָה *days*) that the cloud tarried," &c.

Judg. 11: 40, "That the daughters of Israel went *yearly* (מִיּוֹמָם מִיּוֹמָם *from days to days*) to lament," &c.

Judg. 17: 10, "And I will give thee ten shekels of silver *by the year* (לְיָמִים *to days*)."

Judg. 21: 19, "Behold, there is a feast of the Lord in Shiloh *yearly* (מִיּוֹמָם מִיּוֹמָם *from days to days*)."

1 Sam. 1: 3, "And this man went up out of his city *yearly* (מִיּוֹמָם מִיּוֹמָם *from days to days*) to worship," &c.

1 Sam. 1: 20, "Wherefore it came to pass, *when the time was come about* (לְהַקְטֹחַ הַיָּמִים *at the revolution of the days*)." Compare this with Ex. 34: 22, "Thou shalt observe the feast of ingathering *at the year's end* (לְהַקְטֹחַ הַשָּׁנָה *at the revolution of the year*)." This shows that the import of the two phrases is identical.

1 Sam. 2: 19, "When she came up with her husband to offer *the yearly sacrifice* (זֶבַח הַיָּמִים *the sacrifice of days*)."

2 Sam. 14: 28, "So Absalom dwelt *two full years* (שְׁנָתָיִם יָמִים *two years, days*) in Jerusalem."

2 Chron. 21: 19, "And it came to pass, that *in process of time* (לְיָמִים מִיּוֹמָם *to days from days*), *after the end of two years* (אַחֲרֵי שְׁנָיִם יָמִים *at the time of the going out of the end of days, two years*) his bowels fell out," &c.

Amos 4: 4, "Bring your sacrifices every morning, and your tithes *after three years* (אַחֲרֵי שְׁלֹשָׁה יָמִים *at or after the triad of days*)."

Examples of this usage might be multiplied to still greater extent, but my object is answered if I have succeeded in establishing a relation of a very peculiar nature, in the sacred writings, between the words *day* or *days* and *year*. In what respect I have failed in doing this, I am unable to perceive. I think it must strike every intelligent reader, that the *usus loquendi* of the Scriptures in regard to these terms is such as to lay an ample foundation for the adoption of the one as a substitute for the other in the language of prophecy.

It would be very easy to enlarge upon this part of our subject, and to show that the *events* symbolically set forth in these predictions were of such a nature that they could not possibly be comprised within the literal periods designated by the prophet. But as this has already been done with great clearness by Mede and Faber, and as I wish to leave myself room to advert to some other particulars in your book, I waive the further discussion of this point, and leave it to the calm adjudication of yourself and my readers.

The results of the investigation thus far, in their bearings on your theory, must be evident. They put a new phase at once upon the whole prophetic materiel of Daniel and John. The scope of their predictions, instead of being confined, as you would make them, to the comparatively insignificant events of a few years, and

to the fortunes of Antiochus or Nero, is found to embrace the history of the church through a long lapse of centuries, and to take hold on the grand finale of all earthly dominion prior to the second advent of the Son of man. If this be so, what can be wider asunder from the truth than the conclusions you have stated? What more inadequate, erroneous, or pernicious view of the drift of the prophetic visions can be enounced? If God has been pleased to impart to his servants a series of oracles extending over the whole tract of time, from the establishment of the Saviour's kingdom down to its glorious consummation, does he make a harmless inroad upon this system who would fain persuade us that this is all an idle dream, and that in reality it embraces only a mere fraction of this period, and that, too, one that is long since passed away? Does it not deserve an inquiry somewhat serious, whether this proceeding may not come within the scope of the fearful denunciation against him who either "adds to or takes away from the words of the prophecy of this book?"

As to the structure of the Apocalypse, nothing can be more express than your declarations. "A very small portion of the book (strictly considered only chap. xx., for the sequel is a mere expansion of a part of this,) has respect to the *distant* future."—"We are at liberty, or rather we are obliged, if possible, to seek for a fulfilment of the predictions in the main body of the Apocalypse, within a time which is not far distant from the period when the book was written. If such a fulfilment can be found as coincides with the periods named in the Apocalypse, then what good reason can be offered why we should reject it? Or rather, *why are we not exegetically obliged to admit it?*" This is taking ground at once against the whole current of Protestant commentary on the book in question, and giving to the Romanists every advantage which they could desire. You help them, in fact, to plant themselves in a position from which it is impossible to dislodge them. This is a consequence of more serious moment than might at first blush appear; for, upon the principle of your interpretation, it is clear that the glorious Reformation could never have taken place. The most cursory glance of the prophecy makes it evident that the mystic power denominated Babylon, is denounced as anti-Christian and idolatrous, and the people of God are commanded to separate themselves from it. Now nothing is better ascertained, as a historical fact, than that it was on the ground of these denunciations, which they did not hesitate to apply to the apostate Roman church, that the noble band of Reformers were upheld in their separation from the papacy. They did not scruple to read, in the character of the then existing church, all the distinctive marks which went to identify that corrupt hierarchy with the doomed dominion which the Spirit of God has branded with the epithet of "mother of harlots and abominations

of the earth." They were sustained in their heroic enterprise by this obvious construction of the prophetic oracles. Under an undoubting assurance of its truth, they both denounced and renounced that apostate church, and went forward in the prosecution of labors from which they would otherwise have been intimidated, and of the success of which they would have despaired. To say nothing of the virulence of that external opposition, under the weight of which they were sometimes on the point of being crushed, a separation from the visible head of the papacy, under the dreaded appellation of schism, was represented as the most inexpressible of crimes; and such were the prejudices of the times, that it was almost universally admitted to be a grievous offence to question even the loftiest prerogatives of the Roman see, and the most undaunted of the Reformers shrunk from the charge. But the devout study of the Apocalypse enabled them to repel it, and furnished them with the most powerful weapons for conducting their warfare against that system of corruptions, superstitions, and lies. On every side they appealed to the predictions of the prophet of Patmos to authorize their conduct, and multitudes acknowledged the validity of their appeal. Bishop Hurd (*Discourse* vii. and viii.) hesitates not to assert, that "On this popular ground chiefly, the Protestant cause, in these early times, was upheld." You will have learned, too, from the pages of D'Aubigne, that he takes the same view of the subject.

