

LONDON:
PRINTED BY WERTHEIMER, LEA AND CO.,
CIRCUS PLACE, FINSBURY CIRCUS.

PREFACE TO SECOND EDITION.

THIS Tract was first published during the Crimean War, in 1855. Recent events having caused it to be enquired after, I have reprinted it. The alterations made in this second edition are principally verbal. Substantially, the Tract remains unchanged.

One marked characteristic of Europe at the present moment is its want of a recognised controlling centre. For many years the will of Great Britain and France, unitedly expressed, was determinative of most European questions. But when the power of France was broken, no regulating centre remained. Probably no such centre will again exist, until the leading kingdoms of the Roman World (such as Austria, Italy, France, Spain, and England) shall, by force of circumstances and the recognition of common danger, be compelled formally to combine their strength. Ultimately, *all* the kingdoms of the Roman World, eastern and western, will be federally united; and then, men will behold a combination of power not less mighty and effective than that which was found in Imperial Rome, at the height of her greatness. Indeed, their strength will be greater and their influence more extended.

In the first edition of this Tract I expressed an expectation that the struggle between the Western Powers and Russia would result in the triumph of the

in all respects identical with those of their predecessors; but the same political and commercial exigencies that dictated the ancient distribution are in operation still, and may be expected to produce like results. Assyria and the Euphrates will soon be as familiar to the thoughts of men as Egypt and the Nile now are. Civilisation will return to its ancient seats. Greece, and regathered Israel, aided and sustained by the rest of the Roman nations, will be the revivification of the East. Civilisation will be there—the highest and most advanced civilisation; but it will be civilisation apart from God. Shall we hide from ourselves its character and its doom?

June, 1878.

N.B.—*A few notes added to this Edition are placed in brackets.*

Europe and the East.

FINAL PREDOMINANCE OF RUSSIA INCONSISTENT WITH THE DECLARATIONS OF SCRIPTURE.

§ I.

IT has been of late very generally asked whether the Scripture enables us to form any decided judgment as to the result of the struggle that is now taking place between Russia and Western Europe. We need not hesitate to reply, that the *final* result of that struggle may with great certainty be determined.

The prophecy of Daniel is that which chiefly guides us. Daniel was empowered to prophesy at a time when supreme power, which had, during the reign of Solomon, been committed to Israel in Jerusalem, was, because of transgression, withdrawn from them, and given to certain Empires raised up from among the Gentiles. What then are those Empires? When God was pleased to take supreme power from Jerusalem to whom did He give it? Did He commit it to the Gentile world indiscriminately, or did He appoint that certain selected Empires should arise from among the Gentiles to whom successively the place of supreme control in the earth should be committed, until the

time should come for it to be restored to repentant Jerusalem ?

This question is one to which it is scarcely needful that I should reply, because it has been answered with accordant unanimity in almost every age. The rise of the four successive Empires of Chaldea, Persia, Greece, and Rome (universal Empires as they are commonly called), is a fact known to all; and Mede has with reason placed among the axioms of prophetic interpretation the obvious truth, that these are the four Empires respecting which the vision of the Image was given to Nebuchadnezzar, and interpreted by Daniel.*

The legs of this symbolic Image is that part of the vision with which we are more especially concerned. The head of the Image was of gold; its breast and its arms of silver; its belly and its thigh-part† of brass;

* "That the Roman Empire," says Mede, "was the fourth kingdom of Daniel, was believed by the Church of Israel both before and in our Saviour's time, received by the disciples of the Apostles and the whole Christian Church for the first three hundred years, without any known contradiction: and I confess, having so good ground in Scripture, it is with me, 'tantum non articulus fidei,' little less than an article of faith."

The Chaldean power is recognised in Scripture as supreme in Dan. ii. 37. The Persian in Ezra i. 2. The Grecian under Alexander in Dan. xi. 3. The Roman in Luke ii. 1. "There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world [*πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη*] should be taxed."

[† "*Sides*" is a rendering placed in the margin of our English version, and has been adopted by several translators. It can scarcely be regarded as a *strictly* accurate rendering, but it is certainly preferable to "thighs."

The Chaldee word is peculiar. It is not dual or plural, but

its legs of iron. The iron legs represent the Roman Empire. Why then this duplicate symbol? Why was the Roman Empire denoted by the *two* legs of the Image?

