

THE HIEROPHANT;

OR

MONTHLY EXPOSITOR OF SACRED SYMBOLS AND PROPHECY.

No. VIII.—JANUARY, 1843.

DOUBLE SENSE OF PROPHECY.

TO PROFESSOR STUART.—LETTER V.

REV. AND DEAR SIR:

You are undoubtedly correct in supposing that the strong-hold of the defenders of the *double sense of prophecy* is the mode of quotation adopted by the New Testament writers. In this they find the most ample warrant for the principle which they maintain, nor have I any idea that their confidence in the soundness of their position will be at all diminished by the tone of assurance in which you proclaim the opposite result of your own critical examination of a considerable number of these citations: "I can find, then, no warrant in the New Testament for giving a *double sense* to the words of the Old Testament." And again, on another page: "With an open face, then, we ask: where is the proof, that either prophecy or any other part of the Old Testament or of the New, conveys a *double sense*?" The proof, I trust, has already been accumulated in respectable measure in my previous communications, and I engage that still more shall be forthcoming in the sequel, which it will be a matter of some little difficulty to dispose of, except upon principles of exegesis that will make sad havoc of these canons of common sense which your prolegomena so strenuously insist upon in the sober interpretation.

I am unable to perceive in what respect I have failed in showing that your first remark on the quotations in the New Testament comes entirely short of disproving the doctrine in question. To

say that one mode of quotation is 'when a passage in the Old Testament is simply and directly prophetic, and is appealed or cited as merely prophetic,' throws little or no light on the subject, because we cannot tell to *what particular quotations the rule applies*. From the most careful pondering of your remarks on this head I am wholly at a loss to determine, in regard to a multitude of texts, whether you would bring them into this class or not. How then is it possible to learn the force of your argument on this score, unless we know precisely how it bears upon those specific quotations which are all important in the discussion? Your statement, therefore, still leaves the matter undecided, inasmuch as it cannot be evinced that numerous passages coming under this head do not involve at the same time most unequivocal evidence of double sense. I have already referred to a large class of citations which are as 'directly prophetic' of the Messiah as any that can be adduced, in which he is predicted under the person of David or Solomon, or in other words, *through the medium of a double sense*. These instances might easily be multiplied to a great extent, but a sufficient number has been cited to show that your premises have utterly failed to sustain your conclusion.

As to the second mode, that of 'suggesting typical resemblances,' I aimed to show that your reasoning labored under great defect, from treating together, without sufficient discrimination, two entirely different classes of texts, viz., those that involved prophetic *types*, strictly so called, and those that were prophetic merely by way of *accommodation*. These should obviously have formed distinct heads, as the mere circumstance of their possessing in common the attributes of *resemblance* is not an adequate ground for bringing them into the same class. My remarks thus far have had respect mainly to what you have offered on the *accommodated* texts, in which I have aimed to evince that your application of that principle is in a high degree loose, inconsistent, and unsatisfactory. I now, according to promise, revert again to your theory of *typical prophecies*, with especial reference to the position, that *typical things* do not imply a *double sense of words*.

And here I must be permitted to introduce an extract of some length from Warburton, (*Div. Leg. of Mos.* Vol. II. B. VI. § 6.) who, in his examination of Cellius's theory, has perhaps treated the subject more elaborately than any other writer.

"It hath been shewn, that one of the most ancient and simple modes of human converse was communicating the conceptions by an expressive action. As this was of familiar use in civil matters, it was natural to carry it into religious. Hence it is we see God delivering his instructions to the prophet, and the prophet God's commands to the people in this very manner. Thus far the nature of the action, both in civil and religious matters, is exactly the same.

"But in religion it sometimes happens that a standing information is necessary, and there the action must be continually repeated. This is

done by holding out the truth (thus to be preserved) in a religious rite. Here then the action begins to change its nature; and, from a mere significative mark, of only arbitrary import, like words or letters, becomes an action of moral import, and so acquires the new specific name of Type. Thus God, intending to record the future sacrifice of Christ in action, did it by the periodic sacrifice of a lamb without blemish. This was not merely significative of Christ, which any other expressive action might have been, but was likewise a type of him; because the sacrifice being a religious rite, it had a moral import, under the Jewish dispensation.

“Again it hath been shewn how, in the gradual cultivation of speech, the expression by action was improved and refined into an allegory or parable; in which the words carry a double meaning; having besides their obvious sense, that serves only for the envelope, a more material and secret one. With this figure of speech all the moral writings of antiquity abound. But when it is transferred from civil use into religious, and employed in the writings of inspired men, to convey information of particular circumstances, in two distinct dispensations, to a people who had an equal concern in both, it is then what we call a double sense; and undergoes the very same change of nature with an expressive action converted into a type; that is, both the meanings in the double sense are of moral import; whereas in the allegory one only is so; and this, which arises out of the very nature of their conversion, from civil to religious matters, is the only difference between expressive actions and types, and between allegories and double senses.

“From hence it evidently appears, that as *types* are only religious expressive actions, and *double senses* are only religious allegories, and receive no change but what the very manner of bringing those civil figures into Religion necessarily induces, they must needs have, in this their tralatitious state, the same logical fitness they had in their native. Therefore, as expressive actions and allegories, in civil discourses are esteemed proper and reasonable modes of information, so must *types* and *double senses* in religious; for the end of both is the same, namely, communication of knowledge. The consequence of this is, that our author’s proposition,—a *secondary* or *double sense* is enthusiastic and unscholastic, the necessary support of his grand argument is entirely overthrown. This is the true and simple origin of types and double senses, which our adversaries, through ignorance of the rise and progress of speech, and for want of knowing ancient manners, have insolently treated as the mere issue of the distempered brain of visionaries and enthusiasts.”—pp. 268–270.

He then goes on to show that the *essential nature* of a *typical action* and a *prophecy with a double sense* is in fact the same, and that the use of both is precisely what might be expected in a system designed, like Judaism, to foreshadow another and ultimate system to which it was preparatory, and which was finally to be developed out of it. The prophetic intimations of such an introductory system would necessarily be more or less obscure, as otherwise the divine purpose of a disciplinary training of the chosen people under the previous economy would have been liable to be defeated. For “had the people known it to be only preparatory to another, founded on better promises and easier observances, they would never have borne the yoke of the law, but have shaken off their subjection to Moses, before the fullness of time had brought

their spiritual deliverer among them. This information, therefore, was to be delivered with caution, and conveyed under the cover of their present economy. Hence arose the fit and necessary use of *types and secondary senses.*"

Bishop Chandler, in his 'Defence of Christianity' (Vol. III. p. 263) speaks to the same effect: "For this cause, in predictions a certain mean is to be preserved; the general matter is to be plain; but other circumstances are to be so signified, as to hinder men from nauseating their present estate, and yet not prevent their bearing a share in future events that are to be executed by human instruments. Men ought not to see with that evidence as to be constrained to believe; and yet to have so much light as to be left without excuse for not believing. Upon such grounds the prophets may have been moved to conceal much of what was intended for the Messiah, in types, and allusions, and enigmas; to presignifying spiritual things in earthly and temporal expressions, and under the terms of several parts of worship in the Jewish religion, to denote other things analogous to them in the Christian. And these prophecies were to remain in that obscurity till the days of their accomplishment began to dawn."