Now it is the direct and obvious aim of your Apocalyptic exegesis to throw discredit upon this construction, and to lead your readers to treat it as one of the veriest figments of hermeneutic dreaming. The recognition of the Roman hierarchy under any of the mystic shadows of the Apocalypse is, in your view, nothing more than an idle hallucination; and no adherent of that church, who takes your "Hints" for his guide, can regard its fearful denunciations in any other light than as a mere *brutum fulmen*, fitted and designed only to scare an impious Nero fiddling over the fires of Rome. How far this differs in effect from the most pointed condemnation of Luther and his noble army of confessors—how far it falls short of pouring contempt upon all the Scriptural reasonings by which Protestants would justify their withdrawal from the Papal communion—is a question that I cannot but commend to your serious consideration. That the mitred dignitary who sits enthroned upon the seven hills, would deem yours a signal service performed to his cause, and one that deserved at least the guerdon of a cardinal's hat, I think there can be no reason to doubt. And if these are the principles of interpretation taught in a seminary founded by the sons of the Reformation, and designed to perpetuate its doctrines, it would seem to be something over and above and contrary to what has usually been understood to be the case. I have sometimes asked myself what would be the result, if circum-

stances should occur to enlist your pen in the Romish controversy, which is now beginning to agitate anew the Christian world. I cannot perceive that you would have reason to be surprised to hear yourself accosted on all sides by the significant inquiry—"Under which king, Bezonian?—speak."

I would desire ever to treat with becoming respect the grave conclusions of every serious mind in its attempts to enucleate the mysteries of prophecy. But I cannot disguise, that no small share of amusement has mingled itself with my surprise in following the thread of your expositions. The eleventh chapter of the Apocalypse, for instance, containing the account of the persecution and martyrdom of the two witnesses, you regard as a prediction, "the same in substance as that in Matt. xxiv. The consummation is related in Rev. xi.; i. e. the consummation of the event, for which preparation had been making; which preparation the Apocalypse exhibits in chap. v.-x." This preparation, it will be observed, embraces the woes of the six first trumpets. The consummation, in your theory, is the destruction of Jerusalem, and the slaughter of the witnesses is the putting to death of the faithful Christian confessors who remained in their own country, in defiance of all the terrors and perils arrayed against them. The two thousand six hundred and threescore days of their sackcloth-prophecy, is the literal period of three and a half years, during which Vespasian and Titus carried on the war in Palestine that resulted in the overthrow of the city. But who or what is the power that wages the fatal persecution against these witnesses? In v. 7 we are informed: "And when they shall have finished their testimony, the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them." Now this beast is obviously the same with that described in chap. xiii. and xvii., which rises out of the sea, and exercises his persecuting power during the same period of three and a half years, or forty-two months. "Who this beast was," you say, "we cannot, after the explanations given in Rev. xvii., well doubt. The persecuting power of imperial pagan Rome, and specially that power as exercised by NERO, is, beyond all reasonable question, symbolized by the beast described." This position is repeated over and over in your pages, so that there is no possibility of mistaking your view of the meaning of the seven-headed monster that rose out of the sea. Yet, strange to say, in speaking of the slaughter of the witnesses, this formidable beast is suddenly metamorphosed, by a process nowhere described in Ovid, into "the great body of the Jews"! "Against these witnesses or martyrs, the great body of the Jews are represented as arraying themselves (Rev. 11: 3-12), and as persecuting them unto death." That you have some way of solving the problem of this apparently huge inconsistency I suppose it would not

be fair to doubt, but I must own that it baffles the utmost stretch of my ingenuity to conceive what it is.

"The sum of Rev. xi.," you remark, "is, that the Romans would invade and tread down Palestine for three and a half years, and that the Christians during that period would be bitterly persecuted and slain; but still, that after the same period the persecution would cease, and the religion of Jesus become triumphant." Now, to say nothing about the utter and absolute impossibility of applying the symbols of this chapter to the destruction of Jerusalem, allow me to advert to the fact, that the sixth trumpet, which brings on the second woe, is said to sound in immediate connexion with the close of the events here predicted. It is then added (chap. 11: 14, 15), "The second woe is past; and behold the third woe cometh quickly. And the seventh angel sounded; and there were great voices in heaven, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever." Here it appears that the sound of the seventh trumpet is to ensue *quickly* after that of the sixth, and is to result in rendering the kingdoms of this world the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ. But according to you the sixth trumpet was sounded at the destruction of Jerusalem, and as there is no very satisfactory evidence that the kingdoms of this world have even yet become the kingdoms of our Lord, in the sense intended in the oracle, it does not strike me as altogether easy to see how the seventh trumpet was to sound *quickly* after the sixth, when nearly eighteen hundred years have elapsed since the former event took place. If your projected work on the Apocalypse shall haply afford a little aid towards extricating its precursive brother from some of these awkward dilemmas, it will certainly be acting a very fraternal part.

The general train of your exposition of the prophetical parts of Daniel would afford ample matter of comment, even if I were to confine myself to the narrow range of historical details within which you restrict its scope. But from this labor I am excused, by the fundamental ground which I assume in regard to its entire structure and object, as the work of the prompting Spirit of God. Denying *in toto*, as I do, and disproving, as I think I have done, the truth of your theory in regard to the literal import of *day*, I can of course see no evidence, and therefore feel no interest, in your reasonings respecting the events which you consider as the fulfilment of these splendid visions. If a *day* stands for a *year*, and a *beast* represents an *empire*, then we are imperatively remanded to a far different order of occurrences in which to read the realization of the mystic scenery, from that which you have indicated. As the Spirit of prophecy has under his illimitable ken the most distant future as well as the nearest present, I know nothing in reason or exegesis

that should prevent the affairs of the Christian economy being represented by Daniel as well as, by John. As the fourth beast of Daniel lives and acts through the space of 1260 years, and as the seven-headed and ten-horned beast of John prevails through the same period, and puts forth substantially the same demonstrations, I am driven to the conclusion that they adumbrate precisely the same thing—that they are merely different aspects of the self-same reality—and this I have no question is *the Roman empire*. This you deny; but I submit, that the denial can be sustained only by showing an adequate reason why the Spirit of God should be debarred from giving such extension to the visions of the Old Testament prophets. Until this demand is satisfied, no progress can be made towards convincing the general mind of Christendom of the soundness of your expositions. The students of revelation will still reiterate the query, *why* the oracles of Daniel should be so exclusively occupied with the historical fates of Antiochus Epiphanes? *Why* should the book be so framed as to *localize* and *temporize* its interest to one transient era of the church? *Why* should it be deemed unworthy the inditing Spirit to stretch the range of his developments over the course of centuries down to the denouement of earthly kingdoms? If this is done in the Apocalypse, why may it not be done in Daniel? These are interrogatories to which you have condescended to give no reply, yet, allow me to say, they *must* be answered before your interpretation will be received, except by those who are smitten by the charms of a rampant German neology, and think it sacrilege to question its dicta. If I do not err in the auguries of the times, a struggle is yet to ensue on the prophetic field between two conflicting parties, on whose banners shall be respectively inscribed, *Antiochus* and *Antichrist*.