The Roman Empire from the moment of its establishment under Augustus Cæsar, consisted of two parts very contrasted in their history, and in their condition, and of this contrast none were more sensible than the Romans themselves. The *Eastern* part of their Empire they had conquered from the Greeks who had preceded them. They had received it full of all that constitutes greatness. Taste, intellect, refinement, wealth—in a word, all the concomitants of an advanced civilization were there; so that Rome herself became morally subjugated to the laws, arts, and philosophy of the nations whom her sword had subdued in the East. The Western part of their Empire, on the contrary, the Romans found sunk in barbarism. With the exception of a few spots reached by the influence of Tyre, Carthage, or Greece, uncivilised barbarism

singular, יֶרֶךְ הַיָּמִין the *thigh-part*, that is, *the lower part of the human trunk*, whence the thighs issue. Thus, in several French versions it is rendered *les hanches*. In ordinary language, when a statue or a man is spoken of, the word "legs" is understood to include "the thighs," and certainly a word in the singular number would not have been used if the two thighs were to be denoted. Venema renders it "sides" in the following passage:—"Caput erat aureum: pectus et brachia ex argento; venter et latera æs." Some translate it by "ilia." The lateral part of the lower belly is indicated and called "the thigh part," because the thighs issue thence. This, doubtless, is the true meaning. Geier seems to adopt it.]

reigned over the West. Rome, there, had to civilize her conquests. Accordingly, in the West she diffused Latin institutions and the Latin tongue; whilst in the Eastern part of her empire, Greek institutions and the Greek tongue continued to prevail.

The rule of the Turks, when at its widest, defines with sufficient accuracy for our present purpose, what the Greek branch of the Roman Empire was. The success of the Turks, and the overthrow of the Throne of the Cæsars at Constantinople, in 1453, consigned the Eastern branch of the Roman Empire to oblivion. Recent events, however, have aroused men to the consciousness that Greek influences and Greek institutions have not expired; and now we again hear the long forgotten title, "Eastern, or Greek branch of the Roman Empire," employed in the writings and speeches of the day.

As respects the progress of prophetic enquiry, we may well be thankful for this. Nothing, perhaps, has been a cause of greater perplexity than the habit, which has long prevailed, of treating the Latin branch of the Roman Empire as if it were the *whole* Roman Empire. Almost all writers on prophecy began by affirming, that the two legs of the Image represent THE Roman Empire, that is to say, the *whole* Roman Empire: yet as soon as they begin to treat of its history, and especially of its final subdivision, they forget in their conclusion what they have admitted in their premises—say that they are treating of the *whole* Roman Empire, and yet remember only its *Latin half*, and write as if the Image had only one foot, or rather as if the toes of both feet were gathered

together on one foot. Now, however, it begins again to be admitted (what during the first twelve centuries of Christianity was not doubted) that the Roman Empire had two branches, even as the Image had two feet, and that consequently the final subdivision of the Roman Empire into Ten kingdoms must be sought not in its Western branch merely, but *in the Eastern and Western together*.

Nothing can be more important in prophetic interpretation than to remember what the Roman Empire really was. How could we speak respecting those Ten kingdoms to which the Roman power will finally descend, unless we have first determined aright what the territorial extent of the Roman Empire was?—for of the Roman territory the Ten final kingdoms denoted by the ten toes of the Image are a subdivision. It is not however my present intention to speak of that final subdivision.* Here I would only observe, that if the Roman Empire is signified by the legs and feet of the Image, we thereby learn on the sure authority of God,

° That this subdivision is future is manifest from this—*first*, the Ten final kingdoms are to be sought, not in one, but in *both* branches of the Roman Empire; and no one pretends that the *Eastern* branch has yet been divided. *Secondly*, when once existent, they will continue to the very end, not only as kingdoms, but as the great reigning kingdoms of the earth. By the end, I mean the time when the Image is smitten and ground to powder; and no one pretends that the Image has been thus smitten as yet. *Thirdly*, their development must be a plain palpable development, recognised by all. No one doubts that Chaldea, Persia, Greece, and Rome, have existed and ruled as sovereign Empires. The development of the Ten last kingdoms will be no less decided.

what part of the earth is made the inheritor of that wondrous power which the Image, "excellent in glory, and terrible in form," denoted. The sovereign controlling power of earth which was first vested in Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon, next in Cyrus of Persia, afterwards in Alexander of Greece, descended at last to the Emperors of Rome; and within the territory once ruled over by them,—territory finally to be divided amongst Ten kingdoms, that sovereign power resides, and there its home will be until the Gentile Image ceases to be, and forgiven Jerusalem becomes the "City of the Great King." Accordingly, during all the rude shocks which the Roman Empire has received, shocks, needful under the appointment of God to its final subdivision into ten parts, the supreme determining power of earth has as yet never left the Roman boundary. That which events have proved to be the pillar of power, has always been found somewhere in the Roman world. Invading tribes have never succeeded in removing the seat of power to territories external to the Roman Empire. Such tribes have either lost the authority which they may have temporarily held; or, if they have retained it, it has been by abandoning, like the Turks, their primæval seats, and seeking a new home within the limits of the Roman boundary. Charlemagne, Charles V., and Solyman, all had the seat and basis of their power within the Roman Empire. And where now is the civilisation, and the determining power of earth? England, France, Piedmont, and Turkey, are uniting to prove that it still resides within the Roman Empire.

