

THE  
**ECLECTIC REVIEW.**

MDCCCXXIX.

JANUARY—JUNE.

---

THIRD SERIES.

VOL. I.

---

Φιλοσοφίαν ἢ οὐ ἐν Σουικῇ λέγω, οἷόν ἐστι Πλατωνικὴν, ἢ ἐν 'Επι-  
κουρείῳ τι καὶ 'Αριστοτελικῷ· ἀλλ' ἕνα ἄραται παρ' ἑαυτῶν τῶν αἰσίων  
αὐτῶν καλῶς, διακρίσθαι μετὰ ἰσθιῶς ἰσωνίης ἐκδίδουσα, εἴθε  
σέσωται ἐν 'ΕΚΑΕ'ΚΤΙΚΟΝ φιλοσοφίας φῆμι.

CLEM. ALEX. Strom. L. 1.

---

LONDON:  
**HOLDSWORTH AND BALL,**  
18, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD.

1829.

Tyrrhenians of Asia and the Pelasgian Argos. But when the genealogists and Hellenists wrote, all that remained of this immense race were solitary, detached, widely scattered relics; such as those of the Celtic tribes in Spain; like mountain peaks towering as islands where floods have turned the lowlands into a sea. Like those Celts, they were conceived to be, not fragments of a great people, but settlements formed by colonization or emigration, after the manner of the Grecian, which lay equally scattered. (*Hare and Thirlwalk.*)

It is obvious, from this and other passages, that Mr. Niebuhr's theory of nations corresponds to M. Cuvier's system of the world. As the latter supposes that there have been successive revolutions, destroying and reproducing the due and habitable arrangement of the earth's materials; the former seems to believe in the existence of whole races of men, failing and leaving mere relics and fragments behind them;—flourishing for a while, and filling the whole scene with their numbers and their exploits; then driven off by some fearful catastrophe, scattered or exterminated, and leaving the stage vacant to some fresh congregation of human beings, fated to undergo the same irreversible doom, to meet the same vicissitudes, to exult and bustle for a season, and then to disappear. These are magnificent dreams; but they are nothing more. The aspect of the globe, the probabilities of things, tell a simpler and more rational tale. With Scripture, they tell us of the one great family of man, dispersed over the face of the earth, and modified by climate and by circumstances;—of the one great convulsion which has given to the just and beautiful adaptation of our world, the superficial semblance of confusion and disarray.

We may have occasion, at no distant period, to make use of the valuable geographical details with which Mr. Niebuhr has enriched his first volume.

Art. II. 1. *Objections to the Doctrine of Israel's Future Restoration to Palestine, National Pre-eminence, &c.* In Twelve Letters to a Friend. With an Appendix. 12mo. pp. 178. Price 3s. 6d. London, 1828.

2. *A Defence of the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Second Advent of Christ from the erroneous Representations of Modern Millenarians.* By William Hamilton, D.D., Minister of Strathblane. 12mo. pp. xvi, 332. Price 5s. London, 1828.

3. *A Defence of the Students of Prophecy, in Answer to the Attack of the Rev. Dr. Hamilton of Strathblane.* 8vo. pp. 128. Price 3s. London, 1828.

4. *A Summary View of the Scriptural Argument for the Second and Glorious Advent of the Messiah before the Millennium: specially addressed to the Ministers of Christ.* By William Cuninghame, Esq. of Lainshaw, County of Ayr. 8vo. pp. 28. Glasgow, 1828.

**A**LTHOUGH the doctrine of the Millenarians respecting the personal reign of our Lord at Jerusalem, is not inseparably connected with that of the national restoration of the Jews to Palestine, yet, the latter notion is the parent of the former; and it is the strong-hold of those who are looking for a political kingdom in which the Saints are to share the reign of Christ. The opinion that the Jews are to be restored to their ancient country, may be true and scriptural, while the notions built upon it respecting our Lord's personal reign may nevertheless be fallacious. The converse, however, will not hold good. If the expectations of the Jews are erroneous, the views of the Millenarians must be delusive. And this close connection between the two articles of the modern prophetic creed, forms, we must confess, in our judgement, a strong presumption against the correctness of that which is by far the more plausible and rational doctrine of the two. Such a presumption will have no force against positive Scriptural evidence. Indeed, all errors grow out of truths, and, like parasitical weeds, derive their support from that which they conceal and tend to destroy. But they have nothing in common in their nature; and it is therefore incumbent upon the advocate of truth to shew, that the error which has become blended with any true doctrine, has no real or original connexion with it.

Whether the doctrine of Israel's political restoration be true or false, every right-minded and pious man must regard as a very interesting inquiry, and one which is by no means determined. The language of Scripture upon this point, with whatever confidence it may be appealed to as favouring the doctrine, is by no means of self-evident import. Expositors of unquestionable learning and integrity have widely differed in their interpretation of the passages in question. And this diversity, involving as it does, not only a different view of the sense of particular texts, but of the proper rules for interpreting Scripture, gives additional importance to the original inquiry. Our being right or wrong in our conclusions respecting the destiny of the Jewish people, must be of far less consequence than our adopting an erroneous mode of ascertaining and applying the evidence deducible from the inspired oracles.

The anonymous Author of the first publication on our list, has, we therefore think, deserved well of the Christian public, by bringing distinctly before their view the objections which lie against the now popular doctrine; and his volume will claim an attentive perusal, whatever may be thought of the force of

his reasonings or the validity of his conclusions. In some of his positions, we must say at once, we can by no means agree with him. For instance, his *sixth* reason (we must be excused for disregarding the order) for rejecting the doctrine, is, that it is encumbered with difficulties which are obviated by a more simple interpretation. Now this is in itself a dangerous principle of interpretation, and, as applied by the Rationalists to the supposed doctrinal difficulties to be found in the New Testament, has led to all sorts of pernicious tampering with the sacred text. Nor does the Author's explanation render his reason at all satisfactory. "How can these things be?"—is no argument against the truth of a doctrine, unless the objector can shew that it involves a palpable impossibility or contradiction. But we must let the Writer speak for himself.

The difficulties with which the doctrine of a literal restoration is encumbered, are of three kinds. *First*, Arising from the magnitude of the events necessarily implied. *Secondly*, Arising from the ordinary course of things. *Thirdly*, Arising from the apparent contradiction to Scripture testimony which the doctrine involves.

*First*, the magnitude of the events necessarily implied. If the Jews are to be restored to Palestine, it must be by the operation of moral principles on themselves or on other nations; by the silent workings of Providence in their behalf; by the force of arms; or by the intervention of miraculous power: all events most stupendous, whether regarded singly, or in any supposable combination. Look at their condition scattered among the nations; it is highly improbable that their restoration will be effected by any of these means.' pp. 114, 115.

Now so far from improbable does their restoration appear, in itself considered,—so far does the magnitude of the event fall short of the adequacy of either of these supposed causes taken singly, much more if operating in combination,—that, to us, the matter for wonder seems to be, that their political restoration has not long ago become the record of history. Excluding from our minds the idea of an over-ruling Divine purpose, which can alone adequately account for all the facts in their history,—it does strike us as most extraordinary, that, amid all the revolutions of the East, this nation should never have produced a new Maccabæus to raise the standard of Jewish independence. During the decline and dismemberment of the Roman empire, many states and dynasties rose and fell; and Syria, which was so speedily wrested from the Romans by the hordes of Arabia, banded together under the influence of fanaticism, might, one would think, have been not less easily recovered by a nation ever animated by an unquenchable attachment to the land of their fathers. The wars of the Jews, their desperate struggle against Rome in the zenith of her power, sufficiently refutes the idea that they are a people incapable of military enterprise.

Nor have they been wholly unconcerned in the political transactions of modern history. In the annals of the Arabian monarchy prior to the birth of Mohammed, we find a Jewish king, if not a Jewish dynasty; and in Zu Nowass, the Christians of Yemen found a ruthless persecutor. Mohammed courted at first the support of the Arabian Jews; and had not their obstinate opposition converted his friendship into implacable hatred, he might have rewarded their attachment with the gift of Palestine. But the feud between Ishmael and Isaac was still in operation, and prevented an alliance which would have given a new character to the Mohammedan imposture. In Africa, the Jews may boast of having retained some portion of dominion; a considerable mixture of Jewish blood, too, runs in the veins of the Moors; and the Saracen conqueror of Spain was indebted to the aid of the persecuted Jews for his most important acquisitions. When the holy land subsequently became the theatre of 'the world's debate', it might have been expected, that the Jews; the rightful owners of the sacred territory, would have availed themselves of the contest, to obtain some advantages as the price of their alliance. Their numbers and mercantile wealth must have rescued them at least from contempt at such a juncture; had they not lain under the proscription, with both parties, of an implacable hatred which was cherished as a virtue of expiatory efficacy. On the shores of the Mediterranean, free states have arisen, the creation of commercial wealth; and yet, the Jews, who have almost monopolized at times the commerce of the Mediterranean, and who, at Barcelona, Marseilles, Leghorn, Tunis, and Bengazi, have formed so considerable a portion of the community,—have never assumed the shape of a political body. We are aware that the same remark will apply to the Greeks up to a recent period, and, though not with equal force, to the Armenians, who, like the modern Jews, a nation of traders, and one scarcely less ubiquitous, every where preserving their distinct customs, retain, like them, in all their wanderings, a strong national feeling and a passionate attachment to the land of their fathers,—a country, too, which has also been the theatre of perpetual wars. In point of numbers, however, as well as resources, the Jews form a much more considerable body than either the Armenians or the Greeks; and they have at all times been ready to seize the first opportunity of returning to Palestine, where, in fact, great numbers have preferred to live, though under the Turkish yoke, and whither the prospect of meeting with efficient protection would attract them from all quarters. The political restoration of the Greeks would have seemed, twenty years ago, an event not less unlikely than that of Israel now. It is now all but consummated; and wherein consists the natural improbability that, as the Turkish power declines, some

Mohammed Ali, or some Capo d'Istria, himself a Jew, or favouring that nation from political motives,—may erect a new republic or monarchy on the site of fallen Jerusalem?