I trust you will find in these remarks a sufficient answer to the question which you have elsewhere propounded: "I they (the Old Testament writers) have foretold a Messiah, why not have them to speak out this great truth plainly, simply, without any *ιπονοια* or occult sense?" Even if it were not possible to assign a reason so satisfactory as that given above, yet I would fain hope that you would allow all occasion for such bold questioning to be cut off by the palpable evidence of the fact, that infinite wisdom *has* seen fit to couch these announcements in a shaded and mystic diction. That the fact is a very troublesome one on the principles of your essay I can readily conceive, but the evidence of it is not so easily to be spirited away.

And now as to your momentous distinction between types of *things*; and *double senses of words*, let us rub this head of wheat in our hands, and see if any thing else than chaff comes out. And in the first place I remark, that the distinction is opposed by the plain and unequivocal *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers. Their language obviously implies that they knew nothing of this subtle discrimination between an *acted* and a *spoken* type. Thus, Ezek. 24: 2, 3: "Son of man, write thee the name of the day, even of this same day: the king of Babylon set himself against Jerusalem this same day. And *utter a parable* unto the rebellious house, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God: Set on a pot, set it on, and also pour water into it," &c. Here the typical *action* is called a 'parable,' which the prophet was to 'utter.' So the apostle, Heb. 9: 9, calls the Jewish tabernacle "a parable (*παραβολή*) for the time then present," whereby the Holy Ghost signified 'a greater and more perfect tabernacle "not made with hands." Thus too Heb.

11: 19, it is said of Abraham, who had *intentionally* offered up Isaac, though prevented in the execution, that he received his son from the dead “*in a parable* (επιπαροβολή),” i. e. in an acted semblance. Our Saviour’s words, Matt. 24: 32, are probably to be construed on the same principle: “Now learn a *parable* of the fig-tree; when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh.” Here was a parabolic lesson taught without words in the natural vegetative action of the fig-tree. Yet a parable is properly a figurative *discourse*. It is therefore perfectly in accordance with scriptural usage to say, that the Holy Spirit *speaks* to men by *acted* types or *types of things*, and if there is a double sense to the *things*, so there is to the *words* in which they are couched. If any more decisive proof of this is needed, it is afforded by the following passage from Ezek. 24: 15–19: “Also the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes with a stroke: yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down. Forbear to cry, make no mourning for the dead, bind the tire of thine head upon thee, and put on thy shoes upon thy feet, and cover not thy lips, and eat not the bread of men. So I spake unto the people in the morning: and at even my wife died; and I did in the morning as I was commanded. And the people said unto me, Wilt thou not tell us what these things are to us, that thou doest so?” Here the ‘speaking’ to the people was by means of the *symbolic deportment* which he was commanded to observe on the death of his wife. This is clearly intimated, v. 24, where it is said, “Thus Ezekiel is unto you a *sign* (כֹּזֶם a *type*, Gesen. ‘signum rei futuræ’); according to all that he hath done, shall ye do.” So the phrase, ‘men wondered at,’ Zeck. 3: 9, אֲבָשׁוּ יָבֵר, which properly signifies *men of sign* or *men of type*, that is, men sustaining a *typical character*, or whose actions on special occasions were invested with a prophetic significancy, equivalent to a double sense. The same idea is conveyed by the prophet’s words, Is. 8: 18, “Behold, I and the children God hath given me, are *for signs and wonders* (לְאִתּוֹת וּלְמוֹתָיו for *signs and types*) in Israel, from the Lord of hosts.” The general intimation, of which the above are specific instances, is contained in the words, Hos. 12: 10: “I have spoken by the prophets and I have multiplied vision; and used *similitudes* (אֲדַמְּתָה have *likened*) by the ministry of the prophets.”

But, secondly, I observe that the distinction, so far as it is unintelligible, is frivolous. What is there in the nature of the case that makes it important? The lamb of the paschal sacrifice, or of the daily sacrifice, had a double meaning, but the word ‘lamb’ in this connexion has but its primary literal sense. Let it be admitted; yet when we hear the harbinger of our Lord exclaiming, “Behold the *lamb of God* that taketh away the sin of the world,” of what violence are we guilty when we say that a double sense pertains to

the words of the institution ? Certain it is that there is an *import* in the transaction beyond that which is conveyed by the simple letter of the narrative, and though you may affirm that this import resides not in the words, but in the action recorded, I cannot perceive that the distinction is of any assignable moment. But even if we admit your view of it in regard to certain typical *things*, how is it when we come to the consideration of typical *persons* ? David, you will concede, nay, you have expressly conceded, was a type of Christ. Consequently, the name 'David' must designate, in this relation, not merely the veritable son of Jesse, the king of the literal Israel, but that exalted personage who is mystically shadowed forth under this title, and who sustains the same relation to the spiritual Israel that David did to the literal. This, in my apprehension, amounts, to all intents and purposes, to a *double sense*. If it be not, I think a fair premium may safely be offered for the discovery of one in the whole compass of revelation. Indeed, if this be not an instance in point, the ground of controversy is shifted, and the grand question in debate becomes, what *is* a double sense ?

I need scarcely remark, however, that it is by no means essential to the validity of my argument to disprove your position upon this particular head. He who grants that the genius of the Jewish dispensation was essentially typical and symbolical, grants all that is requisite as a basis for the conclusion that I have taken it upon me to affirm. It is a matter of comparatively trifling moment in what department of the ancient economy we detect the presence of the double sense. If it is *there*, no one has any need to be particularly scrupulous about recognising it in *words* any more than in *things* ; and that you do recognise it in some form I am not at liberty to question, when I hear you say, that "David, as king, was beyond all reasonable doubt a type of King Messiah ; and what is done in respect to the type, may, by the usage of the New Testament writers, be applied to the antitype." I acknowledge my debt of gratitude for such an admission. This will probably be sufficient for my purpose in the estimation of intelligent readers, who will be at a loss to perceive why their powers of abstraction should be tasked to comprehend such tenuous distinctions as you are inclined to insist upon.

Waiving, therefore, any further remarks upon your theory of types, I proceed to the array of still stronger evidence in support of the doctrine of the *double sense of prophecy*. And as this can only be satisfactorily made out by an appeal to the actual usage of holy writ, I shall promise myself your candid consideration of the following passages, which by no means exhaust the list, but which offer themselves on the most cursory survey of the field before me.

In the first and second chapters of the prophet Joel we have the prediction of a desolating plague of locusts, which I believe is usually understood by commentators in the literal sense. It begins

with an address to the drunkards and drinkers of wine to howl and weep on account of the injury that was to be done to the vines from which their beverage was drawn, by the ravages of these insects, ch. 1: 5-7: "Awake, ye drunkards, and weep; and howl all ye drinkers of wine, because of the new wine; for it is cut off from your mouth. For a nation is come up upon my land, strong, and without number, whose teeth are the teeth of a lion, and he hath the cheek teeth of a great lion. He hath laid my vine waste, and barked my fig-tree: he hath made it clean bare, and cast it away; the branches thereof are made white." Yet, in pursuing the prophecy in its details, very evident indications meet us, that it is not only the *death of insects* but the *devastations of war* that the prophet sets before us, and consequently that the invading armies of a foreign power are in fact denoted by the very terms which point, in their primary use, to the judgment of the beasts. They are described as 'a great *people* and a strong,' and their wasting progress is so depicted as to correspond most strikingly with that of hordes of plundering soldiery: ch. 2: 3-10: "A fire devoureth before them; and behind them a flame burneth: the land is as the garden of Eden before them, and behind them a desolate wilderness; yea, and nothing shall escape them. The appearance of them is as the appearance of horses; and as horsemen so shall they run. Like the noise of chariots on the tops of mountains shall they leap, like the noise of a flame of fire that devoureth the stubble, as a strong people set in battle array. Before their face the people shall be much pained; all faces shall gather blackness. They shall run like mighty men; they shall climb the wall like men of war; and they shall march every one on his ways, and they shall not break their ranks: neither shall one thrust another; they shall walk every one in his path: and when they fall upon the sword, they shall not be wounded. They shall run to and fro in the city; they shall run upon the wall, they shall climb upon the houses; they shall enter in at the windows like a thief. The earth shall quake before them; the heavens shall tremble: the sun and the moon shall be dark, and the stars shall withdraw their shining."