After what I have now said, you will not be surprised at the remark, that if there is any part of your work which “moves my special wonder,” it is that which gives so much prominence to Nero as an actor on the Apocalyptic stage. He, upon your theory, is virtually the seven-headed beast that rises out of the sea. I am aware indeed of your subtle and incomprehensible, as well as gratuitous, distinction between the beast as a symbol of the empire, in its pagan state, and the beast as a symbol of Nero individually viewed. But on either theory, I regard the position as untenable and extravagant in the highest degree. The whole fabric falls to the ground at once, the moment your argument respecting the import of the term *day* in the prophecy is seen to be unsound. The inevitable result of establishing the common as the true interpretation on that head is, that the beast of John, as he lives and acts through a period of twelve hundred and sixty years, *must* be the Roman empire, and that not so much in its Pagan, as in its Christian phasis. Consequently, as in zoological verity the life of a beast is concentrated

in its head, the deadly wound in one of his *successive* heads, is the temporary slaying and extinction of the whole beast, and the healing of his deadly wound is the revival of his symbolical life, which I have endeavored to show in my exposition of Dan. vii., was effected in the renovation of the defunct empire under Charlemagne, set forth in the vision under the emblem of the animation of the image of the beast. A lifeless corpse is the image of a man. The animation of a corpse is therefore the animation of an image, and nothing strikes me as more wonderful than the exact correspondence of the historical facts, as related by Gibbon, with the pictured scenery of the Apocalypse. The ten horns, in like manner, are the symbols of the ten sovereignties, from which the ten leading kingdoms of modern Europe have sprung. The prophetic destiny of these powers brings us down to our own times, and thus extends the scope of the prediction, in a connected chain, over the *whole* period from the ascension of Christ down to the grand consummation of all earthly dominion, announced by the seventh or jubilee trump of the angel. This is a view of the purport of prophecy worthy of its divine Author. Is not the whole future naked and open to the Omniscient eye? And are not the later fortunes of the Christian church as deserving of prophetic notice as the earlier? Why this studied attempt to limit the Holy One of Israel? What possible reason can be assigned for restricting the import of his predictions to the range of a few years, and to the petty persons of Antiochus and Nero? What special claims have they to figure so largely on the arena of the predicted history of the world? And who but a German neologist, wedded to the wildest vagaries, would ever suppose that a silly rumor about Nero's resuscitation would be wrought, by the Spirit of God, into the texture of a grand system of prophecy, detailing the history, not of individuals, but of empires? I cannot repress a burst of astonishment, that any sane commentator should ever bring himself to regard, with one moment's complacency, a view of the divine oracles so demeaning and derogatory. Yet, after wasting pages in the attempt to show that the words of the prophet respecting the beast "that was, and is not, and yet shall be," were fulfilled in some old wives' fables respecting Nero's coming to life after being slain, you sum up the whole as follows: "Enough to show the probability, I might almost say, certainty, that Nero is aimed at in this part of the Apocalypse. This supposed, all the difficulties of the writer's language appear to be solved, and every thing moves on harmoniously." And as if this were *not* enough, you say, moreover, "So paradoxical are all other interpretations of this passage, or so arbitrary, so conjectural, so diverse, and therefore unsatisfactory, that one is constrained to wonder how critics could ever have acquiesced in them. But in the interpretation of any book, where the reins are given without check

to fancy and imagination, difficulties of this kind are leaped over, instead of being removed." If the above is a specimen of your mode of 'removing' such difficulties, I should certainly say they had much better be 'leaped over,' at whatever risk of life or limb.

The fact that this *outré* conceit of a *Nero-redivivus* is adopted in all its length and breadth by Neander, and, for aught I know, by a host of his rationalizing *confreres*, avails not to conciliate for it a particle of favorable regard. With all due deference to the critical and philological talent, and the historical lore, of these German oracles, I should never think of making a pilgrimage to their shrines, if I wished to pay my devoirs to the great spirits of prophetic illumination. They are not, in my estimation, the selected scribes to write what the voices of the seven Apocalyptic thunders utter. I will thank them for their Lexicons, Grammars, Scholia, Diatribes, &c., but I would fain be delivered from their expositions of the inner sense of prophecy. It is at quite another 'Abel' that I should 'inquire' for light upon the mysteries of Daniel and John. Although I have accumulated a mass of their commentaries in my apparatus for explaining these prophets, yet I have not met with a single instance, where it has seemed to me that the writer had the least idea of the true genius of the inspired visionings of the seers of the Old or New Testament. They seem to have no conception of prophecy as a great system embracing the fortunes of the church through all periods of time. Nor do I think it very difficult to account for this. To the mass of the theological mind of Germany the doctrine of miracles is not very palatable. Without positively denying them, there is still a perpetual effort to lower them down to the sphere of naturalism, and to bring them within the range of philosophic laws. But the prescience of future events is the greatest of all miracles; and as they generally adopt your theory (or you theirs) that the prophets have announced no more than they *understood*, it was of course to be expected that they should make their reach of prophetic vision comparatively limited. Who can conceive that their minds should be so highly illuminated that they should intelligently take in the whole extent of the future in its grand outlines, as it respected the destinies of the Christian and the anti-Christian kingdoms? This is a point which they virtually deny in the outset, and starting from this, the *πρωτον ψευδος* of their theories, the result is just what might have been anticipated. Enlightened men might see a *little way* into futurity, and predict the career of Antiochus and Nero for about *three years and a half*, but what greater absurdity than to suppose that they should know any thing about the predominance of the Romish apostacy, or the Mohammedan delusion, covering the broad tract of twelve centuries! This is undoubtedly the true source of their error; and happy should I be to believe it was not the foundation of yours also. It is

a system of interpretation which in effect goes upon the principle of excluding the divine omniscience from the revelations of his word. Such is the poisonous fruit that grows upon the tree which you seem to be watering and pruning with so much sedulous care! Start once from the position, that the prophets have uttered no more than came within the scope of their own personal knowledge and intentions, and the ultimatum of issue is as clear as noonday.