If we were at liberty to speculate, or to argue merely

from the analogy of the past, we might perhaps conclude as a modern historian has done, that power necessarily depends on numerical strength and extent of territory ; that decay is the necessary consequent of advanced civilisation ; and that consequently the civilisation of Western Europe must finally fall before the fresh vigour of the rude, but mighty hordes of Russia and northern Asia. Such is the reasoning of a celebrated historian.* He seems to assume as an axiom that Europe must finally become the prey of Russia. But could he have thought thus if he had remembered the prophecy of Daniel ? Is Russia indicated by that wondrous Image which stands strong in the terribleness of its might until the end comes ? If Russia could be indicated by the Image, it must cease to be Russia. In other words, its chief and its people must abandon, like the Turks when they came from Tartary, their present fatherland, and migrating within the Roman boundary establish themselves and the seat of their authority there. No one, I suppose, dreams of this. Consequently, the present struggle between Russia and the countries that fall within the Roman Empire, is a struggle between a country to which God *has not* given supreme power in the earth, and countries to which God *has* given supreme power in the earth. Russia is *not* represented by the Image. How then can it finally succeed against nations that *are* represented by the Image ? How could it establish its supremacy over *them* ? The words of Daniel respecting the Image and its greatness

* Sir Archibald Alison.

are not the invention of man. They are the revelation of the counsel of the Almighty God.*

The countries which fall within the Roman Empire, and which therefore remain as the home and the centre of civilisation and power until the end shall come, are as follows :—

In Western and North-Western Europe : England, Scotland, Spain, Portugal, France, Savoy, Belgium, and parts of Holland west of the Rhine, Luxembourg, Rhenish Prussia west of the Rhine, Baden, Wirtemberg, and most of Bavaria and Switzerland.

In Southern and South-Eastern Europe : Italy, Greece, all the islands of the Mediterranean, Turkey in Europe, south of the Danube, Austrian Provinces north of the Alps and south of the Danube.

North of the Danube and answering to the ancient Dacia : that part of Hungary which lies east of the Roman Vallum, Transylvania, Wallachia, Moldavia, and Bessarabia. To this some have added the south-western corner of the Crimea. (See note at the end.)

In Asia : the Turkish dominions, taking the north of Arabia as the southern limit, this division including

* Observe, I do not say that Russia may not be allowed to assail successfully *for a time* some of the Roman nations. She now holds Bessarabia. She lately occupied Moldavia, and Wallachia, and once was in Paris. But this is a very different thing from her being mistress of Europe, and holding the determining power of earth. *That* she never will possess. Nor, I believe, will any one who has observed how, since the Congress of Vienna, everything has tended to the development and consolidation of the Roman nations, doubt that Russia will find herself unable successfully to struggle against their strength.

Palestine, Asia Minor, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria.

In the time of Trajan this division included Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria. Augustine says:—"In the Oriental regions, the boundaries of the Roman Empire were changed by the will of Hadrian, for he yielded up to the Persian Empire those three noble provinces—Armenia, Mesopotamia, and Assyria." — *Civitas Dei*, Book IV.

In Africa: Egypt and the whole northern coast, viz., Lybia, Tripolis, Tunis, Algeria, and Fez; Sallè, a little outside the Straits of Gibraltar, was their most westerly city.*

* As regards the Eastern part of these territories, such as Greece, Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, &c., it is obvious that amidst all the vicissitudes of the ancient Roman Empire, their connexion with each other has been preserved, as is proved by the very existence of the Turkish power which succeeded in knitting the East together under its control, and so contributed to preserve the integrity of the Eastern part of the Roman Empire. Recent events have revived in many a Greek bosom the hope that the throne of the Constantines and a Byzantine Empire may again be established at Constantinople; but though the power and extent of Greece as a separate kingdom (one in fact of the Ten) will certainly be extended, yet *there cannot be a Byzantine Empire established again at Constantinople*: because we know from this vision of the Image, as well as from the eighth chapter of Daniel, that the Eastern as well as the Western branch of the Roman Empire is to be *subdivided*.

I scarcely need say that the rise of Popery, and the formation of what has been called the "Holy Roman Empire in the West," has contributed to give a marked distinctness to the Latin branch of the Roman Empire in the West. But these later causes of distinction between the Greek and Latin branches, as well as the divisions of territory under the Emperors, are to be

Such is the extent of territory pertaining to the Roman World. It is to be divided into ten kingdoms, and those kingdoms will inherit the Image power. Great Britain, France, Piedmont, Egypt and Turkey (all these being countries that belong to the Roman Empire), have unitedly entered on a contest with a mighty power that is external to the Image. Can we hesitate as to the final result?