I know not indeed in what way your principles of exegesis would lead you to interpret this prophecy. But for myself, as at present advised, I am compelled to regard it as an indubitable example of *double sense*.

My second appeal is to the predictions of Isaiah respecting the destruction of Babylon. The passages it will be unnecessary to cite in full, as you are perfectly familiar with them, and I would occupy no more space than is necessary with extracts. You are well aware that the language of the prophet in describing the overthrow of this idolatrous and tyrannical city, is applied by John in the Apocalypse to the catastrophe of the mystic Babylon, which holds so prominent a place in the visions of that wondrous book.

Now I cannot be ignorant that I shall be giving utterance, in your eyes and those of a multitude of German critics, to an enormous exegetical heresy, when I express the most unwavering conviction, that the Holy Spirit, in inditing the original prophecy by the hand of Isaiah, had the ultimate application of it by John in his eye, and so framed the whole structure of the predictions as to give them the utmost pertinency to the fates of the antichristian city. I am aware that it is your wont to speak about the meaning of Isaiah himself, and of the other prophets, in their annunciations, but I choose to speak of the meaning of the Holy Spirit in those revelations which obviously transcended the limits of all human intelligence, and in which the prophets acted the part of mere amanuenses; for that this was their real character in relation to the utterance of prophetic oracles, is a confident assertion which neither 'all Achaia,' nor all *Germania*, shall hinder me from making. But of this, more in the sequel. My assertion is, that as these predictions are most unquestionably applied to a twofold Babylon, so they have in the nature of the case a *double sense*. I deem myself, at any rate, at perfect liberty to *assume* this position, and to hold it unflinchingly, till some valid reason be shown for relinquishing it. The *onus* of proof does not lie upon me, but that of disproof lies upon you. When the same language is actually applied by the sacred writers to two different events, I have a right to consider it as *intended* to be so applied by the Holy Spirit, and if so, to regard him as adopting a *double sense*; for what else can it be, if the same words are spoken of two different subjects? If you deny the truth of this, you are bound to show it. When I find the inditing Spirit declaring by the Old Testament prophets that the literal Babylon the great is fallen—that it shall be inhabited no more—that the wild beasts of the desert shall lie there—that the houses shall be full of doleful creatures—that owls shall dwell and satyrs dance there—that it shall be a perpetual desolation: and when I find John in the Apocalypse saying in almost identical language, "Babylon the great (the spiritual Babylon) is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," I cannot resist the belief that both events were equally present to the view of the Omniscient Prompter, and that he expressly designed that the same language should describe both, or in other words, that it should possess a *double sense*. You may indeed speak, as you expressly do, of the mind of the inspired writer, and of *his* particular intention, and reject the idea of his being merely an *automaton*, uttering words which he did not understand; but I know nothing of all this. My creed of inspiration recognises no such personal intelligent, or conscious design on the part of the prophets in their annunciations. I regard them as mere amanuenses of the Holy Ghost, speaking as they were moved by his mysterious impulse, and made to convey,

under a sense which they *did* intend, another and an ulterior sense which they *did not* intend. I am well aware that I shall lay myself open to the charge of an almost barbarian ignorance of the vast advances made by Eichhorn, Gesenius and others, in clear and rational views of the inspiration of the sacred writers, by such an old-fashioned style of remark as the above. I shall doubtless betray my 'thrice-sodden simplicity' by speaking much more explicitly of the sense and meaning of the Holy Spirit in his word, than of the sense and meaning of Isaiah, Daniel, or John. But for this I must crave pardon; the habit has probably become incorrigible of speaking of the Spirit of God as the true author of the Bible, and of its sense as his sense in all and every part. If the genius of modern improvement and refinement in this sphere of biblical science can be propitiated by such an honest and homely acknowledgement, I hope it may be. Otherwise I fear my *greenness* will fare hardly at its hands.

Another remarkable instance of the same character, is that class of predictions which relates to the restoration of the Jews from their captivity and exile under their Assyrian conquerors. I see not how to avoid the inference that another and a future return to their own land is actually announced under the terms which declare that from their Babylonish bondage. Nor do I perceive how, upon the principles so unequivocally laid down in your critique on Dr. Duffield, you can yourself consistently hold to any other interpretation. You object, in a series of most stringent criticisms, to his *literal* mode of understanding those prophecies. You insist upon the fact, that his assertions and theories are in point-blank contradiction to the drift of the apostle's reasonings in the epistle to the Hebrews, which you affirm are utterly at war with the idea of any such prophetic destiny of the Jews as would imply their literal return to Palestine, and the re-establishment of a Judaic, or Judaico-Christian, polity. Yet here are the prophecies expressly announcing, *according to the letter*, such an order of events. What do they mean? You affirm that they are not literally to be understood. Consequently the only alternative is to construe them *spiritually*; i. e. in a double sense. The words *sound* one thing, they *signify* another. I am not blessed with a capacity to discern how this differs from the admission of the very doctrine which I am humbly endeavoring to advocate.

But, finally, I affirm the theory of a double sense of prophecy, on the ground of the very nature of the symbolic and pictured imagery under which a large portion of it is conveyed. The holy seers, when made the organs of prophetic revelations, were wrought into a state of extatic trance. In this state a great variety of visionary phenomena were presented to their mental eye. These they have described, and the description forms a *sense*; but this is not the whole sense; the objects seen in vision couched under them a latent purport which could only be fully and adequately disclosed

by the event. This was their occult or ultimate sense, which is clearly enough distinguished from the literal or primary. Daniel beholds and describes four wild, raging, rampant beasts ascending out of the sea, and representing four great worldly empires. In the literal description of these beasts we had the first sense, and so far as he had any object in writing it was to give a faithful statement of the various *visa* presented to his imagination. But the Holy Spirit had an object ulterior to this, which was to foreshadow in this way a series of grand dynasties which time should develop, and which constituted the secondary sense of the prophecy. Here are obviously two senses, neither of which can be denied, nor both confounded.