That such an event has *not* long ago taken place, we say, affords, on a retrospective view, matter for surprise; except as we regard their degraded political condition in the light of a national punishment, the immediate appointment of Divine Providence. "We have no king but Cæsar", said the Jewish rabble, tutored by their sacerdotal rulers; and they have never since had any other king. But, if no natural impossibility, no insurmountable political obstacle, lies in the way of their restoration,—arising either from the magnitude of the event or from the ordinary course of things,—the ground is clear for the inquiry, how far the anticipation of such an event is countenanced by Scripture, and what would be its probable results.

We can conceive of its being attended with results highly unfavourable to the conversion of the Jews, supposing it to precede a religious revolution. Were they, in their present moral condition and with their present views, to be led back to the Holy Land, we should fear that it would tend only to confirm them in their secular notions of Messiah's kingdom, and to give fresh scope and occasion for those cabals and contentions between rival political factions, which hastened the destruction of their commonwealth. The most respectable portion of the nation, the Karaite Jews, would meet with no welcome from their brethren; and were the Rabbinites armed with ecclesiastical power, they would not fail to exhibit the persecuting spirit of their fathers. The re-establishment of the Talmudical law and of an intolerant oligarchy under the name of the Sanhedrim, would, it has been remarked, be scarcely less injurious to the progress of Christianity in that country, than the revival of the Jesuits in Europe. And most revolting and melancholy would be the spectacle, to see them blindly setting about the re-construction of their temple, and insulting the scene of our Lord's sufferings with fresh memorials of their unbelief and impenitence. The probability that attempts of this kind would be made, may be one reason why they have never been permitted to return as a nation to their own land. 'If,' as Mr. Jowett remarks, 'the possession of a particular region were to depend on the power to purchase it, the Jews have always been sufficiently rich to buy a larger tract of land than Palestine.\*' Nor can we conceive of any objections which lie against their restoration, on the ground of political expediency. The principal difficulties to be surmounted would arise from ecclesiastical prejudices; for the

\* Jowett's *Christ. Researches in Syria*, p. 448.

Romish Church, which has not yet lost the taste of Jewish blood, would never consent that they should be restored to civil freedom. Viewed in the abstract, we must regard their emancipation as an event highly desirable on the broad ground of their equal title to all the blessings of political liberty. Abhorring all tyranny and slavery, we must wish to see Israel free. Still, we are not sure that the Jewish people would, under a native government of their own, be likely to enjoy a greater portion of civil or religious freedom than they do under the dominion of Russia, or even under the Turkish yoke. And we question, therefore, whether their religious reformation would be favoured by their political revival. Such an event may take place at no very distant period—we deem it not by any means improbable—and yet, it may be no more in fulfilment of prophecy, than the emancipation of the Greeks or of the Irish. And it may prove a hinderance, instead of furthering their being grafted in again into the Church of God.

A contrary result is possible. Their restoration may take place under circumstances that shall in great measure obviate the attendant evils we have referred to; and it may be preceded by a general diffusion of knowledge among the scattered tribes, that shall render them capable of political union and liberal institutions. It is possible, that the dry bones may thus be brought together and clothed anew with the form of life and the shape of a political body, before the word of God shall impart spiritual vitality to the risen nation. There is something so pleasing, so fascinating in this anticipation, that its truth is often admitted without a very close investigation of the Scriptural evidence. It is possible, we say, that the Jews may be restored to their own land with very mistaken expectations, retaining still their carnal prejudices, rejecting the Son of David who is come, and vainly looking for another; and that they may afterwards, by a fresh Pentecostal effusion, be cured of their fatal blindness, and become obedient to the faith. The question is, What are the Scriptural grounds for such an expectation?

If their restoration to Palestine be desirable, it must be as introductory and subsidiary to such a result. We can scarcely bring ourselves to attach importance to the event in any other point of view. Whether the Jewish people should be located in Syria, in Poland, or in Barbary, in itself matters little: their being restored to the Church is every thing. We wish to see them a free people, no matter under what government or what parallel. There are waste lands enough within the limits of the Turkish empire, to receive and support them if they were thrice as numerous,—in Cyprus and the parts of Libya about Cyrene,

in Mesopotamia, and Cappadocia, and Pontus, and Cilicia, in Numidia and Mauritania; where, indeed, they are now found, as their fathers were, but every where in a state of political degradation and jeopardy. They would, however, deem nothing worthy the name of restoration, that did not re-instate them in their own land. This attachment to Palestine is unconquerable; but it partakes quite as much of superstition as of patriotism. It forms an article of popular belief, Dr. Henderson informs us, among the Polish Jews, that die where they may, their bodies will all be raised there at the end of the world. They believe that such as die in foreign parts, are doomed to perform the *gilgul mehiloth*, or trundling passing through subterraneous caverns till they reach the sepulchres of their fathers; on which account so many remove thither in their life time, or direct their remains to be forwarded by sea to be interred there, to save themselves the trouble of an underground passage\*. The full strength of this feeling displayed itself in the declaration made by a Turkish Jew to Mr. Wolff. 'Even', said the Rabbi, 'if Messiah should come now, and not bring us to Palestine, we would not hear him.' Mr. Wolff's reply was a very just reproof: 'You are *carnally-minded*.'—If, however, it was, in this Rabbi, an indication (as it assuredly was) of a carnal mind, to regard the restoration of the Jews to Palestine as the great event to which the prophecies point, and the object for which Messiah is expected to come,—then let Mr. Wolff say, what are we to think of those Christians who take a similar view of the Old Testament prophecies, and who would encourage in the Jews this worldly-minded expectation? The following is the language held by the Defender of the Students of Prophecy.

'The promise of the perpetual kingdom was not to David for himself, but to David for his son; even the rod out of the root of Jesse. Do you mean to maintain that the promise to David, the son of Jesse, that his son should sit upon his throne for ever, is fulfilled by the Son of God sitting upon God's throne? In this case, you must maintain that David means God; for, if the son sitting upon David's throne signifies Christ sitting upon God's throne, you can believe nothing else. Or will you contend, that the Son of David sitting upon his Father's throne, means the Son of God sitting upon his own throne, and therefore not upon his Father's throne? It is easy to say, that the throne of David is a spiritual throne; and so far as the one word *throne* is concerned, it can neither be proved nor disproved; but when we put together into the proposition all the things predicated of it, we cannot possibly give it any other than a literal interpretation. Is the promise to the Virgin Mary, that her child, the *man* Jesus, should

\* Henderson's Biblical Researches, p. 224.



sit upon his father's David's throne, fulfilled by his going into heaven to sit upon a throne on which his father David never did sit? p. 34.

Had we met with this passage in the writings of some Jewish or some infidel objector against the truth of the Old Testament prophecies,—and it is certainly not unworthy of Tom Paine,—we should have known how to deal with it. But it is painful to meet with such aberrations as these in writers who reverence the authority of Inspiration. According to the above reasoning, we are to believe, that the declaration of the angel to the Virgin Mary remains *unfulfilled*; that our Lord's exaltation to the throne of universal dominion, his being invested, as man, with all power in heaven and on earth, does not include the fulfilment of the declaration that he should reign over the House of Jacob; that, because the anti-type transcends the type, the correspondence is destroyed; that, because Messiah is David's lord, he is not his Son; that, because our Lord's kingdom is not of this world, he does not reign over the world; that he must descend from his own throne to sit upon the throne of David, so undergoing a second humiliation, not to fulfil the office of a priest, but the functions of a king! If this statement does not furnish a sufficient confutation of the unscriptural chimera, the language of St. Peter precludes the necessity for any further argument. "Therefore David, being a prophet, and knowing 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 on his throne: He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ. . . . Therefore, being by the right hand of the Father exalted, and having received the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is not ascended into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my lord, sit thou on my right hand till I make thy foes thy footstool. Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God *hath made* that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, *both LORD and Christ.*" As we are not contending with persons who will question whether the Apostles understood the Old Testament prophecies, we put it to the common sense and conscience of the students of prophecy, whether Christ is not here expressly affirmed to be the anointed *Lord of Israel*, in fulfilment of the promise made to David, and of David's prophecy respecting his Son and Lord. The first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews is equally decisive on this point. The promise which gladdened the heart of David was, not that Messiah should reign from Egypt to Euphrates, but that the Messiah who was to reign at God's right hand, should be his descendant according to the flesh. That the throne of David means, in reference to Christ, a

'*spiritual throne*', is not our position\*. We assert, that his is a *heavenly throne*, but a dominion not less actual, personal, and in a certain sense political, than that of David was; not the less actual, because its providential administration is an object of faith, nor the less personal because "as yet we see him not," nor the less political, because he is raised "far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, and hath all things put under his feet."

That among the modern Millenarians, there are to be found many spiritual-minded individuals, we readily admit; but we must at the same time contend, with all our respect for the piety of their feelings and motives, that their opinions "savour of the things of men"; that they are Jewish, and not Christian, both in their spirit and origin. The utter contrariety to the genius of Christianity, of such a judaizing system of interpretation as has lately been revived, and its dangerous tendency, have long ago been pointed out in a little volume which deserves to be better known. It is many years since our attention was first attracted to it by the interest of the subject and the highly respected name of the Author, Dr. Peter Allix, and we sat down to the perusal of it without any previous bias either for or against his positions. It seems that, in his day, 'a great number of divines had adopted several ideas which were purely Jewish, in following the authority of the Masters of the *Synagogue*'; and it appeared to him of some consequence, 'to endeavour to free them from some of their errors, by showing them that several of the hypotheses which they had adopted, could produce no other effect than to harden the Jews, by making them conceive that their masters have such clear proofs of their sentiments, that one part of the Christians is forced to embrace them.' The title of the Tract is, "A Confutation of the Hope of the Jews concerning the last Redemption." It is in the form of Remarks upon the Eighth Treatise of the famous Rabbi Sahadiah upon that subject, a translation of which is prefixed; an author of the greatest celebrity and authority among the Jews both in the East and the West. In the Dedication (to the Bishop of Ely), Dr. Allix makes some introductory remarks upon the Millenarian controversy, which we shall transcribe as conveying some useful information.