I do not affirm that there may not be a long and difficult conflict, or even reverses. The progress of human events in the channel appointed of God is often slow, and hindered by many obstacles. Thus, when the time had come for the Empire of Persia to be established in the place of the Empire that had preceded, the angel of God that had been sent to confirm and to strengthen the power of Persia, was resisted and hindered, for a time, by the angel of Satan. (See Dan. x. 13; xi. 1.) Again, just before the Roman Empire was established as the mistress of the world, it had to pass through one of its most severe and dangerous struggles with a Prince to whom Peter the Great, of Russia, has since been compared by historians. That Prince was Mithridates. His influence extended along the coast of the Black Sea to the

regarded, not as creating the distinction, but merely as perpetuating a distinction which subsisted when the Empire was first developed under Augustus Cæsar. Accordingly, in the Image, the duplicate symbol of *two* legs pertains to the Roman Empire from its commencement.

For more extended remarks on the countries contained in the Roman Empire see "Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms," as advertised at end.

Caspian—Sinope being his chief city. The prize for which he contended with the Romans was Asia Minor and the East — those very countries about which the contest now is. The conflict was a terrible one; but Mithridates was at last overcome. He died in the Crimea, where the modern Eupatoria still perpetuates his name.* So likewise now. If the time should be come for the limits of the Roman Empire again to appear with the definiteness with which it is necessary they should appear before the last division into ten parts is capable of being made, we may expect that there will be a great struggle. The effectual revival of the East, and the definite and recognised reappearance of the Roman kingdoms would be a great step onward in the development of the counsels of God, and may be the result of a great convulsion.

The Roman Empire and the other Empires which preceded, have an historic existence in Scripture as long as they are employed in anything that concerns Israel in *Jerusalem*. In other words, their actings are referred to in the Scripture whilst those actings are connected with Israel, God's people, existing nationally in Jerusalem. One of the very objects for which these Empires were called into power was that they might punish and "tread down" Jerusalem. Titus and (yet more effectually) Adrian accomplished this.†

* He was named Mithridates *Eupator*. The modern Eupatoria, however, is not on the same site as the ancient one.

† Adrian more effectually than Titus: for he allowed not a single Jew to remain in Jerusalem, and he endeavoured to destroy the very name Jerusalem by calling the city that he built *Ælia*.

As soon as Jerusalem disappeared as a city of Jews, a long night began to fall upon the Roman Empire. Nevertheless, the "iron" strength which was its heritage, has always remained, somewhere or other, within its boundaries; and when the time comes (as it probably soon will) for the Jews to return in unbelief and to re-establish Jerusalem, we shall again see the Roman nations, though in a divided form, assume a very definite relation to that city and its people. Can we say that it is unlikely that the Roman nations who are now engaged with Russia should successfully resist Russia as Rome did Mithridates? After his fall Rome soon became mistress of the East, and established her power in Jerusalem. Will not the modern Roman nations, when they shall have prevailed in the present struggle and curbed (I do not say destroyed) the Russian power, go on to establish their influence in the East? Will they not renovate the East? Will they not re-establish Jerusalem? And what then? The Romans of old, after they had secured to themselves the possession of the East, occupied Jerusalem, and there crucified Christ. When their modern successors shall have renovated Jerusalem and the fallen countries of the East, will that renovation be for the honour and service of Christ, or will it usher in the hour of Antichrist?

I do not deny, that when we think of the calamities that would overspread Europe if Russia were to grasp it as her prey, we may with reason feel thankful that God has been pleased to give to the Roman, or Image-nations, a strength that Russia will in vain labour to destroy. For Western Europe to be possessed of such

power is no doubt a privilege, and to live under the protection thereof may be esteemed a mercy. But the character both of individuals and of nations for good or evil, is determined not by the possession of privileges, but by the manner in which such privileges are used. We may soon expect to see England and France associated at Constantinople in the attempt (no doubt a successful attempt) to renovate the East and to re-establish civilization in its primæval seats.* But what are the principles on which such renovation is to be attempted? Is Holy Scripture to be honoured? Is the Bible to be maintained in its proper supremacy as the one only revelation of the will of the Most High God? Or, are we to augur the future from the Paris medal lately struck, on which Protestantism, Catholicism, and Mahomedanism are represented as three sister systems, equally deserving veneration and honour, and happily united in harmonious association with a view to the diffusion of commerce and civilization? Is this to be the index of the future of the Roman world? Are Pharisaism and superstition to give way, only that they may be succeeded by Saducean Latitudinarianism? I merely suggest this question now. I hope to return to it again.

At present I simply wish to direct attention to those conclusions which may be founded on the vision of

* This expectation has certainly not been fulfilled. Since the Crimean war, although France and England have operated in Egypt and, to a certain extent, in Greece; they have done little for Syria, or Asia Minor, or European Turkey. The Government at Constantinople have, through carelessness, been left without supervision or control, and hence the present catastrophe.

the Image alone. That vision enables us to say that the supreme determining power of earth shall never, until the end comes, abide in any country external to the regions indicated by the feet and toes of the Image. It enables us also to say, that the kingdoms that fall within the Roman Empire shall never be absorbed into one universal Empire, such as that of which Russia dreams. On the contrary, a territorial subdivision both of the Eastern and Western branches of the Roman Empire is indicated by the ten toes of the Image, as subsisting at the close.