It is indeed possible that you may deny it on the ground taken in your strictures on Dr. Duffield, where you say, p. 157: "Types are not language, but *things*; *symbol* is not language, but *thing*." In reading this I find myself again, as I have frequently been before while conversant with your pages, brought up all of a sudden in regard to former fixed notions of the meaning of words. As I suppose these peculiar usages are established by the high authority of the modern philological potentates of Germany, with whose prodigious advances I have not been able to keep up, I cannot but write in a perpetual tremor lest I should be caught tripping in my use of language, and should speak as if the same words had the same meaning that they have had in the mouths of divines and expositors with whom the Christian world has been so long familiar. I had certainly supposed, till informed by you to the contrary, that there were *verbal* as well as *real* symbols. It had never entered my thoughts that I was guilty of any mal-application of language in saying, that a prophetic vision, like those of Daniel, for instance, was a symbol, and that the language describing such a vision was symbolical language, or language conveying a double sense. I can easily admit that a lamb is a *typical thing*; but I do not so easily perceive how a lion seen in a vision, and representing an empire, is a *symbolical thing*. Such an object has no real existence; it is a mere fantasy of the mind, an ideal creation, a hieroglyphical picture painted by Omnipotence on the tablet of the imagination. Why should such a visioned image be called a *thing*? The object represented by the image is a *thing*; but what propriety is there in calling the *image* itself a *thing*? But however this may be, would any one who was not mystified by refinements doubt that the language of John in the Apocalypse respecting the horsemen of the Euphrates had a double sense? And why? Simply because the language is symbolical, and in its own nature requires to be thus understood. The same is of course to be said of nearly the whole mystic *materiel* of the Apocalypse. Its entire structure is symbolical, and as to its being rightly construed on the principle of double sense, I should no sooner doubt of this than I should doubt

of the book's being composed of letters and words. I am only astonished, in the review of what I have written, that any thing should have made it necessary to spend so much time in proving a point so exceedingly obvious as *the double sense of prophecy*.

Very respectfully,

Yours in the Gospel,

GEO. BUSH.

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

EXPOSITION OF DANIEL VII. 9—28.

[CONTINUED.]

Yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time Chal. זמן וְיָמֵן צַד וְאֶרְבַּת בְּחַיִּין יְהִיבַת לְהוֹן צַד *and a prolonging in life was given to them unto a season and time.* This the Jewish writers take to imply that a continuance in life was granted for a season and a time *after* the fourth Beast was destroyed, and for this construction they seem to have plausible grounds, if our previous remarks were well founded. Yet it is evident that the respite must be short, for the kingdom of the saints, which is of *universal* extent, supervenes so speedily upon the extermination of the fourth Beast, that no power can be of long continuance which does not pertain to that holy economy.

The genuine import of the expression, צַד וְיָמֵן וְיָמֵן, Gr. *ἕως χρόνου καὶ καιρῶν*, for a season and a time, it would seem important accurately to determine in this connexion, and yet it is scarcely possible to elicit from it that absolute precision of meaning which would be desirable. The actual usage in regard to the terms will appear from the following citations: Eccles. 3: 1, "To every thing there is a *season* (זָמַן) and a *time* (צֵד) to every purpose under heaven." Neh. 2: 6, "So it pleased the king to send me and I set him a *time* (צֵד)." Est. 9: 27, "So as it should not fail, that they would keep these two days according to their writing, and according to their *appointed time* (זָמַן) every year." Est. 9: 31, "To confirm these days of Purim in their *times appointed* (זְמַנֵּיהֶם)." Dan. 2: 16, "Then Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him *time* (זָמַן), and that he would show the king the interpretation;" i. e. that he would grant him a definite time. Dan. 2: 21, "He changeth the *times* and the *seasons* (זְמַנֵּיהֶם)." Dan. 3: 7, "Therefore *at that time* (זְמַנָּהּ) when all the people heard the sound," &c. Dan. 7: 22, "Until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the *time* (זְמַנָּהּ) came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Ezra, 5: 3,

“ At the same time (זְמַנָּה) came to them Tatnai,” &c. Dan. 6: 10, “ He kneeled upon his knees three times (שְׁלֹשָׁתַיִם) a day, and prayed,” &c. Dan. 7: 25, “ And shall think to change times (יְמֵי) and laws.”

From this display of the *usus loquendi* it appears that the leading sense of זְמַן is that of a *fixed, prescribed, determinate season*, and in this respect it differs from the more general word *time*, as the Greek *καιρός* season differs from *χρόνος* time. This sense flows naturally from the verbal root זָמַן, which signifies to *prepare*, to *appoint*, to *fix*, to *have in readiness at a particular time*. It accordingly answers in the Targum to מְזִיז, of which the precise meaning is that of a *time definitely fixed and appointed*, and which is the usual term for the fixed festivals and solemnities of the Jews. As to the other term זְמַן, it is used for the most part in a wider sense, and answers more accurately to the Heb. זֶמַן time. In the cases however where it signifies *time* in the sense of a *year* it has a more definite import. It occurs only in the following cases: Dan. 2: 8, “ I know of a certainty that ye would gain the time (זְמַנָּה).” V. 9, “ Ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me, till the time (זְמַנָּה) be changed.” V. 21, “ He changeth the times (זְמַנָּה) and the seasons.” Dan. 3: 5, “ That at what time (זְמַנָּה) ye hear the sound of the cornet,” &c. In this case it corresponds to the sense of זְמַן as quoted above: Dan. 3: 7. And so also, Dan. 3: 15, “ Now if ye be ready that at what time (זְמַנָּה) ye hear the sound,” &c. Dan. 4: 16, “ And let seven times (שִׁבְעִימָּה) pass over him.” So also, vv. 23, 25, 32. Dan. 7: 25, “ And they shall be given into his hands for a time, times, and the dividing of time (זְמַן וְזְמַנִּים וְחֵצֵי זְמַן).”

On the whole, we know not that, in the present instance, a very marked distinction can be made out in the import of the two terms. They are perhaps employed together to give more emphasis to the idea of a *certain, fixed, determinate period* to which the prolonged or respited lives of the ‘rest of the beasts’ is to extend; for we think it important to bear in mind, in this connexion, that the true sense of the phrase is that of an appointed season and time *to* or *unto* which, rather than *during* which their lives were to be extended. This is the legitimate meaning of the original זְמַן *to*, and the sense that results is, that subsequent to the destruction of the fourth or Roman Beast, there was a determinate period fixed in the divine counsels and in the prophetic disclosures *unto* which the lives of the ‘rest of the beasts,’ or, as we have suggested, the co-existing Eastern powers, should be prolonged, but beyond which they should not reach. Whether it be possible to determine the precise length of this period, we are far from being satisfied. The domineering prevalency of the Beast and the Little Horn is predicted to cover the space of 1260 years, of which we shall have more to say in the sequel, and we find mention made in the last chapter of Daniel

of two other periods, one of 1290, the other of 1335 years. But whether these supplementary terms of 30 and 45 years have either or both of them any relation to the prorogued duration of the 'rest of the beasts,' we have not the means of affirming. We suggest it, however, as a point well deserving of inquiry, as also whether the destruction of the powers represented by the Dragon, Rev. 20 : 10, and which is posterior to that of the Beast and the False Prophet, be not in fact identical with that of these remaining beasts, and separated by about the interval of 75 years from the prior catastrophe of the fourth Beast. They are points upon which, with our present light, we do not feel prepared to speak with confidence. We are clear, however, in the conviction that the Eastern and Western regions of the old Roman *Ecumenè* are very distinctly regarded in the eye of Prophecy.

Ver. 13.

CHAL.

חָזָה הָיִיתָ בְּחֻזֵי לַיְלָא וְאָרִי
עַם-עֲנָנֵי שָׁמַיָא כְּבָר אֲנֹשׁ אֲתָה
הָוָא וְעַד-עֵתִיק יוֹמֵיָא מָטָה
וְקַדְמָתִי חֲקַרְבֵיָּי :

GR. OF THEOD.

Ἐθεώρων ἐν ὄραματι τῆς νυκ-
τός, καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου
ἐρχόμενος ἦν, καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιῶν
τῶν ἡμερῶν ἔφθασε, καὶ ἐνώ-
πιον αὐτοῦ προσηγήθη ἀντῶ.

ENG. VERS.

I saw in the night visions, and
behold, *one* like the Son of man
came with the clouds of heaven,
and came to the Ancient of days,
and they brought him near before
him.