I should feel, however, that injustice were done to my real sentiments were this language to be construed as any thing more than the free expression of an *opinion*, such as any one is at liberty to form and avow from such data as comes before him. It is not to be charged upon an utterance of this nature, that the author of it sets himself up as an infallible expounder of revelation. I assume simply to form my judgment from evidence, and to express it frankly and honestly. I shall always hope to pay due respect to the *reasons* which induce any man to come to different conclusions from mine on this or any other subject.

But in the present case, what shall we think of a class of interpretations, of which you speak of the following as "the most ingenious:"—

"If the reader is satisfied, with me, that John might describe Nero in this way, it will be easy to show him how well the description comports with the substance of the common rumor. According to this, Nero was to be assassinated, and to receive a wound apparently deadly, and yet to recover from it. So says Rev. 13: 3, "One of the heads, [i. e. Nero] was smitten as it were unto death, and yet his deadly wound was healed." What can be more exact? To detail the widely diverse, contradictory, and ineffectual efforts that have been made to explain and apply this in a different way, would occupy too much time here, and therefore be incompatible with my design. The most ingenious among them is that of Bertholdt, who supposes Julius Cesar (who was assassinated) to have been the head that received the wound. But a conclusive objection to this is, that not only was his wound not healed, but there was not any report abroad that it was healed. Another conclusive objection is, that the head which was wounded is described, in the sequel, as persecuting Christianity. This could not be true of Julius Cesar, who perished half a century before the Christian era."

Here is, indeed, a specimen of 'ingenuity,' as you are pleased to term it, which I should as soon think of confuting as if the writer had found the wounded head in the Lernean hydra slain by Hercules, or in the dragon killed by St. George. The Apocalypse has, I opine, as little relation to the assassination of Julius Cesar as it has to that of the bleeding to death of the philosopher Seneca, and as little to Nero in person as to either. There are some theories so extravagant, that one might about as safely adopt them, as to think of seriously refuting them. Whether the one before us belongs to this class, I shall leave it to the good sense of Christian people to

judge. I have an opinion of my own, which the reader may infer, if he pleases ; and the grand position—as impregnable in my view as the rock of Gibraltar—that the beast of John is the Roman empire indissolubly united with the Roman church, and subsisting even down to the present day, will aid him very essentially in drawing his conclusion.

But I must close. Your work contains, indeed, abundant matter for additional comment, but my limits forbid the farther extension of my remarks. I have endeavored, in the spirit of fair and candid criticism, to canvass your several positions on a subject of paramount importance in the field of biblical investigation. It will have been seen that upon each of the three grand points which you have labored to establish, I come to conclusions diametrically opposite to yours. Of your arguments on each of these heads, viz., the doctrine of Double Sense—the Intelligibility of Prophecy—and the Prophetic Designations of Time, I have spoken plainly, and perhaps on some occasions severely. But for this I find a warrant in the magnitude and sacredness of the interests involved. If your principles of interpretation are wrong, they must inevitably lead to disastrous results ; and the more disastrous from the high authority by which they are promulgated, and the wide field over which they are likely to extend. The subjects treated are those of common concern to all lovers of the Bible, and entering as they do into the central and vital themes of revelation, I know no good reason why your conclusions should be exempted from the most rigid scrutiny of those who may be constrained to dissent from them. The Christian public have by no means forgotten the essential service you were prompted to perform for the cause of truth, when, some fifteen or twenty years since, you addressed a series of letters to Dr. Channing, in defence of what you deemed some of the cardinal doctrines of the Christian faith. I have ventured to do towards yourself what you did towards him. I have presumed to call in question certain positions assumed in your writings, as you did the views propounded in his. I have not indeed the advantage of such high consideration in the religious world, to give effect to my feeble pleadings, and to shield my freedom from the charge of undue assumption. But I have adventured to “show mine opinion,” and I am not aware that the circumstance of my humble repute in the walks of biblical science ought to avail to make a measure wrong in my case that was right in yours. At any rate, I see no reason to doubt that my reasonings, such as they are, will be duly appreciated by the Christian community. If they possess any intrinsic weight in opposition to your uttered sentiments, it will be eventually acknowledged, and a righteous verdict brought in. If I know my own heart, I desire nothing more ; and if you can regard me as a fair and honorable-minded opponent, actuated throughout by

sincere convictions and a conscientious concern for truth, I do not see why there should be any abatement of that personal friendship and courtesy which I shall ever be happy to reciprocate.

With sentiments of fraternal esteem and deep respect,

I remain, yours, &c.,

GEORGE BUSH.

“THE THRONE OF DAVID.”

By those who have followed the train of our exposition of the seventh of Daniel, it will have been seen that we have dwelt largely on the position, that the kingdom of the Son of man, instead of being properly a future expectancy, did in fact commence ages ago, at his ascension in the clouds of heaven to the Father's right hand. Although there is indeed abundant evidence that his kingly power is yet to be more illustriously demonstrated, and more universally acknowledged, in the ages of coming time, when the kingdoms of this world shall recognize in him their predestined and lawful Sovereign, yet that his actual investiture with the regal dignity has long since taken place, we are fully persuaded. The providential delay in assuming to the full extent his promised dominion, does not militate with the fact of his having received, at his ascension, the plenary title to it. The case is strikingly illustrated by that of his lineal and typical predecessor, David. He, as we learn from the inspired history, was anointed by Samuel several years before he actually entered upon the exercise of his royal authority. The jealous hostility of Saul availed to banish him for a long season from public view, and compelled him to wander in the wilderness as a roe that would escape the hands of the hunter. It was only by pressing onwards through a formidable array of obstacles and enemies, that he found a way to his own throne, and made good the divine designation which had chosen him from the sheepfolds to rule over Israel. In like manner, although the Saviour was anointed King of Zion at his exaltation from the grave, and the second Psalm recites the decree of recognition, on the part of Jehovah himself, of his title to this august character, yet the course of Providence, for wise reasons, has been such as to prevent, as in the case of David, his more open, visible, and acknowledged supremacy being thus far entered upon. Still, it cannot be doubted that every thing is in the meantime *tending*, in the councils of God, to the ultimate assertion of that paramount dignity and dominion, which is secured to him by the unerring word of prophecy, and it would