Again, the ten toes, although distinct one from the other, are nevertheless parts of the same Image. The fact of their springing from one body gives them a kind of corporate connection. The same is taught in the seventh chapter, by the ten horns of the fourth beast. They spring from the head of one beast. Consequently the Roman Empire, when finally divided, will as clearly present a form of compact, though divided, unity as when it existed in its undivided integrity. There will be therefore, in a certain sense, a restoration of the Roman Empire. The Roman Empire disappears in the record of Scripture when Jerusalem had been subverted; its reappearance in Scripture narrative will synchronize with the time when Jerusalem shall again assume a national existence.*

Fourthly, we learn from the vision, that as the feet and toes were composed of the same substance, viz.,

• An "Expectation of the Early Church was, that the Roman Empire, remaining torpid for centuries, would awake up at the end of the world and be restored."—See Elliot, quoting from Oxford Tracts.

iron and clay, so a similarity of political constitution will finally subsist throughout all the kingdoms of the Roman world.*

Moreover, seeing that neither the Eastern nor the Western branch of the Roman Empire is at present divided into five kingdoms, we may expect to see considerable alterations in the present territorial arrangements both of Europe and the East. As regards the East, the *eighth* chapter of Daniel enables us to say that Egypt, Greece, Syria, and the remaining part of Turkey (the three first greatly augmented in territory and Turkey proportionably diminished), will form four of the five Eastern kingdoms. As respects the five Western kingdoms there is nothing in Scripture which would enable us to mention them by name. Yet few,

° Hyppolytus, a Christian martyr, who lived in the early part of the third century, intimates that the admixture of clay and iron in the toes of the Image had reference to the rise of "*democracies*." He says, speaking of the Image, "After these come the Romans, being the iron legs of the Image, strong as iron, in order that the '*democracies*' which are about to arise might be pointed out, answering respectively to the ten toes of the Image in which there will be iron mingled with clay."—See *Mai. (Chain on Daniel)*.

Pure democracies, however, are not regarded as "kingdoms" in Scripture. The Ten last kingdoms are always represented in Scripture as ruled over by "*kings*." Popular or limited monarchy is not pure democracy.

Jerome says:—"Therefore let us say, that which all ecclesiastical writers have delivered, that at the end of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans is to be destroyed, there will be ten kings to divide the Roman World among themselves," etc. For similar statements among writers in the first twelve centuries, see "*Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman World*," as advertised at end.

I suppose, will doubt that England, France, and Spain (the last two considerably augmented in territory) will continue kingdoms to the end. As regards this, however, we must wait the unfolding of events. The accomplishment of the final division will precede, by very little, the closing hour of the history of the Image.

This however we may confidently predict, that as the Roman nations resume their distinctness and corporate relation to each other, all countries *external* to the Roman limit, that now exercise authority over countries *within* that limit, will be obliged to relinquish such authority. Thus, we have already seen Holland obliged to relinquish Belgium—Belgium being within, Holland without the Roman boundary. For the same reason we may expect to see Prussia, which is *without* the Roman Empire, compelled to resign her present possessions west of the Rhine, for they fall within the Roman Empire. In like manner we may expect to see Baden, Wirtemburgh, and the chief part of Bavaria (all these falling within the Roman Empire) separated from their present German connection, and united to France, or some other country that falls within the Roman Empire. We may also expect that Bessarabia as well as Moldavia and Wallachia will be rescued from the grasp of Russia, those three districts having been included within the ancient Roman province of Dacia. In like manner we may expect to see Austria withdrawn from the control of the German confederation, and associated more intimately with the Roman kingdoms.

There are also cases in which countries *external* to the Roman Empire are united to a country that falls within the Roman Empire. The countries at present thus circumstanced are Ireland in its relation to England—Ireland never having been brought within the Roman Empire: also, the central part of Hungary, between the Danube on the west and the Vallum Romanum on the east,* at present united to Austria: likewise Bohemia and all German Austria north of the Danube, and the Colonies of England, France, Spain, and Portugal.

On this case we cannot perhaps pronounce with the same confidence as on the preceding; but I think there can be little doubt that the union between such countries will be dissolved—if not fully, yet to the extent of distinct and independent legislations being granted, as indeed has been already done in the leading Colonies of England. The annals of Europe, since the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, afford abundant examples of the difficulty of causing countries *external* to the Roman Empire to move concurrently with those *within*, and this difficulty will no doubt

* The remains of the Vallum Romanum are still visible. It left the Danube a few miles east of Belgrade, and running by Temesvar continued its northern course until it met the upper Theiss, which runs there from east to west. Gibbon makes the Theiss the boundary, but this is not quite correct, for the Vallum Romanum leaves the Danube at a point east of the Theiss. The words of Gibbon are, "If we except Bohemia, Moravia, and the northern skirts of Austria, and a part of Hungary between the Teyss and the Danube, all the dominions of the House of Austria were comprised within the limits of the Roman Empire." These may be regarded as the parts in which the tenure of Austria is insecure.

be found to increase as the appointed consummation draws near.