LAT. VULG.

Aspiciebam ergo in visione noc-
tis, et ecce! cum nubibus cæli
quasi filius hominis veniebat, et
usque ad antiquum dierum perve-
nit; et in conspectu ejus obtule-
runt eum.

And I saw in the night visions. חָזָה הָיִיתָ בְּחֻזֵי לַיְלָא *I was beholding in the visions of night*; the same phraseology and conveying the same import of *continued contemplation* which we have already explained in v. 9. In the opening verse of the present chapter we are informed that, "In the first year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters." The contents of the entire chapter, considered as a whole, are called a 'dream,' and yet, as there were great variations of aspect in the scenery, he employs the word 'visions' to denote them. So, in the acting of a play, while the play is one, the acts are several, and the curtain is dropped and lifted as the action proceeds. The 'visions' of the prophet correspond to the acts of the drama. The whole dream of the prophet is divided into three such visions; the first including v. 2-6; the second, v. 7-12; the third, v. 13-15; the

remainder of the chapter being devoted to the angel's explanation. In the first the Divine Architect of the thoughts of his prophets presents to the entranced eye of the seer the succession of the Lion, the Bear, and the Leopard; which having exhibited their symbolical forms and wrought their symbolical acts, the first vision is brought to a close. The scene then shifts and another beast appears of monstrous form and still more monstrous doing, as he is seen devouring and breaking in pieces, and trampling the residue under his feet, himself to be trampled down by no fifth beast, but reserved for the judgment of the Ancient of days, the result of which is to cast his body to the burning flame. The scene then again shifts, and presents the Son of man coming to the Ancient of days, and receiving the everlasting kingdom of the earth under the whole heaven. Such is what may be termed the plot of this scenic exhibition, and we now come to that which may be considered as its paramount and crowning action. In regard to this, Jacchiades says: "Because the fifth kingdom shall be great and stable he says concerning it, 'in the night visions,' as he had said also concerning the fourth kingdom; for on account of its importance he had not included it in the order of vision of the three former beasts." That is to say, the paramount pre-eminence of this fifth kingdom is the reason why he introduces the account of it with the discretive formula, 'I beheld in the night visions.'

And behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven. Chal. וָאֵרָא בְּמִצְוֵי שְׂמַיָא אֶבְרָא אֶחָד הוּא אֶשְׁרֵי אֶחָד הוּא. Gr. καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν. As the grand object here presented to our contemplation is the Personage brought to the Ancient of days, so it would appear scarcely possible that we should fail of recognising in Him our blessed Lord in his glorified humanity. He alone it is to whom the title, the attributes, and the prerogatives so loftily set forth in the vision pertain. And accordingly his introduction into the scene is heralded, as it were, by an emphatic note of announcement in the word 'behold,' implying the occurrence of something grand, and momentous, and worthy of profound attention. The title by which he is ushered before us is, אֶשְׁרֵי אֶחָד, *one as, or like, the Son of man*, where it is to be remarked that the term אֶשְׁרֵי is equivalent to the Heb. בֵּן, the more common word for *son*, and is referred by Gesenius to the root בָּרָא *to create, produce, beget*, while בֵּן comes from בָּנָה *to build*, from the fact of a son's *building up* a house or family. Others, however, trace it to the root בָּרַר *to select, to separate, to purge out, to cleanse*, and give it the import of *pure, elect, precious*, confirming it by an appeal to Luke 9: 35, where in connexion also with a heavenly cloud a voice was heard saying, "This is my beloved Son; hear him." The word is not of frequent occurrence in pure Hebrew, though we meet with it in the following instances: Ps. 2: 12, "Kiss the son (בֵּן), lest he be angry," &c. Prov. 31: 2, "What,

my son (בְּרִי) ? and what, *the son* (בֵּן) of my womb ? and what, *the son* (בֵּן) of my vows ?” In the Chaldee of Daniel it is oftener met with. Thus, ch. 3 : 25, “Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and the form of the fourth is *like the Son of God* (כְּבֵן אֱלֹהִים),” as if bearing an aspect of superhuman beauty, dignity, and majesty. Dan. 5 : 22, “And thou *his son*, (בְּרִי) O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart,” &c. Dan. 5 : 31. “And Darius the Median took the kingdom, *being about threescore and two years old*, (כְּבֵן as the son of, &c.)” The appellation here bestowed upon him, בֵּן אָנוּשׁ *Son of man*, implying, according to a distinction in the original between אָנוּשׁ and אִישׁ, *man in his weakness, frailty, and infirmity*, points undoubtedly to that subsequent human state of humiliation, abasement, and suffering, through which he was ordained to pass before entering upon his ultimate glory. Even while exhibited as clothed with the insignia of divinity, and as surrounded and served by the ministering hosts of heaven, he is yet called by a title that indicates him as a true man, and as participating in the lowliest lot of his brethren of human kind. And yet as all this was seen *in vision*, as he had not yet been actually manifested, and as it was designed that only a veiled and shadowed representation of future realities should be in that age vouchsafed, therefore the particle of similitude, כְּ *like, as*, is employed, as the general decorum of visionary presentment makes proper. In regard to all the symbolic anticipations of the person of the Messiah, the same shaded and comparative forms of speech are to be observed. The prophets seldom or never say in express terms that they *saw the Son of man*, but rather, as here, they beheld one *like the Son of man*, one who had evidently the form and aspect of a human being, and yet at the same time these lineaments of the human so blended with the air and emanations of the divine, that they were constrained to qualify the terms which bespoke him man. Thus Ezek. 1 : 26—28, “And upon the likeness of the throne was *the likeness as the appearance* of a man above upon it. And I saw as the color of amber, as the appearance of fire round about within it, from the appearance of his loins even upward, and from the appearance of his loins even downward, I saw as it were the appearance of fire, and it had brightness round about. This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord.” The vague and somewhat indistinct mode of representation here employed is obvious to every eye ; it is *the likeness of an appearance*. So also in the Apocalypse, ch. 1 : 12, 13, “And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks ; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks *one like unto the Son of man*, clothed with a garment down to the foot,” &c. So again, Rev. 14 : 14, “And I looked, and behold, a white cloud, and upon the cloud one sat *like the Son of man*, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle,” where we may remark, by the way, that as this is the vision of a period

respecting which it is said, "The hour of his *judgment* is come," we perceive the intimate relation between an appearance in *clouds* and the execution of *judgment*. All this is evidently in keeping with the nature of prophetic visions, in which objects are represented as in a dream, and described accordingly. Indeed a perfectly similar phraseology obtains in regard to the beasts of the former vision, of which the prophet says the first was *like* a lion, the second *like* a bear, the third *like* a leopard. The person of the Messiah, previous to his advent, which was only seen in ecstasy or trance, could hardly be described otherwise, and the true condition of the prophets under the influence of the divine afflatus must be duly appreciated in order to understand the character of the revelations made to them.