be a very erroneous reading of the oracles of Scripture that should fail to recognize him as *even now* really sustaining all the characters which the Old Testament prophets announce in respect to him. Thus it was clearly predicted that he should be a Son and successor of David, and *should sit upon his throne*. This prediction announces a form of the Saviour's empire, which we are prone to regard as yet future. We image to ourselves in a vague and indefinite manner, some future phasis of the mediatorial kingdom, particularly in connexion with the conversion of the Jews, when he shall be distinctly manifested and confessed as the *successor of David* in some manner entirely different from any thing that has been hitherto predicable of his sovereignty. We find it difficult to conceive of him as at present sustaining that character, just as the tribes of Israel might be supposed to have found it difficult to look upon David as really their king, while he was fleeing from the pursuit of Saul over the mountains of Judea. But it is the great character of prophecy to resolve itself more and more into a shadowed and symbolical portraiture of the actual *accomplished* events of Providence which are to be read in the page of history. So, in the present case, the predicted character of Christ as the inheritor of the throne of his father David, is fully established in the realized facts of Providence; and the following extract from Edwards's "History of Redemption," presents a view of it which will be seen to be of immense importance in this relation :

"Christ was legally descended from the kings of Judah, though he was not naturally descended from them. He was both legally and naturally descended from David. He was naturally descended from Nathan, the son of David; for Mary, his mother, was of the posterity of David by Nathan, as may be seen in Luke's genealogy; but Joseph, the reputed and legal father of Christ, was naturally descended from Solomon and his successors, as we have an account in Matthew's genealogy. Jesus Christ, though he was not the natural son of Joseph, yet, by the law and constitution of the Jews, he was Joseph's lawful heir; he was the lawful son of Joseph's lawful wife; conceived while she was his espoused wife. The Holy Ghost raised up seed to him. A person, by the law of Moses, might be the legal son and heir of another whose natural son he was not; as sometimes a man raised up seed to his brother; a brother in some cases was to build up a brother's house; so the Holy Ghost built up Joseph's house. And Joseph being in the direct line of the kings of Judah, the house of David, he was the legal heir to the crown of David; and Christ being legally his first-born son, he was his heir; and so Christ, by the law, was the proper heir of the crown of David, and is therefore said to sit upon the throne of David."

It is undoubtedly very common, on reading or hearing the following passage, Ezek. 21: 17, "I will overturn, overturn, overturn, till *he shall come whose right it is*," to understand its accomplishment as in every respect yet future; but the words of Peter, Acts 2: 30, interpreted on the ground above assumed, show it as having

entered upon a course of fulfilment; "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing of a truth that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, *he would raise up Christ to sit upon his throne*; He seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear." What then should prevent us from understanding as *literally accomplished* the words of Gabriel, in announcing the birth of the Saviour to Mary, Luke 1: 30—33, "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called [because he shall be] the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him *the throne of his father David*; and he shall reign over the house of David forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end"? We admit of course that his regal dominion is *in the process of universal establishment*—that it will be eventually far more visibly and signally *manifested* than it ever yet has been; still we cannot resist the evidence that it has been long since commenced in such a manner as to satisfy the very letter of the predictions. It may indeed be affirmed that the prophetic oracles warrant the expectation that this kingdom shall be visibly established on earth, and that Jesus Christ shall be as truly recognized as the occupant of David's throne, and that too among the Jewish race, as was David himself in the days of his life. Granted; but still, we ask what is there to forbid the idea that that kingdom has already *commenced*, and that the Messiah's headship over it is in a continued process of development, which will ultimately reach a consummation that shall perfectly realize the highest import of the language applied to it? Is the fact of his being the *spiritual* king of Zion necessarily inconsistent with the fact of his being at the same time her *literal* king? It was clearly predicted that he should "*sit a priest upon his throne*," or that the *regal* and *sacerdotal* character should be combined in him. But his *priesthood* is not the less real because it is not visibly exercised at an earthly altar, and in connexion with an earthly temple. And so, although his *throne* is not now an object of the senses on the material earth, yet we see not why the royal succession of the line of David is not continued in Him, who is ascended on high, and has been crowned "Lord of all to the glory of God the Father."

The suggestions now offered are intended to bear upon the mode of interpretation adopted by many excellent men, both in this country and in England, and on the ground of which they are led to look for a future *personal* manifestation of Christ in his kingly char-

acter and on this terrestrial theatre. Though fully aware of the force of the argument, as drawn from the *letter* of Scripture, yet we cannot assure ourselves that this is the true-meant sense, because we cannot feel sure of being in possession of those laws of spiritual and physical being upon which such a manifestation must necessarily depend. We are not satisfied that the raised, spiritualized, and glorified bodies of Christ, or the saints, *can* be seen by mortal eyes; nor, if they could, are we convinced that this mode of manifestation would address itself any more effectually to the intellectual principles of our nature than they do when seen by a purely spiritual vision. Take the case of a single church visited by a powerful revival of religion; does not the presence of Christ as really, yea and as visibly, manifest itself as if he were *personally* present in *bodily form*? Suppose such an influence vastly extended, so as to embrace in fact the whole world; would there not then be such a *real* and *visible* demonstration of the divine presence, power, and working, as would answer all the demands of prophecy relative to what is often termed the *personal reign* of Christ during the millennial age?

We throw out these queries suggestively. For ourselves, we have a latent persuasion that the true sense of many of the prophecies, relative to the grand futurities of the church and the world, cannot be determined without a fuller knowledge than we at present possess, respecting the psychical conditions of our being, and the laws that regulate the relations of matter and spirit. Who shall define for us the precise line of demarcation, where the sight of the body ends, and that of the spirit begins? It is to us by no means clear, that the church at large is not to be elevated into a state of spiritual perception very much akin to that of the prophets themselves, before they can properly be said to *see* what the prophets have described. If these suggestions are well founded, it follows, that study of the *subjective* as well as that of the *objective* enters of necessity into the sphere of prophetic elucidation. B.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

SACRED HERMENEUTICS DEVELOPED AND APPLIED; *including a History of Biblical Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the Reformation.* By Samuel Davidson, L. L. D., Author of Lectures on Biblical Criticism. Edinburgh: 1843. 8vo. pp. 747.