And although the knowledge which the Scripture communicates respecting these things is too general to afford any material aid to the politician, yet it is sufficiently specific to enable the Christian to trace the hand of God in effecting those things which He has said shall come to pass before the hour comes when He will sweep away the inventions of mere human power, and establish His own kingdom of peace and truth. When once the Roman countries have undergone their last division, and are found distributed into Ten, the end will be very nigh.

§ II.

WHENEVER the European powers shall have succeeded in restraining Russia, and in establishing their influence in Constantinople, the present metropolis of the East, their next great object will be to revive the regions over which Turkey ruled—in other words, to introduce civilization, commerce, and wealth into the Greek branch of the Roman Empire.

This object would be materially promoted by the return of the Jews to Palestine. The Jews expect to be restored to their own Land and City, and many among them desire it. If security for their property, as well as their persons, could be assured to them, they would nationally regather to Palestine; and their return would instantly introduce into the East, from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, abundant wealth, and a skill and energy in commercial enterprise almost

unrivalled. Greek merchants too, both in England and the East, are rapidly advancing in wealth and influence, so that in the Greek, and in the Jew, two great elements for the re-construction of Eastern greatness are already prepared.

But however bright the prospect may seem when we think merely of civilization supplanting the dark and cruel influences which have so long preyed upon the East, the illusion will soon be dissipated if we ask ourselves the question, why did God cause civilization to be banished thence? Why more especially were Israel driven from their Land and City? Have they repented of their iniquity? Have they turned to Him of whom they said, "His blood be upon us and upon our children;" or, does the curse, which they thus invoked, rest on them still? If it do, though they may be allowed to return to their Land and to re-establish themselves there in apparent prosperity for a season, yet how can we doubt that the Divine hand will be stretched out against them again?

And this is what all Scripture declares. It continually speaks of the Jews as returning to their Land in unbelief, and there restoring their City and Temple; and then becoming the subjects of chastisements more terrible than any that have yet fallen on them. The eighth chapter of Daniel is one among the many records of the afflictions that are to fall upon Israel at an hour yet future, and now, probably, not far distant.

The eighth chapter of Daniel begins by describing the victorious career of the first great "Prince of Grecia"—Alexander the Great. It was he who established the influence of the Greek name and Greek in-

stitutions in the East, and prepared for Rome the most valued branch of her dominion. Accordingly this chapter speaks of Alexander's rapid conquests and of his greatness; but it tells us also that his Empire should not retain its unity nor descend to his posterity; but that others should inherit it and distribute it into *four* divisions. Yet, remarkable as this prediction respecting Alexander and the fourfold division of his kingdom is, this is not the great subject of the prophecy. Its especial object is to tell us of events that will be connected indeed with the regions over which Alexander ruled, but which will not be brought to pass until a period called in this chapter "the time of the end," and "the last end of the indignation" against Jerusalem. "Behold," said the angel to Daniel, "I will make thee know which shall be *in the last end of the indignation*;" and again "Understand, O son of man, for *at the time of the end* shall be the vision." In the 23rd verse also we find the time marked as being "*when the transgressors are come to the full*." All these expressions show that the great burthen of the vision refers to something yet unaccomplished, for we cannot say of any past period either that transgression had "come to the full," or that "the last end of the indignation" had come, as respects Israel.

The burthen of this prophecy respects one who at the very close of the day of Israel's evil and sorrow, is to be raised up to trample down and to destroy them, after they shall have returned in unbelief to their own land and restored their Temple and reconstituted their sacrifices. He is to be the last, but the greatest, of their persecutors. "He shall destroy wonderfully, and

shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." (Dan. viii. 24.) "I will send him against an hypocritical people, and against the people of my wrath will I give him a charge, to take the spoil, and to take the prey, and to tread them down like the mire of the streets." (Isaiah x. 6.) His characteristic marks, as noted in the chapter before us, are as follow :

I. He is to arise, *not* from the Latin or Western part of the Roman Empire, but from one of the four divisions into which Alexander's Empire was distributed. The words of Daniel are these, "Therefore the he-goat [which is afterwards said to represent the Greek dynasty, of which Alexander was the first king], waxed very great, and when he was strong, the great horn [Alexander, see verse 21] was broken, and for it came up four notable ones, toward the four winds of Heaven: and *out of one of them* came forth a little horn which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, [Egypt], and toward the east [Syria and Babylon], and toward the pleasant land [the Land of Israel]."—Dan. viii. 8, 9.