It is universally agreed by commentators that the appellation, 'Son of man,' which the Saviour so often applies to himself, and which is never, but in this instance and two in the Apocalypse, applied except by himself, is to be traced to its occurrence in this passage. The phrases, 'Son of God' and 'Son of man,' occur in reference to him with nearly equal frequency, and are each mentioned about eighty times. The former, though sometimes used by himself, is much oftener applied to him by others; whereas the latter is never given to him, with the above mentioned exceptions, by any but himself. It was perhaps natural that in speaking of himself he should employ a title which gave prominence to the idea of his *humanity*, while in being spoken of by his apostles a term would be employed giving more distinctness to the fact of his *divinity*. Besides, the assertion of this as his appropriate title would probably go further with the Jews towards identifying himself with the Messiah than any other which he could adopt; for it is obvious that prior to his coming the Jewish writers considered him who is represented in this passage as 'coming in the clouds of heaven,' as no other than their promised Messiah. The paraphrase of Jacchides, in which a multitude of Rabbinical authorities agree, puts this beyond a doubt. Upon the passage before us he says, "This is Messiah our righteousness, (Jer. 23: 6,) who shall come into the presence of God, and Elias the prophet shall introduce him before him, and to him shall be given dominion forever and ever." So Jarchi: "This is the king Messiah." Saadias: "This is Messiah our righteousness." This is clearly confirmed by the evangelical narrative Matt. 26: 64, 65, "Jesus saith unto them, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes saying, He hath spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of witnesses? behold now ye have heard his blasphemy." What more obvious than that they took this for an assertion of his claims to be the expected Messiah? Yet what did he say? Simply that he was Daniel's 'Son of man' coming in the clouds of hea-

ven (אָנִי *Anāni*); the rest was their own inference, which could have no other foundation than that Daniel was universally understood to have prophesied there of the Messiah. Indeed the original word for 'clouds' (אָנִי *anāni, cloud-wafted*) became with them a current term by which to denominate the Messiah. Our Lord seems therefore to have aimed especially at establishing his claim to this appellation, particularly as connected with the exercise of *regal power* and *judgment*. Indeed the Scriptural usage in regard to this title is so peculiar, and goes so strikingly to display its connexion with the character and office of the Messiah as exhibited in this visionary announcement, that it will be worth our while to dwell at some little length upon it. To the confession of Nathanael, John 1: 49, "Thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel," our Lord replied, v. 51, "Hereafter ye shall see heaven opened, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the *Son of man*." As if he had said, 'You profess to believe in me as the Christ, from the trifling circumstance of my telling you where you were at a particular time. Be assured you shall have greater evidence than this. You shall see the angels ministering to me. You shall see me in circumstances that will afford an ocular demonstration that I am that *Son of man* spoken of in the vision of Daniel, to whom the angels minister, and to whom the kingdom is given.' So far as this manifestation was made at the agony, the resurrection, the ascension, and the powerful coming of Christ at the destruction of Jerusalem, so far was this promise fulfilled.

In the conversation with Nicodemus, John 3: 12, 13, our Lord said to him, "If I have told you earthly things and ye believe not, how shall ye believe if I tell you of heavenly things? And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the *Son of man which is in heaven*, (ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ)." That is, who is represented in the vision of Daniel as *being in heaven*—whose visionary abiding place is heaven. This is probably all that the language, in this connexion, can fairly be understood to mean. The participle ὢν, *being*, is equivalent to ἦν, *was*, but is here used as more appropriate to express the idea of something that was *continuously characteristic* of our Lord. In like manner, the phrase, John 1: 18, ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, *who is in the bosom of the Father*, merely predicates of the Son the fact of his having always, previous to his manifestation in the flesh, abode in the bosom of the Father.

In Luke 9: 58, Jesus says to a certain man of Capernaum, "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the *Son of man* hath not where to lay his head." That is, the august person predicted in Daniel under the title of "Son of man," and who was to have the glory of a kingdom given him, is now in so poor and mean a condition, as not to have where to lay his head!

Mark 2: 27, 28, "And he said unto them, The Sabbath was
18*

made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. Therefore the *Son of man* is Lord also of the Sabbath." That is, as the Sabbath was made for man, and, as the law of it is rather positive than moral and immutable, therefore, the Son of Man, who is invested with supreme dominion, may rightfully modify or relax the strictness of its observances.

Again, with a latent reference to this passage in Daniel, it is said, John 5: 27, "And hath given him authority to *execute judgment* also, because he is the *Son of man*." This undoubtedly explains the grounds of the Apostle's language, Acts 17: 31, "Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will *judge* the world in righteousness, *by that man* whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance to all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead."

As to the accompaniment of *clouds*, it is not unimportant to mark the phraseology of the original, כִּבְּעָנִים *with clouds*. In the parallel passages, Matt. 24: 30, 26: 64, it is indeed ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, *upon clouds*, and in Mark 13: 26, ἐν νεφέλαις, *in clouds*; but in Mark 14: 63, and Rev. 1: 7, it is in strict accordance with the original, μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν, *with the clouds*. Whatever may have been the true import of this phrase, it certainly has the air of implying that he came *in conjunction with the clouds*, instead of more strictly *in* or *upon* them, and if it had been designed to employ clouds, as a symbolical term, to denote a *multitude of heavenly attendants*, it is evident that no form of expression could have been more appropriate than the present. That this idea is in fact latently couched in the phraseology before us we have a strong impression, and it is a fact well worthy of notice, that Paul, in 1 Thes. 4: 17, in saying that "we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them *in the clouds*," seems actually to convey the same idea, for his language is not that we shall be caught up, εἰς τὰς νεφελάς, *into the clouds*, but ἐν νεφέλαις, *in clouds*, i. e., as it would seem, *in multitudes*. It can hardly be supposed that the literal clouds, which usually float in the upper ether, shall take their departure with the translated quick from the surface of the earth, as a kind of vehicle of ascent; and as to any other sense which can be predicated of being 'caught up in the clouds,' it would seem difficult to establish one that is not precluded by the accompanying phrase, 'in the air.' Reserving, however, to the sequel a more expanded view of these parallelisms, we proceed in our exposition.

And came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him.—Chal. וַיָּבֹאוּ אֵלָיו וַיִּקְרָבוּ אֵלָיו וַיִּבְרָאוּ אֵלָיו—Gr. καὶ ἕως τοῦ παλαιῶν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐφθασε, καὶ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ προσηρέχθη αὐτῷ. Upon the appropriation of the phrase, "Ancient of days," to the person of God the Father, we have already dwelt in a former note. To this Divine Personage, the 'One like the Son

of man' comes, and into his presence is brought by the angelic convoy; the phrase, "they brought him," being merely equivalent to "he was brought," as we have already remarked. It is true there is nothing expressly said of the quarter or the direction from whence he came. We have the *terminus ad quem*, but not the *terminus a quo*. From the language of the vision itself, we could not determine whether it was intended to imply a descent from heaven to the earth, or an ascent from the earth to heaven. But we may perhaps be able to ascertain the true sense, from a comparison of all the circumstances, and this we shall attempt in the sequel.

H E A V E N.—ETYMOLOGY OF THE TERM.

NOTHING would be more interesting than to trace the progress of the ideas which, in different ages and among different races, have embodied themselves in this pregnant term. Something on this head may doubtless be learned from its probable etymology in the various languages in which it occurs, although we are here, as usual, obliged to encounter a host of uncertainties. In the Hebrew, the equivalent word for our English "heaven" is שָׁמַיִם *shama-yim*, which we are unable to trace to any living root in that tongue. But in the cognate Arabic the word *shama* signifies to be high or lifted up, and to this radical lexicographers do not hesitate to refer the Hebrew term, as denoting an object or locality that is high, lofty, sublime. The Greek word οὐρανός, *heaven*, is of more doubtful origin. Philologists are greatly divided in regard to it. By perhaps the greater part of them it is traced to ὀραῶ, *to see*, as referring to the visible space which stretches into infinity on every side of us. The Latin *cælum* is derived, not from the foregoing Greek term οὐρανός, but from another word in that language, κοίλον, signifying hollow. In this sense it imports, of course, that aspect of concavity which strikes us on looking up to the blue ethereal vault. Our English term "heaven," is traced back by etymologists to the verb "heave," of which the past tense was anciently "hove," and the participle "hoven," just as "help" made formerly "holp" and "holpen," instead of "helped." The word therefore strictly implies that which is heaved up, conspicuously elevated; the original form of "hoven" being afterwards, in the process of the changes which are continually coming over language, softened to "heaven." The term, therefore, in English, is very nearly allied in import with its Hebrew equivalent. B.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Epistle to the Hebrews. By Albert Barnes. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 335.