'Before the midst of the Second Century', says Dr. Allix, 'we find that several Christians had already mixed with this doctrine of

---

\* Dr. Hamilton uses this expression, in contradistinction from *literal*, but, we think, in this case unhappily.

the Millennium, many notions which savoured altogether of Judaism; some Jews converted to Christianity having made their utmost effort to join with the doctrine of St. John, the ideas of their masters with relation to a temporal reign of the Messiah in Palestine, and concerning several other Articles diametrically opposite to the doctrine of our Saviour Christ. After this mixture of those Jewish ideas with those of St. John the Apostle, this doctrine became a stumbling-block to many Christians, and we may say, that it occasioned an irreconcilable difference between the ancientest interpreters of Holy Scripture. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, Origen, and his disciples, became famous for standing up and opposing this medley of Jewish notions with St. John's system. But it fell out so, that they gave allegorical explications to all the ancient prophecies, which served to no other end but to render the sense of them dark and obscure, the literal sense seeming to them altogether insipid. St. Jerom, who made commentaries upon all the prophets, following but too closely Origen's method and his works, where he shews the sense and the explication which the Jews gave these ancient prophecies, convinces us that Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, followed the Jewish ideas of the Millennium in their full extent.

The same differences were renewed at the time ensuing the Reformation, but more especially a hundred years ago; and the Holy Scripture being more studied, and with greater helps than before, the books of the Jews and their commentaries being published, we saw Christian divines divided about these matters. And this division was carried so far, as to force several to think themselves obliged to abstain from the study of the prophecies; but more particularly of the book of the Revelations, so that they might avoid joining themselves to a party, and not expose themselves to the laughter of their adversaries. Yet, it is certain, that every one that studies Scripture, must espouse a party touching the questions that relate to this controversy.

St. Jerom, in several places, maintained, that the Ten Tribes never returned into their own country. This opinion was so universally followed, that the Divines of the Church of Rome unanimously declared for the opinion of the Jews, when they adopted their notion concerning the coming of Elijah before the second appearing of the Messiah. The greatest part of the Protestant writers rejected this opinion; and to free themselves from it, turned into allegories most of the oracles which relate to the return of the Ten Tribes, and of the Two Tribes under the empire of Cyrus and of his successors, that by that means they might apply them to the time of the Gospel. Some acknowledged that it was hard this application should be just, seeing that the terms of the prophecies relate to temporal advantages, which the primitive Christians never enjoyed; so that they pretended with Theodoret, that these oracles which the Jews at present refer to the time of the Messiah, had a literal accomplishment under Zerubbabel and his successors. Since Protestants applied themselves to the study of the Revelation of St. John, they divided themselves into two parties. The one, in imitation of the Papist Divines, and upon the same foundation that crept in amongst Christians out of the school of the Jews, pretend that some allusions found in the book of the Revelation,

obliged them to apply all the oracles of the old Prophets to the Millennium. So that, without the least hesitation, they apply to the time of the Messiah, a great number of prophecies which had their accomplishment before the coming of our Lord. As the Jews afford them no small assistance upon those places of the Old Testament, so it happened, that they also embraced one part of the Jewish system with regard to the second coming of the Messiah. They adopted a temporal reign of the Messiah, a re-establishment of Jerusalem, of its temple, of its sacrifices, a kingdom of the Jews in the land of Canaan; and they pretend that these hypotheses, which had their rise in the bosom of the Synagogue, since it rejected the true Messiah, are sufficient means to make them embrace him, when he shall reveal himself to call all the nations of the world to his communion. This was formerly the opinion of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, Lactantius, and of several Fathers, for some ages. But Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, particularly defended it in his Commentaries on the Prophets. As this opinion appears to me of a very dangerous consequence, and seeing at present it is reviving, I thought myself obliged to do my utmost to prevent its growth.' pp. ii—iv.

The Defender of the Students of Prophecy boldly asserts, that a Millennium, as held by the modern Millenarians, 'was the general belief of the first ages of the Church', and that 'the doctrine was maintained even up to the first council of Nice.' That such an assertion should be reiterated, after its utter contrariety to fact has been so repeatedly demonstrated, only shews that error is an earth-born giant who recovers strength from being prostrated. 'If they had simply affirmed, that their creed was ancient', Dr. Hamilton remarks, 'or, at least, that there had been an ancient expectation of a supernatural Millennium, they would have asserted a notorious and indubitable fact.'

'But when they say, that their notions respecting the Millennium prevailed in the primitive church, and prevailed in the best and purest ages of the church, they betray either a childish ignorance of the history of the Christian church, or a deplorable want of Christian truth and candour.' p. 291.

In fact, a direct confutation of the assertion is supplied by the pages of Mr. Irving's Oracle, the learned Jew or Jesuit, Ben Ezra, alias Lacunza. In this curious and elaborate defence of the Jewish doctrine of the Millennium, Lactantius is made to assert, by means of an imperfect citation, that it was, until the termination of the fourth century, 'the common opinion of Christians';—'this doctrine of the holy fathers the prophets, which we Christians follow.' Yet, Ben Ezra immediately proceeds to shew, that the 'common opinion of Christians' on this point, was any thing rather than the doctrine of the holy fathers and the Scriptures. He tells us, that the an-

cient Millenarians must be distinguished into three classes. In the first, we have the followers of Cerinthus and other heretics, and heretics alone, because it is *impossible* 'that the saints who are called Millenarians, or the other Catholic and pious doctors, would in any way follow this party.' In the second class, are comprised the Jewish Rabbies who look for their Messiah in the form of a great conqueror, subjecting to his dominion, by force of arms, all nations, and obliging them to observe the law of Moses; and those Christians who have followed in their footsteps or adopted some of their ideas. These are they whom, with propriety, they call judaizing Millenarians, whose principal leaders were Nepos, an African bishop, against whom St. Dionysius Alexandrinus wrote his two books upon the Promises, and Apollinarius, against whom St. Epiphanius wrote under the seventy-seventh heresy.' The third class of Millenarians is that in which the Writer enters the catholic and the pious; including Saints Justin, Irenæus, and Lactantius, in whose works he professes that he can find no trace of any such extravagance. But the ridiculous ideas of Nepos and Apollinarius, it is admitted, were embraced by *innumerable followers*.' Nor were the notions of Cerinthus held by a few. The common or prevailing opinion among the Millenarians then, we must conclude, was *not* the doctrine of the third class, who formed the minority. On the contrary, the Apocalypse, which Ben Ezra affirms to be the proper and natural key to the *whole* Scriptures, 'had the misfortune to fall', he says, 'almost from the beginning, into the impure hands of gross heretics.' The consequence was, that the doctrine of the Millennium, as expounded by Papias and his followers, brought into suspicion the authenticity and inspiration of the Apocalypse itself; so that, at the end of the fourth century, 'it was almost universally considered as spurious by the members of the Greek Church.'\* 'Likewise', adds Ben Ezra, 'it is undeniable, that many Millenarians, although both catholic and pious, *but wanting in spirituality*, not a little abuse this twentieth chapter of the Apocalypse, adding, from their own fancy, matters which the Scripture expresseth not, and proceeding to write treatises and books which appear more like novels fit only to amuse the idle.' He proceeds to say, that many grave and learned men who have written upon the subject, separate, and with good reason, those whom they denominate innocent, from 'the *common herd* of Millenarians'; 'but I likewise see', he adds, 'that when they come to censure and final sentence, they involve them all.' We desire no clearer proof than this, that the 'common herd' of ancient Millena-

\* Marsh's Michaelis, vol. iv. pp. 491; 541.

rians were *not* of the innocent class,—that, *as a sect*, they were distinguished by tenets opposed to the doctrines of primitive Christianity,—and that, although some who embraced the Millenarian fable, (including Nepos himself,) were men of undoubted learning and piety, and not chargeable with the impious extravagance of the Cerinthian crew,—still, they were regarded as having fallen into the same error respecting the nature of the kingdom of Christ. Thus, Sixtus Senensis, in a passage cited by Ben Ezra, admits that the opinion of Lactantius and others differed from the dogma of Cerinthus; but he asserts, that it nevertheless contained error at variance with the evangelical doctrine. And the opinions of Lactantius, as cited by Dr. Hamilton, will not appear to our readers undeserving of being so stigmatized. Those who shall be living in the time of the Millennium, he says,

‘ shall not die;—but, during these thousand years, shall produce an infinite multitude of children, and their offspring shall be holy and beloved of God. But those who shall be raised from the dead, will, as judges, rule over the living. The nations, however, shall not be altogether destroyed: some of them shall be left for a conquest to God; that the just may triumph over them, and subject them to perpetual bondage.....The rocks will drop honey; wine will run in streams, and the rivers overflow with milk,’ &c. *Hamilton*, pp. 295, 6.