THE former work of Dr. Davidson, entitled "Lectures on Biblical Criticism," gave abundant promise of still riper and richer fruits from his pen in the field of Hermeneutics, in which he had already achieved a distinguished reputation. This promise is largely realized in the present

volume. It affords a cheering evidence that biblical science will not be always obliged to resort to Germany for what is valuable in the Germans. The author enters the wide realm of Hermeneutics as one that is at home, and has furnished by far the most elaborate and complete treatise on the subject that is to be found in the English language. Without detracting at all from the merits of his German predecessors in this department, he shows himself entirely aloof from an implicit deference to their authority, or a plastic conformity to their models. Though evidently familiar with all their various schools, and prepared fully to appreciate the valuable points of their systems, he still sits in the seat of judgment, sternly determined to admit their principles no further than they accord with the dictates of sound reason and the analogy of faith. This unfortunately has not always been the case with those who have opened to themselves an access to the stores of philology, criticism, and exegesis, accumulated by the biblical literati of Halle, Goettingen, Berlin, Stuttgart, and Bonn. It would seem as if the sudden revelation of the hitherto unknown treasures of Scripture commentary in that quarter had for a time bewildered the good sense, which could alone turn them to account, and all but paralyzed the sober independence of thought, that had before distinguished their discoverers. A certain seductive charm in the refined and specious rationalism of Rosenmueller, Eichhorn, Gesenius, et omne genus id, would appear to have laid asleep the vigilance of an orthodox faith, and merged every thing in a sort of blind *Germanolatry*, from which the truth has not a little to fear. From influences of this nature Mr. Davidson is eminently free, and the conservative tone which runs through his work involves every assurance that the republic of biblical letters will receive no detriment from a source which might otherwise be prolific of error and evil.

Our limits will scarcely allow even an analysis of the rich and varied contents of his volume. He commences with a brief but pertinent enumeration of the qualifications, moral, intellectual, and literary, demanded in an interpreter. His second chapter is devoted to the consideration of the *Use of Reason in the Exposition of Scripture*, in which he insists, at considerable length, that the Bible is to be explained on the same principles as other books. Aware, however, that this canon may be interpreted in such a way as to reduce the Bible to the level of mere human productions, he has appended to it a very important chapter on the *Limitations* with which these principles are to be understood. And here we meet with a series of remarks so strikingly confirmatory of the general views which we have advanced in our preceding Letters to Professor Stuart, that we cannot refrain from presenting our readers with the following extract:

"We have said that the Bible is to be explained on the same principles as other books. To this remark there are some exceptions. There is a peculiarity belonging to most of the prophetic parts which should be taken into account. It arises from the manner in which occurrences were presented to the internal view of the prophets. They saw things *together*; not in a regular succession of smaller pictures, but delineated in one

group. Hence the use of the present tense, even when they speak of remote objects. Individuals stand before them, to whom they point *as present*. So in Isaiah, 'For unto us a child *is born*, unto us a son *is given*' (chap. ix. 6); and again, 'Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed, to Cyrus, whom I hold by the right hand, to subdue nations before him; and ungird the loins of kings, to open before him the folding doors; and the gates shall not be shut' (xlv. 1). Distinctions of time were thus annihilated to the prophets. They viewed not in time but in space, and so painted *in perspective*, as Olshausen aptly denominates it. They exhibit neither the remoteness of the objects they behold, nor the intervals of time between them. On the contrary, events are adduced just as they are seen, in juxtaposition, or continuous succession, as though they all pertained to the same period." p. 47.

"This peculiarity of prophetic vision and description, demands a corresponding peculiarity of exegesis. When events are *laid upon one another*, or blended together in narration, the words in which they are described have a twofold reference. A single application does not include *all* that was designed; they look towards two persons or objects. When thus commingled, they must be considered as symbolical and antitypical. They are blended in the picture presented to the prophetic view, just because it was divinely purposed that the one should adumbrate the other. There is, therefore, a natural and necessary connexion between them, not merely as they are related in the internal view of the prophets, but as antecedent and consequent mutually adapted by divine arrangement, they flow together, because much that was predicated of the one, may be also predicated of the other. As the series of prophecy advanced, the events, painted on the prophetic canvass, in perspective, or in commingling colors, were gradually distinguished and separated. Light was thrown upon them by the unfolding of the divine purposes; and those who once failed to perceive the intervals of time between, began to see widening vistas. The coming of Christ in glory might have been regarded as almost coincident with his appearance in humiliation, until He was born of a woman. The one phenomenon is portrayed in the Old Testament as closely connected in time with the other; but in the Gospels they are separated. Again, the destruction of Jerusalem and the general judgment appear coexistent in the Gospels; but in the book of Revelation they stand apart. Thus, as prophecy advanced, and the events of the Redeemer's church were accomplished, the predictions of seers assumed a clearer form; and the readers of these inspired effusions were able to avoid the chronological mistakes into which their predecessors fell." pp. 50, 51.

From this he proceeds to a very extended survey of the *History of Biblical Interpretation*, commencing with the Patristic and following it down through the *Hierarchical* period to the times of the Reformation, and thence to our own days, exhibiting, in strong relief, the various schools and systems which have since prevailed—the Moral or Kantian, the Psychological-historical, the Accommodation system, the Mythic, the Rationalistic, the Pietist. Under all these heads, an immense amount of information is embodied, and presented in a lucid and interesting form. He then proceeds to lay down and exemplify what he deems the genuine principles of a sound interpretation of the Scriptures, which he contends must rest upon the *grammatico-historical sense*. In this the great object to be ascertained, is the *usus loquendi*, for the settling of which he adduces an

ample array of rules and canons, illustrated by a large induction of apposite examples. This chapter would form a very important treatise if published by itself.

The principles of interpretation are next applied to Figurative Language, in which Allegory, Parable, Fable, and Enigma, come especially to be considered. In this, as in every other part of the work, the author studiously avoids the tedium of dry didactics, by the citation and elucidation of a multitude of texts in the Old and New Testament, in their appropriate relations, which the reader is conscious of never having seen before presented in such striking lights.

After some remarks on the *Use of Historical Circumstances in Interpretation*, we come to the two most copious chapters in the book, the first on the *Quotations from the Old Testament in the New*, and the second on the *Alleged Contradictions of Scripture*. These subjects are treated with a minuteness of detail, and an accuracy of judgment, which leave scarcely any thing to be desired. Indeed, we might almost say, that the subject is exhausted under the writer's elaborate scrutiny, which nothing seems to have escaped. A full table is given of all the citations, accompanied by the original Hebrew, the Septuagint Version, and the authorized English Translation, with Critical Notes on each. The various modes and formulas of quotation are considered, the supposed instances of *accommodation* expounded, and the connexion of the subject with verbal inspiration particularly discussed. Did our space allow, we should be happy to present the reader with the general results of the investigation in this department, which is assuredly one of the most important and difficult in the whole circle of biblical science; but we must content ourselves with performing the office rather of an index to the work than of setting forth specimens.