WE hail with pleasure the appearance of a new volume in this invaluable series of Notes. We are always sure of meeting in Mr. Barnes's works with the fruits of an indefatigable industry—of a calm but somewhat severe judgment of the import of words—and of a rich vein of practical reflection. This last constitutes perhaps the leading feature of his commentaries. While we find no lack of critical ability—no signs of a perfunctory pondering of the various points of grammar and philology involved in a course of thorough interpretation—no apparent *nescience* of any of the appropriate sources of Scriptural exegesis—we yet perceive the evidence of higher gifts in the department of homiletic exposition. His tact of easy, natural, and effective enforcement of the doctrinal and moral truth which he develops, is in the highest degree rare and felicitous. It almost works within us the conviction that none but a pastor, in the actual discharge of pulpit ministrations, can be adequately endowed for the office of a commentator—a remark, however, which has rather a fearful recoil in the present case upon him who makes it. That it gives him pre-eminent advantages for the work, there can be no question.

The Prolegomena to the present volume, in which Mr. B. discusses the various questions relative to the time, scope, authorship, and canonical claims of the epistle, contain a judicious compend of all that is really requisite, for the sake of common readers, to be said on the subject. To those who wish to go deeper into these disputed points, the student must be referred to Prof. Stuart's elaborate canvassings of the ancient and modern evidence on this head. Mr. B. gives an unhesitating assent to the theory of the Pauline origin of the Epistle, and the reasons for this conclusion are briefly, but very strongly stated. For ourselves, though we confess to some lingering doubts on the subject, yet as the canonical character of the writing appears indisputable, we give ourselves but little concern as to the real author.

In regard to the Notes themselves, if we take exceptions here and there to particular parts, we would imply nothing else in the main than a very high estimate of their soundness and value. They indicate a profound study of the document itself, and a discreet use of all the requisite appliances, critical and antiquarian, for making its import available to the great ends for which all Scripture is given. Without aiming at innovation, he is still independent; and this is evinced, rather in a refusal to follow in the wake of old explanations, than in a prurient prompting to lead

off into new ones. He is uniformly sober, self-possessed, and judicious—qualities which, combined with adequate learning, constitute the grand endowments of a useful expositor. We are not sure that a somewhat greater *freedom* of construction—an allowance for something less than an absolute mathematical certainty of interpretation—an abatement, in a word, of a kind of iron sternness of requisition on the score of evidence—would not impart a more genial and attractive air to his comments, without compromising any essential attributes. We seem to feel in his presence a constant rebuke of every thing like a play of the soul, a saliency of spirit, a license to the imagination. The pious impulses of the heart never fail to find in him a fostering smile; those of the head are sure to encounter a withering frown. An illustration of the trait of which we are speaking, is afforded in the general tenor of his remarks on the *typical* features of the Levitical institute. He here insists, with Prof. Stuart, that we shall, in the explication of types, confine ourselves most rigidly to the letter of the apostolic solutions—that we shall walk round the Tabernacle and its various apparatus, with a tethered tread, utterly restrained from moving a step beyond the limits of New Testament express prescription in our attempts to unfold its evangelical drift. Now we, for ourselves, have just as strong a confidence that Mr. B. goes to a pernicious extreme of skeptical cautiousness on this score, as he doubtless has that we give loose to the reins of a dangerous rashness in the same department. Whose judgment is most according to truth must be left to the verdict of enlightened theologians. To us there is no assumption more purely gratuitous, irrational, and, in one word, absurd, than that we are forbidden to recognise a typical intention, except in the cases expressly specified in the New Testament. If this ground be taken in regard to *types*, why not also in regard to *predictions*? What right has Mr. B. or any man to apply to Christ any predictions in the Old Testament, except such as are actually thus applied by the apostles?

In his note on ch. 9: 5, where the writer speaks of the ‘Cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy seat,’ Mr. B. observes: “Of the form and design of the Cherubim much has been written, and much that is the mere creation of the fancy, and the fruit of wild conjecture. Their design is not explained in the Bible, and silence in regard to it would have been wisdom. If they were intended to be symbolical, as is certainly possible, it is impossible now to determine the object of the symbol. Who is authorized to explain it? Who can give to his speculations any thing more than the authority of *pious conjecture*? And of what advantage, therefore, can speculation be, where the volume of inspiration says nothing?” An equivalent remark is made in regard to the Candlestick of the Tabernacle, and no doubt expresses the writer’s general view in respect to all the different parts of the sacred furniture. The logic of the sentence here pronounced, we are not exactly competent to appreciate. The objects in question may possibly have a symbolical meaning, and yet it is impossible now to determine it. How does this appear? Has God said so?

And if you, Mr. B., so strenuously insist upon an express *divine warrant* for every thing, on what grounds, we would ask, do you dispense with it here? Are you authorized to *assume* the impossibility of determining the symbolical import of the Cherubim, when you cannot point to the express declaration affirming it? But waving this obvious suggestion, why is it a matter of such high presumption to endeavor to compass the meaning of so significant a symbol as that of the Cherubim? That the Ark itself, over which they were stationed, had a mystical import, we believe has never hitherto been doubted by divines, although Mr. B. studiously refrains from intimating, by the slightest hint, what he supposes it to have adumbrated. He is very particular as to its form, materials, history, &c., but no one would infer from his explanations that it was any thing more than a splendid gewgaw, at once magnificent and meaningless. And so as to the Cherubim. While he revolts at any attempt however sober to solve their mystical purport, he appears not in the least troubled at the idea that God should solemnly have ordained these mystic sculptures and placed them in the inner shrine of his temple, with the Glory of the Shekinah between, with no particular or intelligible design. But Mr. B. explicitly says, that the entrance of the High Priest annually into the Holy of Holies, was significative of Christ's entering into heaven—"of which," says he, "the Most Holy place in the Tabernacle was undoubtedly designed to be an emblem." If then the innermost sanctum of the Tabernacle was a type of heaven, do not the contents of that room image forth something which is *in* heaven? And are we not at liberty to attempt to ascertain what that is? And are we following a mere *ignis fatuus* when we have recourse to the subsequent visions of Ezekiel and John, and by proving the absolute identity of the 'living creatures' of each with the Mosaic Cherubim, establish the conclusion that these mystic creations represent the multitude of glorified saints gathered out of every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and occupied in worship and praise in the celestial temple? Is it presumptuous, vain, or visionary, thus to endeavor to show that these hieroglyphical tenants of the Holy of Holies resolve themselves into the beatified dwellers in the upper sanctuary? Mr. B. may smile with contempt at these proposed solutions of an important mystery, and content himself with regarding the whole as a mass of empty costume, but we shall beg leave to be left to dally with our delusion, if it be such, that the grand typical scope of the Jewish economy is capable of being soundly and satisfactorily explained.