In reference, probably, to this very passage, Sixtus Senensis remarks, that the opinion of Lactantius was opposed to the doctrine of our Lord, that “the children of the Resurrection neither marry nor are given in marriage”; and to the declaration of St. Paul, that the kingdom of God “consisteth not in meat and drink, but in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.” Yet, Ben Ezra confidently asserts, that ‘Lactantius neither directly nor indirectly utters such extravagance’ as, that ‘among the risen saints there will be such marriages and banquets.’ ‘And equally certain is it,’ he adds, ‘that neither St. Justin, nor St. Irenæus, nor Tertullian had broached such an error, or ever had a thought of it.’ The following, however, is the language of Irenæus, as cited by Dr. Hamilton.

‘The days shall come, in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand branches; and each of these branches shall have ten thousand smaller branches; and each of these branches shall have ten thousand twigs; and each of these twigs shall have ten thousand clusters of grapes; and each of these grapes being pressed, shall give twenty-five measures of wine,’ &c. p. 290.

The language of Justin is far less puerile, but he too seems to have given into the judaizing system of interpretation. Nor

is it with any justice, that, while he is ranked among the pious Millenarians, Nepos is entered by Ben Ezra in a less innocent class. Dionysius thus speaks of the African bishop in the work written expressly to confute his errors. 'I will grant that, in many respects, I follow Nepos, and that I esteem him on account of his faith, his labours, his diligence in expounding the Bible, and also on account of his hymns, which many of our brethren still use to their edification; and I have so much the more respect for him, as he is gone to his rest before us; but the truth is dearer and more valuable to me than any thing else.' \* Ben Ezra would throw Nepos overboard; and he represents Justin, and Irenæus, and all the orthodox Millenarians as complaining of Nepos for his absurd notions. But he does not adduce the slightest evidence of the discrepancy of their opinions; and his classification may therefore be dismissed as having no other foundation than an erroneous assumption. Indeed, his own opinions are so decidedly those of the judaizing Millenarians, that we can trust as little to his discrimination as to his accuracy of statement. He avows his belief, that not only will the temple be rebuilt, but the ancient rites of sacrifice and all the Jewish ceremonies will be re-established as an acceptable service; an opinion at which we feel less surprise, when we recollect how well it harmonizes with the Popish doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass. 'In the new and last temple of Jerusalem', he says, 'the ancient sacrifices will be nothing else than a new and most wise liturgy which shall precede the bloodless sacrifices of the Eucharist.' He believes too, that

'there will be deposited in that new temple, the very sacred ark of the old covenant, the tabernacle, and the altar, which Jeremiah, being warned of God', hid in a cave of Mount Nebo, prophesying at the same time: "As for that place, it shall be unknown until the time that God gather his people again together and receive them unto mercy." † *Maccabees*, ii. 8.' Ben Ezra, Vol. II. pp. 298, 9.

Such is a specimen of 'the wonderful work',—the 'best gift offered to the easy, drowsy, lukewarm Church in these latter times', as Mr. Irving characterises it, which, together with Basilicus's Letters and his own Discourses on Prophecy, he represents as a threefold voice from the sister churches of Rome, England, and Scotland, which let any one refuse to listen to,—*'if he dare'!*

The opinions of Ben Ezra, however, are neither peculiar nor novel. Michaelis, after expressing his opinion that the sensual doctrine of the Millenarians might give the more offence, in ancient times, on account of the ascetic views of many of the fathers

\* Eusebius, as cited by Michaelis. Marsh's Michaelis, iv. 476.

of the Church\*, proceeds to remark, that the doctrine was rejected by the Reformers in the sixteenth century on a very different account, and was condemned, 'not as a speculative, but as a dangerous practical error. For the expectation of a kingdom in which pure saints should rule over the unregenerate children of the world, began to excite a spirit of sedition; as it is very easy for the unruly members of a discontented party to fancy, that they themselves are the saints, and their opponents the unregenerate: and for this very reason, the Augsburg Confession condemns the doctrine of the Millennium in express terms. Further, according to the representation of the ancient Chiliasts, offerings and offering-festivals were to be celebrated in this kingdom. But such notions are inconsistent with St. Paul's doctrine concerning the imperfection and abolition of the Levitical law.' †

As such notions are evidently of Jewish origin, so, their revival in modern times has originated in a desire to promote the reception of Christianity on the part of the Jews. This was the great design which Mede had in view; and it is the avowed object of Bea Ezra.

\* My purpose and desire, in the third place, is, to offer some greater light, some other remedy more prompt and efficacious, to my own brethren the Jews, "whose are the fathers, and of whom is Jesus Christ according to the flesh." And what remedy can these miserable men receive, but the knowledge of their true Messiah whom they love, and for whom they sigh night and day without knowing Him? And how are they to know him unless the doctrine be opened to them? And how, in the state of ignorance and blindness in which they are actually found, can that doctrine be sufficiently discovered, while you shew them only the one half of Messiah, while the other half is concealed and even positively denied?—if there be preached to them only what is to be found in the Scriptures pertaining to (his) first coming in suffering flesh, as Redeemer, as Master, as Example, as High Priest, &c.—and there be denied to them without any reason, what, accord-

---

\* This supposition is more ingenious than solid. It was not so much any voluptuous doctrine that was charged upon the Chiliasts, as their embracing the fable of 'a golden and gemmed Jerusalem on the earth, the renewal of the temple, delights of the feast and servitude of all nations, and the renewal of wars, armies, and triumphs, and slaughter of the vanquished.'

† Marsh's *Michaelis*, Vol. IV. p. 542. It cannot be necessary that we should disclaim participating in the learned Author's scepticism with regard to the canonical authority of the Apocalypse. Dean Woodhouse has, in our opinion, satisfactorily exposed the unreasonableness of his doubts; and Dr. Priestley admits the strength of the external evidence in favour of its authenticity.



ing to the same Scriptures, though with ideas little worthy, and even gross, they believe and hope pertaining to (his) second coming.'

Vol. I. p. 10.

How admirably does this new remedy for the moral blindness of the Jew harmonize with St. Paul's determination to "know nothing" among the churches, "save Jesus Christ, even the Crucified One,"—to glory in nothing "save *the Cross* of our Lord Jesus Christ!" It was upon this system of accommodation, that the first judaizing teachers sought to render Christianity palatable to their own countrymen by obviating "the offense of the Cross." And it was the same fatal policy which led to the corruption of religion by the Romish Church, in adaptation to the prejudices of the heathen. This *succedaneum* for the gospel which Paul preached, might naturally enough commend itself to the adoption of a Spanish Jesuit or Jew; but most grievously do Protestants err from the simplicity of Christ, when they would substitute the Millennium for the Cross, and build up in the mind of the unbelieving Jew, those fond prejudices and delusions which St. Paul laboured with all his apostolic zeal and authority to destroy. To the Jew, indeed, he became a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; but such a policy formed no part of his plan of conciliation. And, in those parts of his writings which had for their express object to vindicate his own patriotism and to excite the emulation of the Jews, it is especially remarkable, that there occurs not a hint as to their political restoration. His doctrine was, that "Christ gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world"; and awful is the anathema which he denounces against such as should preach to the Jews any other gospel. But what else than another gospel is the new remedy for Jewish unbelief, which Ben Ezra proposes? A crucified Saviour suffering as a victim, the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world,—this is, in his view, the dark side of Christianity to a Jew; and he finds an excuse for his unbelief in the unpalatableness of the doctrine. But tell him, that his temple shall be restored with all its rites and ceremonies; that he shall be led back to Palestine; that David's throne shall be built up again in temporal splendour; and that Messiah shall personally occupy it, and ride forth at the head of his saints to the slaughter of the wicked,—then, the Jews will become obedient to the faith!

The Unitarian has *his* plan for converting the Jews and the children of Ishmael also, which, opposite as it is in some respects, proceeds upon the same erroneous calculation, that the unbelief of the Jew would be removed by the adaptation of Christianity to his reasonable prejudices. Divest the faith in Christ of those repulsive doctrines,—the Atonement, Justifica-

tion through the blood of Christ, and the Divine nature of the Son of God, and every obstacle to its reception, it is thought, would be removed. To both the Unitarian and the Judaizing Millenarian, the words of St. Paul convey a sufficient reply: "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom; but we preach Christ crucified, to the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness, but, unto them who are called, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men."

In relation then to the best interests of the Jews themselves, we regard the Millenarian doctrine as having the most unfavourable tendency. If the Jews are to be restored to Palestine, this is not the gospel that is to be the instrument of their conversion. The Jew must be saved *as a sinner*, and his salvation must consist in being delivered from his sins. He must be taught that in Christ, his circumcision "availeth nothing," and that between Jew and Gentile "there is no difference". "He who is our peace, hath made both one". Surely those are not the true friends of the Jewish people, who would encourage in their minds a hope of political supremacy, founded on their standing in a nearer relation to Messiah than the meanest Gentile who is sealed by the Spirit. It was not to the Jews, that St. Peter addressed himself, when he said, "But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation." Nor was it as a Hebrew of the Hebrews that St. Paul said, "*We* are the circumcision, who rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh". All that distinguished him as a Jew, every hope peculiar to him as a Jew, he disclaimed and rejected that he might be found in Christ. Nothing, as it appears to us, can be more diametrically opposed to the whole genius of the Christian dispensation and the constant tenor and bearing of the Apostolic writings, than the language of our modern Millenarians respecting the Jews, whom they would coax and bribe into accepting the Gospel,—no, not the Gospel, but the hope of the Second Advent; bribe, not indeed with money, but with the golden reversion of the sovereignty of Palestine, nay of the Church itself. "Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?" said our Blessed Lord;—and surely that filial relation was the closest of ties of which his humanity was susceptible,—a relation of which, even amid the agonies of the Cross, he was neither unmindful nor regardless;—Who are my countrymen? he might, *à fortiori*, have demanded, when he added: "For whosoever doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven, the same is my Mother, and Sister, and Brother."