II. He is to arise from one of these four kingdoms, *not* at an early period of their history, but "*in the latter time of their kingdom.*" This will be seen very plainly if we read the twenty-first and following verses connectedly. "The rough goat is the king of Grecia, and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king [Alexander]. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation [the Greek nation], but not in his power. And *in the latter time of their king-*

dom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences shall stand up," &c.

III. He will find "the daily sacrifice" offered and the sanctuary standing at Jerusalem, for it is said in verse 2, that he will take away the daily sacrifice and cast down the sanctuary.

IV. He will not only rise up against God, but also specifically against Christ. "He shall rise up against the Prince of princes."

V. He is not to arise until "the last end of the indignation" against Israel, nor before "the transgressors have come to the full."

VI. He is to be broken without hand, that is by no mere human instrumentality, but by the immediate action of the Divine hand.

Some have endeavoured to interpret this chapter of the Pope; some, of Mahomet; others, of Antiochus Epiphanes: but neither of the three answers to the criteria that have just been given. The Pope comes from the Latin, not from the Greek, branch of the Roman Empire. Mahomet came from Arabia; and Arabia formed no part of Alexander's Empire, nor of that of the Romans. Neither the Pope nor Mahomet ever had it in their power "to take away the daily sacrifice," or "to cast down the sanctuary;" because Jewish worship had ceased in Jerusalem long before either the Pope or Mahomet arose. Antiochus more nearly answers to the description, and no doubt was intended peculiarly to foreshadow the last great Anti-Christ; but Antiochus neither lived in "the last end of the indignation," nor when "the transgressors had

come to the full ;” nor did he rise up against Christ specifically, for Christ had not then come ; nor was Antiochus destroyed “without hand ;” nor was Antiochus a little horn that arose out of one of the four great horns. On the contrary, he and the dynasty to which he belonged, were symbolised *by one of the four horns*.

It is distinctly said that this last great Transgressor is to arise out of one of the divisions of Alexander’s broken Empire “*in the latter time of their kingdom or rule.*” This clearly implies that the four divisions of Alexander’s Empire exist in their distinctness, at the time when this vision is to be fulfilled. A few years ago it would have been deemed madness to say that the four divisions of Alexander’s Empire, after having been for so many ages merged first in the Roman, and subsequently in the Turkish Empire, would eventually reappear. Recent events, however, have, as to this, disarmed scepticism, inasmuch as two of these divisions *have* reappeared. Within our own days, Greece and Egypt have been separated from the Turkish Empire—Greece with an actual, Egypt with a virtual, independence ; and Greece and Egypt were two of the divisions into which Alexander’s Empire was distributed. Of no past period, therefore, can it be said, that Greece had then reached “the latter end of its kingdom,” for in that case it would not exist as a restored kingdom now : consequently, the very fact of its existence as a kingdom, proves that the period spoken of in this chapter is not a *past* period ; and it cannot become a *present* period until Syria (the separation of which has not unfrequently been spoken of), shall, together with the fourth division of Alexander’s Empire, (viz. Thrace

and Bithynia) attain as marked a distinctness, as that which is at present possessed by Egypt and by Greece. All four divisions exist together at the close.

From this we learn that great territorial changes must be accomplished in the East. Politicians may labour earnestly for the maintenance of the integrity of the Turkish Empire, but they will labour in vain ; for it must finally be divided, and so divided, as for the ancient kingdoms of Greece, of Egypt, of Syria, and of Thrace to reappear.* And if, as is probable, the extent of the dominions of the four successors of Alexander is to guide us as to the future fourfold distribution of that part of those territories that falls within the Roman boundary, we shall, in that case, not only see both Egypt and Greece greatly augmented in territory, but when Syria is made independent and extended to the eastern boundary of Rome it will be found that very little remains as the portion of the throne of Constantinople, whosoever may be its occupant. For Greece, or any other power, to establish there a modern Byzantine Empire must be regarded as a dream.

I do not indeed affirm that, when these kingdoms are restored, we shall find exactly the same territorial

* The division was this :—

Ptolemy possessed Egypt, Cyrene, Coele-Syria, and some of the southern parts of Asia Minor.

Cassander—Macedon, Thessaly, and Greece.

Lysimachus—Thrace, Western Bithynia, Phrygia, Mysia, and Lydia—the Meander being the boundary.