But we must subject this cold-hearted dogma to a little farther interrogation. Mr. B. would put an imperative veto upon any interpretation of types which is not expressly *authorized*. By what warrant then does he say that the twelve loaves upon the table of show-bread represented the twelve tribes of Israel? Let him point to the place where this is asserted. Again, what express authority has he for asserting that the mercy-seat had any particular typical connexion with the sprinkling of the blood of atonement? It is not expressly affirmed. So, in respect to various other items, it would not be difficult to show that Mr. B. occasionally

plays at the game which he so pointedly condemns. We are no advocates for fanciful interpretation, but we strenuously contend that it is possible to propound sober and satisfactory solutions of types pertaining to a system which we know to be, in its main features, typical. Of this we trust we have given some adequate proofs in our previous letters to Prof. Stuart.

A rapid perusal of the volume before us has suggested remarks upon several passages of the annotations, at which our limits will permit us merely to hint.

On the words of the writer, ch. 1 : 2, *By whom also he made the worlds*, he distinctly intimates, if we understand him, that Christ was the *instrumental cause* of creation, or, as he otherwise expresses it, by whose agency God created the worlds. The idea of an *instrumental Creator* entirely baffles our utmost conceptions. If Jesus Christ created the universe, it must have been by virtue of his attributes as originally and essentially divine, a view which is utterly inconsistent with the idea of any thing like *instrumentality* or *delegation*. A delegated omnipotence is the first-born of absurdities. The fact undoubtedly is, that the word 'worlds' in this connexion has nothing to do with the modern astronomical sense of the term. This is a sense in which the word *never* occurs in the sacred writers. Its genuine import is that of *age, dispensation, worldly order of things*. To attempt to fix upon it the sense of a *planetary globe*, is to do downright violence to the language of holy writ, in order to make it speak what we in our foolish wisdom think it ought to speak. Mr. B. appears to be aware that the matter is attended with some doubt, as he remarks that the only perfectly clear use of the word in this sense in the New Testament is, Heb. 11 : 3, "Through faith we understand that the *worlds* (*αἰῶνας*) were made by the word of God," &c. But this passage is as far from proving it as any other. The far more obvious sense is, that the *ages, the dispensations, the Edenic, the Antediluvian, the Patriarchal, the Mosaic, &c.*, were *appointed, constituted, adjusted*, by the word or efficacious will of God. So here the real purport of the language is undoubtedly that suggested by Grotius, and which Mr. B. says *may be* the true one, to wit, that the various *ages, dispensations, or religious economies*, were ordered *in reference* (*διὰ*) to Christ. He was the grand prominent object had in view from beginning to end of all the divine dispensations. We are only surprised that this obvious and legitimate sense of the word *αἰῶν, world*, did not at once direct Mr. B. to the true construction of the connected phrase—"by whom he made." If the term *αἰῶνας* does not signify *material worlds*, then *ἐποίησε* does not signify the *creation* of such worlds, and consequently *δι' ὃν* cannot properly be rendered "by whom." The verb has the import of *constituted, appointed*, and the preposition conveys the sense of *for* or *in reference to*, as it does in multitudes of other cases. Time and a deeper research into the inner sense of revelation will doubtless evince, that the absolute verities of the *physical* universe are much less frequently alluded to by the sacred writers than is generally supposed.

Mr. B.'s remarks on the quotations made by the apostle from the Old Testament, in proof of the essential divinity of our Lord, are generally, we think, well considered and sound. The evidence on this head, as illustrated by his luminous commentary, is but little short of demonstration. In one or two points we think he has come somewhat short of the duty of a thoroughgoing expositor. In the annotation, for instance, on ch. 1: 8, he has failed to designate the speaker; "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is forever and ever." The subject of the verb here is not God, but the Scriptures. It is a phrase equivalent to "it is said"—"the sacred writer says." This is an idiom of the utmost importance, both in the New Testament and the Old, and is in fact to be borne in mind by the commentator throughout the whole context in which the present passage occurs. In nearly every instance the phrase, "he saith," implies not the direct, but the indirect, speaking of God, through his word and in the person of the inspired writer. This feature of the record Mr. B. has beautifully illustrated in his note on ch. 1: 6, "And again when he bringeth his first-begotten into the world."

Viewed as a whole, we cannot but regard the present work as extremely valuable, and one that will in no way suffer by a comparison with the best of its predecessors. It has an air of completeness and compactness about it, which leaves next to nothing to be desired. If faulty in any point, it is perhaps in the slightly too large infusion of the homiletic element, and yet this we feel rather in the general impression than in regard to any particular part. If put to the specification of any given portion which we should mark with an excising *dele*, we should find ourselves greatly nonplussed in the selection, so apt, native, and spontaneous are the reflections to which his rich practical vein gives rise. We sincerely hope Mr. B. may be enabled to accomplish his plan to its very ultimatum, and furnish a commentary of equal merit on the remaining books of the New Testament—with the exception, however, of the Apocalypse, to which we think his rigid Calvinian austerity of reason is not so well adapted, and which we presume to think would fare better under our own reputed *fanciful* and *allegorical* pen. B.

✂ Owing to the absence of the Editor from the city, while the present No. was passing through the press, the following errata have crept into the first form, which the reader will have the goodness to correct:

- Page 169, for 'the sober interpretation' read 'the sober interpreter.'
- " 170, for 'Cellius' theory' read 'Collins's theory.'
- " 172, for 'I they' read 'If they.'
- " " for 'have them to speak' read 'leave them to speak.'
- " 173, for 'εὑπαράβολή' read 'ἐπαράβολή.'
- " " for 'unintelligible' read 'intelligible.'
- " " for 'אֲבֵשׁי זָבַח' read 'אֲבֵשׁי מִזְבֵּחַ.'
- " " for 'multiplied vision' read 'multiplied visions.'
- " 175, for 'death of insects' read 'dearth of insects.'
- " " for 'beasts' read 'locusts.'

No. V.—OCTOBER.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter II. to Prof. Stuart,	97
The Judgment of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints— <i>Continued</i> ,	103
Commentary on the Psalms.—Ps. IV.	110
The Pre-Millennial Advent of Christ— <i>Second Article</i> ,	115
Notices of New Publications :	
Robinson's Bibliotheca Sacra,	116
Kitto's Biblical Cyclopædia,	119
Redfield's Pictorial Bible,	120
Chalmers's Lectures on Romans,	120

No. VI.—NOVEMBER.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter to Prof. Stuart,	121
The Judgment of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the everlasting Kingdom of the Saints— <i>Continued</i> ,	133

No. VII.—DECEMBER.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter to Prof. Stuart,	145
The Judgment of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints— <i>Continued</i> ,	155
Notices of New Publications :	
Duffield's Reply to Prof. Stuart,	165
Prophecy interpreted Literally or Spiritually,	168
White's Practical Reflections on the Second Advent,	168

NO. VIII.—JANUARY.

Double Sense of Prophecy.—Letter to Prof. Stuart,	169
The Judgment of the Beast and the Little Horn, succeeded by the Everlasting Kingdom of the Saints— <i>Continued</i> ,	179
Heaven.—Etymology of the Term,	187
Notices of New Publications :	
Barnes's Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews,	188

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

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

Postmasters are authorized to remit subscription monies free of postage.



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

Orders to be addressed to the Editor or Publisher.

LIST OF AGENTS.

MAINE.—*Portland*, William Hyde.
Bangor, E. F. Duren.

MASSACHUSETTS.—*Boston*, Saxton & Pierce.
Salem, John P. Jewett.
Andover, W. Wardwell.

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

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

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