The remaining four chapters are occupied with the *Ancient Versions, Commentaries, and Lexicons, as sources of Interpretation—the Cognate Languages of the Scriptures, viz., the Arabic, Syriac, and Chaldee*, viewed in the same relation—the *Use of General Information in the Interpretation of Scripture*—and a *Bibliographical Account of Hermeneutical Writers from the Reformation to the Present Time*. We are on the whole disposed to regret that the portion of the work which treats of the Ancient Versions and the Cognate Languages, did not come under the author's hand in an earlier part of the volume, as he would have been able to do them more justice in their relations to the general subject. As it is, he was evidently cramped in his discussion, and an air of meagerness marks this department, which the intelligent reader cannot but greatly regret. If our suggestion might be heeded, we would recommend, that in another edition a pretty large curtailment should be made from the chapters on the *History of Hermeneutics*, which will well bear a breaking of bulk, and the space thus secured be devoted to an enlargement of the portions above-mentioned, the claims of which are certainly paramount. The chapter of Bibliographical notices is exceedingly valuable, and the fruit

of immense reading. We know of nothing to be compared to it as a guide to the student of Hermeneutics, and could desire nothing more than that it could be made accessible as a separate publication, as we fear there is too little reason to hope for the reprint of the whole volume in this country.

It gives us pleasure thus to have borne our testimony to the high merits of a work which is certainly adapted to do more than any other in the language to elevate sacred Hermeneutics to the rank of a science, a place to which its own intrinsic importance and the character of its evidences justly entitle it. In a direct ratio to the importance of a divine Revelation itself, is that of a sound code of canons by which its true construction is to be ascertained; and he who does aught towards settling, on a firm basis, the hitherto loose and indeterminate principles of Scriptural exegesis, has performed a work for which all coming generations can well afford to be grateful.

B.

Harpers' Illuminated and New Pictorial Bible. No. I.

WE have here a splendid triumph of the arts in their application to the Book of books. The work is to be embellished with sixteen hundred historical Engravings, of which fourteen hundred are from original designs. Exquisite in every respect is the specimen now before us. Paper, typography, plate—every thing appears in a style which comes as near as possible to the perfection of art. And upon what can it better be expended than in rendering attractive the priceless volume of Revelation!

B.

The Scripture Doctrine of Christian Perfection stated and defended: with a critical and historical Examination of the Controversy, both ancient and modern. By Rev. George Peck, D. D. New York: Lane and Sanford, 1843. 12mo. pp. 474.

THE reader will find an elaborate discussion of the doctrine of *Perfection* in these pages, and conclusions stated which can only be overthrown by denying the soundness of the exegetical principles on which they are built. That these principles may not be denied or questioned, we do not assert; but an opponent will find that he must first demolish the critic, before he can reach the theologian.

B.

Christian Baptism, in Two Parts. By Rev. F. G. Hibbard. New York: Lane and Sanford. 1848. 12mo. pp. 218.

THE argument in favor of Pædobaptism is presented in this volume with great strength. The author shows himself master of the whole ground, and his incessant appeals to the original languages of Scripture, evince that he understands how important is philology in settling dogmatic disputes. We hail as an omen for good, every indication of the reference of all contested points in theology to the tribunal of the Hebrew and Greek, fairly and legitimately interpreted.

B.

Xenophon's Anabasis, with Notes for the use of Schools and Colleges.
By John J. Owen, Principal of the Cornelius Institute. New York:
Leavitt & Trow. 12mo. pp. 368.

FROM a partial examination of this work, we have no hesitation in adding our testimony to that of much higher authority to its great value to the classical student. The text is beautifully printed, and the notes evince the diligence and acumen of the finished scholar. The plan of grammatical reference is such as to give the reader all requisite aid, without at the same time superseding his own labor. This is the grand secret of rendering critical and explanatory scholia useful. B.

Fiske's Manual of Classical Literature. 4th edit. Edward C. Biddle: Philadelphia.

WE are surprised at the immense amount of valuable matter embodied in this volume. It would be difficult to name any subject which requires elucidation from the stores of antiquity, that is not ably treated in the pages of this elaborate compilation; and to those who wish to pursue more extended researches, the proper authorities are copiously indicated: We look back with a mournful regret to our classic days, to think we should have been deprived of the advantage of such an auxiliary as is here furnished to our children. We should about as soon think of a scholar's dispensing with the use of the Lexicon in studying the Greek and Roman authors, as with this invaluable "Manual." B.

VALEDICTORY.

TO SUBSCRIBERS AND READERS—With the present number of the Hierophant, closing the volume, I am reluctantly compelled to terminate the work. In making this announcement, however, I am happy to say that the measure is not dictated by any anticipated want of patronage—provided the requisite agencies were employed—but wholly by the pressure of other engagements and various circumstances of a personal nature, which render it impossible for me to devote that attention to it which is indispensable to make it all I could wish. Though entered upon as a purely private undertaking, in which I have had no assistance from any quarter, with the exception of two short letters, it has yet received a measure of support, which, without affording any considerable income, has still involved no pecuniary loss. For this fact, and for the warm interest which has been evinced in the publication by many whose good opinion I highly value, I beg leave to express my unfeigned gratitude. So far as I have been able to learn, the work has been conducted to the general satisfaction of my readers; at least I consider myself fortunate in having heard no complaints from any quarter. That the principles, positions, and views, advanced in the successive numbers, should have met with a ready assent from all who have perused them, it would be presumptuous to suppose. Yet I have reason to believe that they have, for the most part, commended themselves to the approval of reflecting

minds, and that my humble enterprise has performed some essential service to the cause of sound biblical interpretation. To have succeeded thus far in a department where the negative merit of avoiding extravagance is itself a high attainment, is perhaps no improper ground of self-felicitation. I am indeed aware of having drawn largely upon the lenity of my subscribers, by the prolonged intervals and the frequent irregularities that have occurred in the issue of the successive numbers. But I can only say, that the interruptions were absolutely unavoidable, and that if a decorous reserve did not forbid the statement of the causes to which they have been owing, I should stand at once excused in the estimation of the candid. As it is, however, I have been enabled, though somewhat tardily, to perform my engagements with my subscribers, and "in this I do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." I should have been sorely tried in spirit, had my enterprise fallen through before the completion of the volume, for which I had, for the most part, received subscriptions in advance.