But the most dangerous feature of the Millenarian theology, is the erroneous method of Biblical interpretation to which its

dreams and dogmas owe all their plausibility. It is this circumstance, as we remarked in the outset, which gives the subject its chief importance, since, as the Author of the "Objections" remarks,—

'If the doctrine contested be fallacious, the principles of scriptural interpretation by which it is maintained are fallacious also, and; if not exposed and exploded, are calculated to sap the foundations of truth, to cherish the rank weeds of fanaticism, mislead the ignorant, misdirect the zealous, obstruct the progress of true religion, and weaken the efforts of those who scripturally seek the moral renovation of the world.' p. vii.

Now, the fundamental principle of the system of interpretation adopted by divines of this school, from the time of Nepos to that of Mede and Ben Ezra, is to take the Apocalypse as the key to the whole of the Old Testament Scriptures; but a key which, in their hands, serves to *lock up* the prophecies of the Old Testament among the secret things belonging to the future, rather than to open their true import. All their labours have for their object to shew, that the old prophecies have *not* been fulfilled,—that the opinion of the Jewish rabbies on this point is right,—and that the argument in favour of our Lord's divine mission and the truth of Christianity, derivable from the fulfilment of prophecy, has owed much of its apparent strength to the misapprehension of Christian advocates. Even the prophecies of Moses and David have not, it seems, been verified as yet. This was the great error into which Mr. Mede was betrayed, by forsaking the guidance of the New Testament for that of the Talmud. 'No one', remarks Dr. Peter Allix, in the volume before referred to,

'I hath a greater veneration for Mr. Mede's memory, than I have; and I am so far from desiring to diminish his reputation, that I freely own, we are indebted to his industry and labours for that great light we enjoy in St. John's Revelation. But, as I do not in the least believe Mr. Mede was divinely inspired for the understanding and explaining the Revelation of St. John, so, I fancy it is lawful for me, or any body else who is a lover of the truth, to shew, that his method is not only *useless*, but also *contrary to his great design, which was the conversion of the Jews*. Mr. Mede hath done two things in his *Clavis Apocalyptica*. First, he explained St. John's text, and for the most part hath done it excellently well. But, as the Book of the Revelation alludes to many prophecies of the Old Testament, which the Jews refer to several events under the Messiah, so, I find he hath been prevailed upon to follow the Jewish explications of those texts of the old Prophets, as if they had never been accomplished, which is the opinion of the Jews: in supposing which things, I am fully convinced at present he was in the wrong. . . . Those Oracles having had their literal accomplishment before the nativity of Christ, St. John, in his Revelation, could not be supposed to allude to them, but with relation to the conformity and

likeness which there is to be between some events already past and some other events which are yet to come.

I acknowledge Mr. Mede has on his side a great many famous authors amongst the Ancients and Moderns, both Papists and Protestants of the greatest fame, and also no small number of the learnedest commentators, who have led him into his prejudices. Some Rules of the Ancients for the better understanding of the Prophecies of old, (such as St. Jerome mentioned by Cornelius à Lapide in his Prolegomena to the Prophets,) have also caused him to embrace some of the Jewish notions, as though they were the same with St. John's prophecies in the Revelation. And this you perceive from the end of his *Clavis Apocalyptica*, where he produces a place out of Justin Martyr, which he vindicates against St. Jerome, and where he quotes several places from the Targum, from the Talmud, and from R. Sahadias, being fully persuaded that those authors maintained such a Millennium as he had imagined and collected from St. John.

..... 'After all, I confess Mr. Mede was very much in the right for condemning many divines, who, being to dispute against the Jews, objected against them those places of Scripture which concern the glorious kingdom of the Messiah, as though they had been fulfilled at the first coming of our Saviour. Certainly, this is not the way to work upon, but rather to harden the Jews. But yet, at the same time, I maintain, that the hypothesis which Mr. Mede pretends to establish from the prophecies of the Old Testament, as relating to the Millennium revealed by St. John, *does put as great a stop to the conversion of the Jews.* For it is certain, first, that those prophecies do not in the least relate to the latter times; as I have shewn upon the iid and xith chapters of Isaiah, and upon Isaiah i. 16, Zeph. iii. 8, and Malachi iv. 1. Upon which places the Jews establish their notions, and which many of the Fathers and of the modern commentators apply to the first foundation of the Gospel. Secondly, it is as certain, that, if they relate to the latter times, viz. after the destruction of Antichrist, as Mr. Mede pretends, they must be understood according to the explication of the Jews; which explication is absolutely contrary to the genius of the Christian religion and to the book of Revelation. This is the reason why I have altogether renounced these principles of Mr. Mede, which I yet afore followed but too closely, being prevailed upon by the authority and example of some great men who adhere to them but too much.'

..... 'I have a great value for Mr. Mede's judgement; but that great man forgot himself through an effect of his prejudices on that question. For, though he was in the right to be angry with St. Jerom for adopting the foolish notion of the Jews, viz. that the Ten Tribes never returned by virtue of Cyrus's Edict; yet, by this hypothesis, (of another captivity after that of Assyria and Chaldea \*,) which

---

\* One of Mr. Mede's chief arguments in favour of this second captivity, and the subsequent restoration of the Jewish polity and temple, is founded on the *prophecy of Tobias* (*prophetia Tobiae moribundi*). But the words which he cites, are not to be found either in the Greek, the Latin, or the Syriac version, or in the Hebrew of Munster. And

he borrowed from the Jews, he overturned all the sense of the prophecies. First, he applied many prophecies to Christ, which literally concerned Zerubbabel. Secondly, he referred many prophecies which literally concerned the happiness of Israel as restored to their land, to the Christian Church, explaining those prophecies either by a spiritual peace or by a happiness in heaven. Thirdly, he applied many prophecies which concerned the re-establishment of the Levitical worship and the Second Temple, (as though they were to be understood by a figure,) to the spiritual worship under the Gospel. In short, he usually takes Israel and Judah after an allegorical, and not after a literal manner. According to his style, Judea signifies the Christian Church, and Earth signifies Heaven; and as by these hypotheses he hindered the conversion of the Jews, so, he also gave them but too just an occasion of laughing at Christian interpreters who followed his principles, as you see from Abarbanel's Preface to his *Masmiah Jeshua*.

Dr. Allix then proceeds to instance as another of Mr. Mede's mistakes, his notion concerning a second Elijah as the fore-runner of our Lord at his second coming. 'It would be considered,' says the Father of prophetic interpretation, (so Mr. Cuninghame styles him,) 'seeing the coming of Christ is twofold, first and second, whether the same prophecy implies not that there should be a harbinger as well of his second coming as of his first; as well an Elias to prepare the way for his coming in glory to judge the world, as there was at his first coming in humility to preach the Gospel and suffer for the world.' Mr. Mede urges three reasons in support of this strange opinion, which the Jews are particularly fond of, on account of its telling so strongly against the truth of Christianity. His first is, 'the consent of all the Fathers in general,' which is in his opinion of no small weight. On this argument, Dr. Allix remarks:—

'First, there are several eminent authors among the Papists, who maintained, that in Malachi, mention is made of John the Baptist, and not of Elias. Such were Paulus Burgensis, a converted Jew, Arias

---

Mr. Mede is therefore led to suppose, that St. Jerome *left them out on purpose!* This unwarrantable charge has no other ground than the edition of Fagius, which is not the Chaldee original, but a Hebrew version from the Greek, made by some ignorant Jew in later times. It is curious to observe the consistent fondness of the Millenarians for the Apocrypha, at the moment that some of them in our day affect to be so indignant against its circulation. Mr. Mede does not lay more stress upon the book of Tobit, than Mr. Irving does upon the 2d book of Esdras. As to Ben Ezra, as might be expected, 'the famous prophecy of holy Tobias,' 'the prophecy of Baruch,' and the second book of Maccabees, are his strong-holds. See vol. ii. pp. 209—212. As an earnest stickler for adhering to the letter of Scripture, and rejecting the allegorical sense, he also draws some of his most cogent scriptural arguments from Solomon's Song!

Montanus, and Isidorus Clarius. Secondly, all the Fathers in general, believed that Elias was to come in person before the second appearing of Christ; which Mr. Mede rejects as altogether absurd, and indeed not without reason, seeing we own Christ to be the true Messiah. Thirdly, how could the Fathers avoid embracing such an error, seeing the Greek version, which they maintained was inspired by the Holy Ghost, had, in Mal. iv. 5, added the word *Thisbite* to Elias? It was chiefly from that Jewish gloss, which was inserted into the text, that the Author of the Sibylline Oracles fancied that Elias the Thisbite should come from heaven and give three signs. And that foolish author, having obtained but too great an esteem, was followed by Justin Martyr, by Tertullian, by Hippolytus, by Ephrem, by Gregory Nysson, by St. Ambrose, by St. Austin, and by many others; but particularly by almost all the writers in the Church of Rome.

Mr. Mede's second reason is, that the Prophet Malachi refers; in ver. 6. of the last chapter, to the Day of Judgement. 'If we will not admit the day here described to be the Day of Judgement', he says, 'I know scarce any description of that day in the Old Testament but we may elude.' Dr. Allix remarks in the first place, that by 'the earth', in ver. 6, nothing more is denoted than the land of Judea, according to the clear and acknowledged import of the word in numerous other places; and that the anathema threatened corresponds to the *securis ad radicem posita* of the Baptist, Matt. iii. 10. Secondly, the great and dreadful day of the Lord, is the day of his coming spoken of in the previous chapter. The Millenarians, indeed, would deny that either expression could be applied to the destruction of Jerusalem. Mr. Cuninghame affirms, that he 'knows of no text which speaks of our Lord's coming at that catastrophe': and he reminds us, that 'the eminently profound and learned Bishop Horsley entirely rejects the fancy of a coming of the Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem.' The Bishop is not quite so positive and sweeping, however, in his assertion on this point, as this gentleman represents. In combating, very properly, the notion of some Interpreters who would refer the phrase *exclusively* to the destruction of Jerusalem, the learned Prelate attempts to prove, that 'the figurative use of the phrase is very rare, if not altogether unexampled in the Scriptures of the New Testament, except, perhaps, in some passages of the Book of Revelation';—an exception which must materially deduct from the weight of the Bishop's authority in Mr. Cuninghame's estimation. We entirely agree with the learned Prelate, that the phrase, in by far the majority of instances, points to the literal and final coming of Our Lord in all the majesty of the Godhead. But we cannot see how any one can question that, in ver. 27. of Matt. xxviii, the destruction of Jerusalem is referred to,—unless it be denied that that event is alluded to at all in the preceding

verses, and that Our Lord's admonitions and cautions had any reference to the time of the Roman invasion and the overthrow of the temple. If any person will assert this, it would be idle to waste any argument in refuting a palpable absurdity\*.