The principal source of regret which I feel in bringing my labors to a close, is in the fact that it compels me to cut short, in the midst, the course of my begun expositions on a very interesting portion of Daniel. This, in my own view, would have constituted, in the end, the principal value and the main attraction of my work. The materials are ample for a rich vein of prophetic development, and I am sorry to leave them before they are wrought into the systematic form which I had contemplated. But I cherish the hope of continuing, at a future day, the commentary on the chronological prophet, and of presenting it to the world through another medium.

From the peculiar character of the general subject-matter of my pages it is not perhaps too much to anticipate that it will be regarded as of more permanent interest than that which usually forms the staple of our religious periodical literature. As my numbers contain scarcely any thing which derives its interest from local or ephemeral sources, or which would prevent its being read with as much relish hereafter as at the time of its publication, it is not improbable that something of a demand for the work may be kept up after its regular issue has ceased. The indications to this effect already witnessed, have determined me to reprint some of the exhausted numbers of the early part of the series, which will enable the publisher to keep the work for some time on hand in handsomely bound volumes, for the accommodation of those who may desire to procure it.

It only remains for me to bid an editorial adieu to my friends and favorers who have kept me company from the commencement to the close of my *hierophantic* sojourn, through some of the interesting and imposing regions of Revelation. If, according to the pledge of my assumed function, they have found any *mysteries explained*, any symbols elucidated, any momentous truths defended, any fundamental principles settled, any valued light imparted, or, finally, any pious pleasure enhanced, I shall feel abundantly rewarded for that small part of my toil, in ministering to their gratification, which was not a positive delight.

GEORGE BUSH.

BUSH'S HEBREW GRAMMAR.

THIS work has been adopted as a Manual for the Hebrew Language in several of our Theological Seminaries, and the publisher has been assured by a distinguished professor in one of them, that although he always had Stewart, Nordheimer, and Gesenius before him in teaching, he yet considered Bush's as decidedly preferable to either for the *practical* purposes of the learner. For sale by M. H. Newman; price \$1 75.

The following are among the testimonials which have been given to its value :

"In this very elegant volume we have a second and much improved edition of Professor Bush's Hebrew Grammar, first published in 1835. Indeed, it appears from the preface, that the original work has been entirely recast, and that the present may be considered in all essential points a new and independent treatise. It now appears in the form of a handsome octavo, very nearly of the size of Professor Stuart's Hebrew Grammar, and of equally neat and attractive aspect on the score of type, paper, &c. Great pains have evidently been taken by the author to render the elementary part at once simple and scientific. The initiatory stages of the student's progress appear to be made easy, while at the same time all the needed solutions of the principal facts of the language are ably given. It is in every respect a volume of respectable and scholarly appearance, and we doubt not entitled to rank among the very best Hebrew manuals of the day."—*N. Y. Observer*.

"This is probably the most unexceptionable performance that has ever yet emanated from the pen of Professor Bush. It is decidedly a philosophical as well as elementary grammar. The driest portion of the study, viz., that of Hebrew punctuation, becomes even *interesting* under the contagious influence of his philological enthusiasm. His style is well calculated to lead the learner insensibly into the mysteries of the language, without being perplexed with its difficulties, or even feeling that there are any. If Professor Bush had never been heard of before, or been heard of to disadvantage, this work is alone sufficient to give him a permanent reputation. This book will not pass away like his Millennium, without being noticed by any body. He has created for himself an entirely new character."—*N. Y. Evangelist*.

"Compared with other Hebrew grammars, now in vogue, we have no question that this will take the lead as soon as it shall have attracted the attention of Hebrew teachers. One particular excellence by which it is distinguished, is its clear, well-ordered arrangement. In the first hundred pages it will bear an advantageous comparison with any grammar extant. The student will find in these pages a perspicuous exhibition of the philosophy of those principles of euphony which regulate the vowel and consonant changes, free from the intolerable *dryness* which forms a striking feature in several similar works. The student would risk nothing in the attempt to acquire the elements of the language without the aid of a teacher. The value of the part which treats of the verb is much enhanced by the very convenient tabular arrangement of the anomalous forms. In the nouns, Professor Bush has had the good sense to reject that monument of German trifling, the thirteen declensions. In his rules on syntax, he has embodied only those distinctive principles which belong to the Hebrew, thus sparing the reader the drudgery of going over again a set of rules with which he has become familiar in his English studies. On the whole, Professor B's Grammar may be considered excellent."—*Christ. Intelligencer*.

"This is a new and greatly improved edition of the work, just issued from the press. From a thorough examination of the work, competent judges rank it among the standard Hebrew manuals of the day. It is at once simple and scientific. While the author has throughout studied the wants of a mere tyro, he has also opened an ample field for those who wish to go beyond *facts to reasons*. We rejoice in the appearance of this Grammar as calculated to excite a new interest and impulse, as well as to afford new facilities to the study of this ancient and venerable language."—*Method. Magazine*.

BUSH'S NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

MARK H. NEWMAN keeps constantly on hand this valuable series of volumes, which have now amounted to six: two on Genesis—two on Exodus—one on Leviticus—and one on Joshua and Judges. Of the Notes on Genesis *seven* editions have already been published, and the *fifth* of Exodus will soon be put to press. The most decided testimonies of their value in Bible-class instruction are continually accumulating; and it is intended by the author to complete the remaining volumes on the Pentateuch and the historical books at the earliest possible opportunity. The field is at present unoccupied by any similar work, and the want of no other is felt by those who have made themselves acquainted with Prof. Bush's commentaries. Retail price, 75 cts. per vol.

BOUND VOLUMES OF THE HIEROPHANT.

It will be seen, from a notice in the foregoing pages, that by a reprint of some of the exhausted numbers of the Hierophant, the whole series can be obtained, to a limited extent, in a handsomely bound volume, which will be afforded at the original subscription price, \$ 1 50. As the work will probably never be reprinted entire, the opportunity of obtaining it cannot continue long, as it is but a small remnant of the edition that remains on hand. To be had of M. H. NEWMAN, 199 Broadway.