In ver. 23 of the tenth chapter, we meet with this same phrase, *εἰς ἃν ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*; where, whatever construction be put upon the words, the final coming of Our Lord cannot be intended. And again, in ch. xvi. 28, a coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom,—that is to say, a manifestation of his regal power and glory, must be meant, distinct from that which is spoken of in the preceding verse. According to Calvin and the most judicious expositors, the Son of Man coming in his kingdom, is equivalent to his setting up his kingdom or reign on earth,—namely, by the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit and the signs and wonders which attested his exaltation to be a Prince and a Saviour †. The Church is that kingdom which was then visibly established, and against which the gates of hell were found unable to prevail. No sound critic will lay any stress upon the mere word *ἐρχόμενος*, the force of which depends altogether upon the connexion. The same remark will apply to the phrase, the day of the Lord; but it is evident from St. Peter's application of the prophecy of Joel in Acts ii., that he understood the destruction of Jerusalem to be the event there referred to.

Mr. Mede's third reason is grounded upon Our Saviour's own words, spoken *after* John was beheaded, and yet seemingly referring to the coming of Elias as a future event: "Elias shall come and shall restore all things." Dr. Allix forcibly replies, that, if we understand Our Lord to refer to a future event, his declaration was no answer either to the question of the disciples, or to the objection of the scribes; for the Jews at that time admitted not two comings of the Messiah, and the question related to the evidence of his first advent. The words ought evidently to have been rendered agreeably to the English idiom: 'Elias was indeed first to come, and was to restore (or reform) all things.' The same phraseology occurs, Matt. xi. 3. Besides, had Our Saviour spoken of a second coming of Elias, how was it possible, asks Dr. Allix, for his disciples to under-

\* The thrice repeated threat, *ἔρχομαι σοὶ ταχύ*, (Rev. ii. 5, 16; iii. 3.) clearly points to an approaching hour of trial and the calamities with which the Seven Churches were visited.

† *Adventum verò regni Dei, intellige gloria celestis manifestationem quam à resurrectione auspiciatus est Christus, et plenius deinde Spiritum Sanctum mittendo et mirificas edendo virtutes, exhibuit.* Calvin in locis. By others, the visible exhibition of his mediatorial glory in the Transfiguration is understood, as a figure and evidence of his final coming. The connexion in which the words occur, sanctions this view.

stand that he spoke of John the Baptist, when he added, "But I say unto you, that Elias is come already?" Mr. Mede is at a loss to know in what sense the words of Malachi were verified by the mission and ministry of the Baptist, since 'the restitution of all things' belongs to the *second* advent of Christ, according to St. Peter's language, Acts iii. 21. But either Mr. Mede, to be consistent, must have denied that Malachi speaks of the first coming of Christ; or he must admit, that John the Baptist did accomplish all things to which the prediction referred.\* The declaration of the angel to Zacharias, Luke i. 15—17, is, indeed, so full and unequivocal upon this point, that nothing but the strong prepossession of an hypothesis could have led this learned and pious man to raise a doubt upon the subject.

But supposing that our Lord meant to speak of an Elias yet to come, as the harbinger of his second advent, then how, Dr. Allix asks, 'can Mr. Mede blame the Jews for adhering to the Law of Moses until the second coming of the Messiah, seeing that Malachi commands them to observe it till Elias should come?' 'Or how can he avoid embracing the tradition of the Jews, who have maintained for many ages, (and pretend to ground it upon Jeremiah,) that Elias is to come in order to discover to them the Ark and the Curtains which Jeremiah hid in Mount Nebo, before the burning of the Temple by Nebuzaradan?' The Papists, the learned Author remarks, cannot pretend to deny the authority upon which this fable rests; (referring to 2 Macc. ii. 4, which Mr. Irving's Oracle, Ben Ezra, cites with so triumphant satisfaction;) but Dr. Allix expresses his conviction, that Mr. Mede would not have allowed its validity.

'We cannot abstain from laughing at the fancies of the Romanists, who, having imagined several chimeras concerning Antichrist, pretend that the Jews are to embrace Antichrist, and to adhere to him, and, by a natural consequence, suppose that Elias is to come in person, in order to reclaim them from their horrid error. This, indeed, might be called a restoration; but Mr. Mede was far from such an opinion, though the authority of the Fathers is as much for this as for the first; almost all the Fathers in general having falsely explained after that manner, John v. 43. For my part, it seems that, granting, according to the opinion of the Jews, that Elias is to come before the appearing of the Messiah, and that Elias is a second time to come before the Day of Judgement in order to convert the Fathers and the Church of Rome, it would be more natural to believe that Elias is to come in person, than to suppose that such a prophet as John the Bap-

---

\* Ἀποκατάστασις, as interpreted by Hesychius, is τελείωσις, accomplishment. Campbell renders the verb, accordingly, *consummate*; Doddridge, *regulate*. The sense is illustrated by Matt. xi. 13.



ist was, is to come, who wrought no miracles. For such a prophet as St. John the Baptist was, must go into all the parts of the world where the Jews are at present dispersed, to convert them: whereas, according to the notion of the Sibylline Oracles, Elias would perform that with greater ease, he being to be carried in a fiery chariot where he pleases, and by such an astonishing appearance, engage the Jews to receive the Messiah.

Ben Ezra and his Translator embrace the notion, that Elias is to come *in person*. The conversion of the Jews, Mr. Irving believes, will be effected 'chiefly by the sending of Elias, who 'is promised before the dreadful and terrible day of the Lord.' (Prel. Dis. vol. i. p. v.) But he does not condescend to give his reasons for the belief. Ben Ezra is more explicit. He affirms, that Malachi iii. 1, 'is manifestly and properly spoken of the prophet Elias, and of his mission still future, and at the same time, *though indirectly and secondarily*, of the mission of St. John the Baptist, who came in the spirit of the power of Elias.' And how, does the reader imagine, our worthy Jesuit gets over the declaration of our Lord in the xviiith of Matthew? *By boldly transposing the 11th and 12th verses*, so as to make our Lord *add* to his reference to John the Baptist, a declaration that Elias in his own person was yet to come!! (Vol. II. p. 303.) On this point, however, as on almost every other, the Students of Prophecy differ.

Mr. King is positive that Elijah was only the incarnation of an angel, who re-appeared in the person of the Baptist, and is to return a third time before the supposed personal reign of Christ on earth. (Miscels of Criticism, Vol. I. pp. 221—315.) The collocutors in the Dialogues on Prophecy (Part III. pp. 236—239) have ascertained, as they imagine, that it is not the person, but the spirit of Elias, which is to precede the second coming of Christ. *This spirit has come already.* "The spirit of prophecy has been in abeyance, as it were, ever since the third century, a period of 1500 years, until now, when it has pleased God to awaken the attention of his Church again to the subject, and to excite many persons in every part of England, at one and the same time, to cry, *Fear God and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgements is come.* The virgins are gone out to meet the bride; the cry is making, *Behold the Bridegroom cometh, go ye out to meet him.* This then, is the spirit of Elias, testifying *IN US*, of the second coming of Christ in his glorified body, as it did in John, of the first coming of Christ in his body of humiliation."—"Philalethes—I think you have made out this case *very clearly!*"

Hamilton on Millenarianism, pp. 223, 4.

Thus it seems, that John the Baptist was no more the Elias of Malachi, than the Prophet Frere or the Prophet Irving, or the King Saul among the Prophets, the Lord of Albury. We should ourselves prefer the notion of the Sibylline

Oracles, Lactantius's great authority, that Elias is to descend in a chariot and fire; because, if we must have absurdity, let it be poetical and venerable. But the emphatic words of our Lord, while they prepare us for Jewish unbelief, convey a fearful reproof of such *ultra-Judaical* tampering with the Scripture: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John. And, if ye will receive it, this is Elias who was to come."

We have purposely refrained, in the present paper, from entering upon the subject of the Millennium itself, reserving that for a distinct article. It will be seen, that we are at issue with the Students of Prophecy as to the very preliminaries and rudiments. No writer on prophecy now-a-days, Mr. Cuninghame, tells us,

' can be justly expected to enter upon the proof of the future and certain restoration of the Jews to the land of the fathers, and that this event is also to precede the Millennium. . . Among the students of prophecy, these points are one and all considered as of the nature of *prophetic rudiments finally settled and set at rest*—no less so than the principles of gravitation and first elements of mechanics and chemistry are in the schools of human science.' p. ix.

This is amusing. But may we take the liberty of saying, that we lay claim ourselves to the modest designation of students of prophecy, albeit we have not attained to the inspired interpretation of it, nor have studied in the Albury school; and in our view, these rudiments are any thing rather than established axioms. That the Jews will be restored to Palestine, we neither affirm nor deny; but of this we are quite certain, that the supposed proofs deduced from the Old Testament prophecies, are, for the most part, entirely fallacious, resting upon an erroneous system of interpretation, and that the objections which lie against the doctrine, have never yet been satisfactorily disposed of. We are not unaware of the difficulties connected with the historical interpretation of some of the Old Testament predictions; difficulties arising sometimes from the strength of the figurative language employed; in other cases, from the deficiency of historical documents. But we must maintain, that more than equal difficulties attend the scheme of the Judaizing interpreters, who, whenever it suits their purpose, can allegorize and spiritualize away the literal import as unscrupulously as Origen himself. Dr. Allix's little work contains some highly valuable hints upon the subject of Prophetic Interpretation. As the volume is scarce, we shall perhaps receive the thanks of some students of Prophecy, for transcribing the rules which the Author lays down for the explanation of the Old Testament predictions.

Rule I. A Prophecy which foretels to the people of Israel their

destruction because they were fallen into idolatry, cannot be said to be fulfilled by a destruction which happened at a time when they were not guilty of idolatry. I make this observation in opposition to Jewish writers who pretend, that Moses and some other Prophets spoke, in the same prophecies, of the second destruction of their state by Vespasian, as well as of the first by Salmanazar and Nebuchadnezzar. The names of idolatry are exactly distinguished by Mr. Mede (*Com. in Ap. p. 192.*) And indeed, were we to suppose that such predictions of the prophets reach all events of the same nature, how is it possible to know the number of events that are included in the same prophecy?

II. A prophecy which supposes the distinction of the people into two kingdoms, cannot be supposed to be fulfilled but at a time when they are actually distinguished into two kingdoms; as they were after Jeroboam's time.

III. A prophecy which supposes a king in Israel, viz. over the Ten Tribes, and a king in Judah, viz. over the Two Tribes, cannot be fulfilled at a time when there is no king in the midst of them.

IV. A prophecy which supposes the distinction of Israel and Judah, as they were distinguished by their tribes and families, cannot be supposed to have its accomplishment, at a time when such a distinction is altogether lost among the people. This rule is of absolute necessity to confute the Jews at present. They are forced to confess, that their nation is so mixed and confounded that no one certainly knows the tribe or family he descended from.

V. A prophecy which specifies and denotes such events as concern some particular nations, such as the Philistines, the Moabites, the Ammonites, the Amalekites, the Idumeans, the Egyptians, the Chaldeans, cannot be considered as accomplished but with respect to those very nations denoted by those names.

VI. We must never apply those prophecies to other nations, which concern only Israel and Judah. This rule is necessary against those who fancy that many prophecies spoken literally of Israel, were accomplished after a spiritual manner, viz. when the Gentiles were called to the faith of the Gospel.

VII. We must not refer the prophecies of the ancient prophets to such events as are foretold in the New Testament, upon the account of some conformity and likeness which is found between those ideas and the ideas of the first prophets, as if these prophecies had not been fulfilled. This is quite wrong. For the new Prophets, such as St. John, borrow those ideas upon no other account, than because such like events were to happen to the Church after Christ, as had befallen the Jews before Christ, according to the predictions from which they borrow their expressions and their ideas. Thus, it would be ridiculous to apply the prophecies which were published against Babylon in Chaldea, to Rome, because Rome is called, mystically, Babylon.

VIII. We must never refer those promises of temporal blessings, on those threats of temporal curses, borrowed from the Law of Moses, to any other nation but to the carnal Israel and Judah, to whom the Prophets proposed them. The method of those that use allegoria, hath confounded the sense of a great many prophecies, when they en-

deavoured to make them agree with the spiritual blessings and curses proposed under the Gospel dispensation.

IX. It is very unnatural to suppose, that the Prophets passed over and omitted the nearest events, in order to speak of the latter ones, without taking any notice of those events which, according to the end and design of their ministry, and the expectation of the people to whom they were sent from God, they were nearly concerned in.

X. It is against common sense, when we apply those Oracles which speak of the people as being in such and such countries, to a time when they at present can no more be said to be in those countries than in any other, but are indifferently scattered in all parts of the world.

XI. It is ridiculous to apply to the Jews, as they are in their present condition, those Oracles which speak of them as *captives*, since they are no longer captives, but members of every kingdom or state in which they live; though, in some places, they are excluded from sharing in the government. This Rule is acknowledged by R. Aben Ezra, in several places of his book upon Obadiah and Daniel.

XII. It is ridiculous to apply those Oracles which promise the rebuilding of Jerusalem, to a time to come, without you suppose that Jerusalem will shortly be destroyed, that it may be rebuilt again; for it was rebuilt under Adrian, and continues a great city to this day, having been fortified by Christians, Saracens, and Turks.

XIII. There is no sufficient ground for denying that an Oracle was fulfilled before the coming of our Saviour, because it is quoted by some of the Writers of the New Testament; seeing, it must be owned, that the Apostles often mix some places of the Old Testament with what they treat of, by way of accommodation, and upon the account of the likeness which they found between the ancient events and the new ones which they foretell.

In addition to these Rules, the learned Author offers some critical remarks on the force of certain phrases and modes of expression which occur in the Prophetical writings, (such as, not one; *beacharith hajarain*, after that time; *la netsac*, for ever; *leolam* and *gnad olam*, *gnad dor vedor*, &c.), and on the figurative language applied to the overthrow of states, taken from the convulsions of nature; which are not reducible to a general canon. These Rules will of course appear to our modern Millenarians altogether inadmissible, for they are fatal to their whole scheme of interpretation. We are strongly inclined to believe, however, that every one of them is susceptible of being fully established; and they certainly strike us as being much more deserving of the appellation of *prophetic rudiments* and first elements of interpretation, than the assumptions which Mr. Cuninghame would lay as the basis of all inquiries into the import of Scripture Prophecy. We wish to speak, however, with all due humility, not knowing how far, by venturing an opinion of our own on the point, we may incur the same rebuke that Mr.

Cunninghame inflicts upon another Reviewer,—‘a man of piety and worth, who has obtained a very creditable degree of knowledge on the subject of prophecy, but who has overrated his attainments, which certainly are not of that extensive and profound nature’, we are told, that is required for the high task of reviewing the writings of the Millenarians! Leaving, therefore, these Rules for the consideration of the erudite, profound, and inspired among the Students of Prophecy, we shall conclude the present article with a few desultory observations of a general nature.

In the first place, we wish to guard against the possibility of being understood to have any doubts as to the eventual recovery of Israel from that state of blindness which has befallen them, and their restoration to the Divine favour. Upon this point, it seems to us that the language of St. Paul is clear and decisive; nor can it be otherwise understood, Dr. Allix remarks, than of the nation’s being converted to the Christian religion, when the fulness of the nations is brought in. And this belief furnishes every motive to compassionate their present condition, and to labour for its melioration, that can be supplied by the doctrine of their literal restoration to Palestine. There is much good sense and good feeling in the following remarks.

‘Far be it from those who entertain this simple belief to be heedless of Israel’s welfare! No: remembering the glory that once pertained to them,—remembering all the benefits instrumentally derived from them, and, especially, that from them, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, “who is over all, God blessed for ever,” they are “beloved for the fathers’ sakes;” and the more abject their present condition, the more generously should we strive to soothe them in their exile, and to compensate them for their loss of temporal possessions. But let the efforts of Christian charity be made intelligently; let the end contemplated be clearly understood, and be pursued upon substantial grounds, and let the means employed be suitable.

‘Look at the wretched Jews—wretched, not more sensibly so, perhaps, than the great majority of Gentiles, but wretched more than others, by their mental degradation, and wretched, in comparison with their favoured ancestry. What is the present and perpetuating cause of their wretchedness?—Their disbelief of Christianity. Why are they a bye-word among the nations? Not because they are exiles, but because they are Jews. Why are they less privileged as subjects and as citizens? and what is the source of all the invidious distinctions that constitute their temporal degradation?—They are *Jews!* Talk to them of their nation’s return to Palestine, what does it avail?—It elevates them not—it relieves not a want—it removes not a woe—it breaks not a fetter. The Jew is a Jew still. His eye may brighten for a moment at the distant prospect of his nation’s glory, and, by anticipation, he may live in his posterity; but soon it sinks again in apathy, or roves in search of some present good. But, aim at his con-

version, there is plain, unquestionable duty, and its own sweet reward in the act; and, if effected, all that is truly worthy of desire in the end. The Jew becomes a *Christian*, and Christianity describes the circle of his wishes. Dissipate the delusions of Judaism, and the shackles that bound him in the prison-house of woe are broken. Then he waits not for uncertain happiness, and transitory, however certain; his heart dreams not of an earthly inheritance that must soon be left; but he has blessings in possession, an eternal inheritance inalienably secured. But is not the prospect of brighter days to Palestine his solace in his wanderings? And would you rob him of this sole comfort? I would make no allusions whatever to his expectations on that subject, either one way or the other; because, if they were groundless, I might help to confirm him in error, if my views accorded with his own; and should needlessly assail his prejudices, whether groundless or not; if I expressed an opinion in opposition to them. I would attack no prejudice not directly necessary to be removed; but preaching only "Jesus," I would leave the glories opened by the truth, to their own edifying influence.' pp. 152—156.

Our second observation relates to the representations of Mr. Cuninghame and others, relative to the salutary influence of their peculiar notions respecting the approaching Advent of our Lord, which they suppose is to usher in the Millennium. "If it be thus near at hand, then, remarks Mr. C., 'a great proportion of the generation now alive upon earth may actually witness his appearing.' Our belief is, that not only a great proportion, but every individual of this generation, and of all former, all future generations *shall* witness his appearing. And yet, Mr. Cuninghame would claim for his *peradventure*, a more salutary efficiency than our certainty.

'Shall we be told,' he asks, 'that such a persuasion as this would produce no effect in awakening the secure, in alarming and filling with terror such of the ministers of Christ as have been either slumbering or sleeping at their posts, or have been minding earthly things rather than heavenly? . . . And say whether this would not give a more intense tone of solemnity and pathos to your denunciations of the wrath of God against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; and whether it would not infuse a new pathos, a new tenderness of spirit into your handling of the doctrine of reconciliation, while, standing as it were upon the threshold of eternity, you pointed to the cross of Christ for the last time, as the only refuge of a perishing world.' pp. xvi, xvii.

Making every due allowance for individual peculiarities, we say, no. A dying man preaching to dying men, requires but to realize his own responsibility and their condition, in order to have every emotion of tenderness, every feeling of earnestness awakened, of which his nature is susceptible. Our Leightons, and Baxters, and Whitfields, have not been Millenarians. *Their* zeal did not require the deleterious stimulant of fanaticism. If the ministers of our own day are slumbering at their

posts, it does not arise from any insufficiency in the motives for vigilance and laboriousness, which are involved in the creed they hold, but from the decay of faith itself. Mr. Cuninghame mistakes the matter altogether, when he ascribes to a mere opinion, the efficacy of a living principle of faith. A man may hold opinions, as we see every day, which shall have little or no influence upon his conduct. Every man knows that his death is certain, the period uncertain; and almost every one admits, that, after death, there is "the judgement." Will Mr. Cuninghame maintain, that this persuasion has not a natural tendency to produce diligence to make sure our election of God? Yet, "all men have not faith," and the most awful and stirring truths fall upon the ears of the dead. In like manner, a man may be brought to embrace the Millenarian hypothesis, may believe that he stands a chance of being alive at our Lord's second advent, and his imagination may even be powerfully excited by the expectation; while his conduct shall remain totally uninfluenced by the practical considerations connected with his new opinion, because he is not the subject of that Divine principle which alone purifies the heart, and overcomes the world. Opinion, we repeat it, is not faith. The disease of the times is not speculative, but practical unbelief, which the nostrums of Millenarianism have no power to remedy.

But the effect of their doctrines, we know to be the very reverse of that which Mr. Cuninghame attributes to them. Of his own sincere piety and philanthropy we entertain no suspicion; but he has associated and identified himself with individuals of a different spirit,—with men who hold, that 'Satan will never be made to give up his reign *by any preaching of the Gospel*';\*—that 'the doctrine of the Atonement hath swallowed up every other doctrine, and become the great indulgence of ignorance and idleness'; †—that '*more truth is to be found in popery, buried under the rubbish with which it has been smothered, than in Evangelicism*'. ‡ Truly, these are the men to handle the ministry of reconciliation with new tenderness, and to point sinners to the cross of Christ!

The tendency of the Millenarian delusion has, in former times, been repeatedly illustrated upon a broad scale. On its first appearance, at the beginning of the third century, at Arsinœ in Egypt, it is said to have 'gained such ground among the Christians, that it banished from their thoughts the most important precepts of their religion; and in alliance with the gross doctrines of Cerinthus, and the puerilities of Papias and Nepos, it had the most unhappy effect upon the Church at

\* Dial. on Proph. iii. 176.

† Irving's Fast Sermon, p. 18.

‡ Def. of Students of Prophecy, p. 57.

large. In the tenth century, the prevailing notion that the end of the world was at hand, contributed to give rise to the madness of the Crusades. In the seventeenth century, the epidemic frenzy of the fifth-monarchy men, 'the proud turbulence of political interpretation,' was allied to the same delusion. And in the present day, Millenarianism is discovering its inherent tendency to incorporate with itself errors far more pernicious than itself;—the denial of the consciousness of the separate spirit,—the Antinomian heresy,—the blasphemous attribution of evil to the Divine will and working,—the depreciation of evangelical preaching—the claim, on the part of more than one of its doctors, to inspiration,—and the crowning folly and impiety of one of their Writers, *that the day of judgement is past* \*. In some of the cases we allude to, Millenarianism would seem to be the offspring—in others, the parent of the error or errors with which it has become amalgamated; and, in some instances, it might almost be said to have taken with itself seven other spirits more wicked than itself.

The Author of the "Defence" complains, however, of Dr. Hamilton for having adverted to the wild opinions of certain students of prophecy upon other subjects, in order to create an unjust prejudice against them; and he would fain tie us down to the subject of the Millennium. This complaint indicates a sore feeling, which we are not sorry to perceive; but we must remind Mr. H. D., that it comes with a very ill grace from parties who, instead of confining themselves to the study of prophecy, or to the assertion of their opinions respecting the Millennium, include all subjects, theological, ecclesiastical, and political, within the range of their oracular decisions, and launch out sweeping invectives and calumnies against the Evangelicals, the Liberals, the Dissenters, the Reviewers, the hireling pastors, and the whole religious world. That the controversy is not confined to the Millenarian theory, who are to blame but the Millenarians themselves? This gentleman tells Dr. Hamilton, that,

'Several clergymen, as well Dissenters as in the Church, have received personal insults and coarse language, even in some instances amounting to cursing, from their evangelical brethren, such as no other branch of doctrine can, in these days, draw forth from the openly profane. When, in addition to this new information, you refer again to the pages of the Evangelical, Congregational, Eclectic, and Edinburgh Theological Magazines, and to your own book, you will indeed per-

---

\* See Hamilton on Millenarianism, pp. 96. 330. Thom's "Three Questions." p. 88. Eclectic Review for January, pp. 17, 18. *Ibid.* Second Series, Vol. XXVII. p. 329. Vol. XXX. p. 205.



ceive, that this subject has elicited an acrimony which no other has had power to do.' p. 117.

If we might judge of the credibility of the former part of this statement, from the accuracy of the latter part, we might safely dismiss the whole representation as totally unfounded. Mr. H. D. must, we feel persuaded, have been grossly misinformed. As regards the pages of our own Journal, he could not have made an assertion more uncalled for and unjust. Let him turn for himself to the articles which have appeared in the former series of the Eclectic Review, on the publications of Mr. Noel, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cuninghame, and Mr. Stewart, and he will feel bound, as a Christian and a gentleman, to retract the charge. If he should deem our critical treatment of Mr. Irving an exception, we must remind him, that it is not the Millenarian notions of that personage that have provoked our severest animadversions. But, so far are we from pleading guilty to the charge of acrimony with respect to those animadversions, that we should deem ourselves culpable and deserving of our readers' contempt, had we met with tame and pusillanimous forbearance, his arrogant assumptions and pestilent fanaticism. We can assure Mr. H. D., that we would, for their own sakes, conciliate, far rather than offend, those individuals whose piety and benevolence we honour, while we deprecate and deplore their errors. But we must "make a difference." The Writers whom he enumerates as ranking among Millenarians, differ not less widely from each other in their temper and character, than they do in their creed. With regard to Mr. H. D. himself, he is perfectly welcome to enjoy, undisturbed by us, his enlightened preference of popery to evangelicism,—of the *opus operatum* in baptism, to the opinion of Calvin with regard to the sacraments,—of the intolerance of the papists to civil and religious liberty,—and his paradoxical opinion, that

'America is the only nation in the world without a God. America has no national God. Christians living on its soil do not make it a Christian nation, any more than Turks living in England make the English nation Mahomedan. Turkey, Ava, China, and the Hottentots, are not so far removed from the truth in this matter as America and the London University; the great image before which our Liberals, Dissenters, and Evangelicals command us to fall down and worship.' p. 110.

Harmless monstrosities of opinion like these, we should never think of encountering with serious argument, or of opposing with ungenerous acrimony. They can do no harm, except to the party to which the writer has attached himself. In advert- ing to these and other aberrations of Millenarians, let it be observed, that we do not seek to prove that their opinions must

therefore be erroneous upon the original question; but simply to illustrate the uniform tendency of such notions to attract to themselves all sorts of floating error and epidemic absurdity.

Apart, however, from the accidental accompaniments of the Millenarian creed, we regard the doctrine itself as the offspring of Jewish error, repugnant to the genius of Christianity, hostile to all rational and Scriptural methods of propagating the Gospel, and adapted to weaken the influence of every consideration drawn from the joys or terrors of the world to come. By attempting to 'reduce heaven more palpably to the level of our comprehension and our hopes,' it operates a transmutation upon the object of our faith and hope, scarcely less debasing than that which the idea of the Deity suffers on being embodied in the image of corruptible man. It undertakes to bring the object nearer to the mind, but how does it do so? By substituting a kaleidoscope for a telescope,—by exhibiting the unreal, in place of the unseen, and interposing the gaudy illusions of earthly colouring between the eye of faith and eternity.

But to the believer; accustomed to dwell upon the animating assurance, that "if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens,"—to believe, that when "absent from the body," he shall be "present with the Lord,"—to sympathize with the Apostle's desire to "depart and to be with Christ," as far better than living in the flesh,—to regard the things which are not seen as eternal; and eternity as ever near,—a condition of existence into which a moment may introduce the conscious spirit,—to such a one, the apocryphal revelation of the Millenarians is an insipid dream. He knows, that death will be, to himself at least, the end of prophecy, the great revealer of secrets. And while he can rejoice in the glorious prospect of the future triumphs of Messiah and his Church upon earth, and thence derive strong encouragement to abound in the work of the Lord, he looks forward, through all the scenes of this world's history, to the period when, at the trump of God, this mortal shall put on immortality, and death be swallowed up in victory,—when there shall be no more curse, and the saints of God shall serve him, and see his face, and reign in bliss for ever and ever.

---

Art. III. *Guatemala, or the Republic of Central America in 1827-8: being Sketches and Memorandums made during a Twelvemonth's Residence.* By Henry Dunn. 8vo. pp. 328. London, 1829.

**T**O persons already in possession of the very scanty information before the public respecting this central portion of the