Seleucus—All the rest. His dominions extended to the Indus, and therefore included much that was never possessed by Rome : Rome's development was toward the West.

arrangements as subsisted under the successors of Alexander. Yet no one, I suppose, would be much surprised to see the present kingdom of Greece augmented by the addition of Northern Greece and Macedonia ; or to see the ruler of Egypt possessed of Ptolemy's portion ; or to see Syria (through the influence of the returned Jews, and of the Greeks who are so widely scattered throughout those regions) formed into a great and extended kingdom ; or to see the authority of the Turks at Constantinople limited to the dominions of Lysimachus. However, whatever may be the exact territorial limits, we shall be safe in saying that four distinct kingdoms will again divide that portion of Alexander's dominions that falls within the Roman boundary. These kingdoms will thus constitute *four* of the ten into which the Roman Empire is to be divided ; and, like their sister-kingdoms in the West, will stand strong in that strength which they unitedly receive as parts of the Image and inheritors of the Roman power ; for they are symbolised by the toes of one Image, and by the horns of the same Beast. If then Russia dreams of incorporating with itself into one vast Empire, either *all* the Roman Empire or even one of its branches, she is greatly deceived. Territorial *division* is to characterise the Roman world until the end comes ; and superiority of greatness and strength shall still remain fixed within the Roman boundary. There has been many an inroad of many a fierce nation into the Roman world ; but, in entering it, they have entered within a circle where they have, suddenly and unexpectedly, found themselves subjected to potent and resistless influences to which they have

been obliged to bow. They have never been able to transfer the seat of power to other regions. They have either retired from the Roman circle, or, if they have remained, their ancient seats have been abandoned; their strength and their vigour has been given as an endowment to their new home; and they have been made, by an unseen power, to submit to those laws of development and progress which are making the Roman nations what they will be, when they shall have reached their final tenfold form. Is Russia likely to be brought under a process like this? If so, it must, as I have before said, cease to be Russia. Its chief and its people must quit their fatherland, and transfer their strength into the Roman kingdoms, and then become subject to the institutions and territorial arrangements and subdivisions which God has said shall finally prevail in the Roman countries. No one, surely, dreams of this. If, on the other hand, we suppose that Russia, retaining her present position external to the Image-nations, should be allowed to seize on some of the Roman countries—Asia Minor for example—such an event must finally result in the region so seized becoming not only territorially separate from Russia, but in its being so brought into connection with the other Roman nations to which it belongs, as to become, in union with them, opposed to Russia and superior to Russia, in civilization, wealth, and all else that constitutes greatness. This is something very different from Russia being allowed to form a universal Empire on the ruins of Western Europe.

I by no means pretend to say *when* it may please the great Disposer of events to cause the last tenfold

division of the Roman world to be accomplished. That it will not be effected before the return of the Jews to their Land and City, is, I think, very evident. But I certainly believe we have arrived at the period when the territorial boundary of the Roman world is being reconstituted, with a view to the nations that are within it being brought into closer association, so as to help one another onward towards that final greatness which they are destined unitedly to attain. How many events have occurred in Europe since the Congress of Vienna in 1815, tending to develop the Roman boundary, and to bring the Roman nations into closer association with each other? How remarkably, for example, has the present contest with Russia tended to bring Austria and Turkey into connection with England and France. If the hour for the revival and reunion of the Roman nations has arrived, it will explain why it was that the mighty armies of Russia found themselves unable to force Silistria and the Danube, and will account for the easy relinquishment of Moldavia and Wallachia—principalities that anciently formed part of the Roman Dacia. It will account too for the facility with which France conquered and annexed Algeria—Algeria (the ancient Numidia) having formed part of the Roman Empire. *If the time for the reconstitution of the Roman nations be come*, we may certainly expect that no external nation will be allowed to carry its arms successfully across the Roman boundary.* The Danube

* [That that time is not yet *fully* come is evident: yet we may be very sure that it is not far distant. And certain events in late years, which have seemed to check, will, on examination,

and the Rhine and the other limits of the Roman territory may be expected to become, in a certain sense, impregnable. On the other hand we may anticipate that difficulties, perhaps insuperable difficulties, will be encountered by the Roman nations, if they seek *to incorporate* into their own system countries external to themselves. Some years ago, when the French were conquering Algeria, one of their Generals, in writing to his government at home, boasted that he had led the triumphant legions of France into districts which the Eagles of Rome had never reached. His next despatch was the record of a reverse, and he was obliged to retire. As regards too the subdivision of the Roman territory, it is worthy of remark, that when the ruler of Egypt, a few years ago, sought to conquer and annex Syria to his dominions, he was, in a moment almost, obliged by the sudden advance of England to quit his prey. The chapter we have been considering teaches us that Syria finally is *not* to be annexed to Egypt.

Almost every thing that tends to resuscitate the Roman nations, and to bring them into that condition which the feet and toes of the Image symbolise, meets the present wishes of England. England dreads the rise of any thing like a universal Empire. It desires a subdivision of power; and such a subdivision will be when the ten kingdoms answering to the ten toes of the Image shall be found. England would desire that these kingdoms should, as nearly as possible, resemble each other in their institutions and laws; and that they should be bound

be found to have promoted the progress of things towards the appointed end.]

together in a kind of federal bond, which, whilst it allows the necessary distinctness between the several nations, should nevertheless give them a common united standing of strength against other nations. This also is symbolised in the toes of the Image. They are all associated in a common standing of strength; they are all formed of the like material—iron and clay. Russia will become, in relation to these Image-nations, just what Scythia was to the ancient Roman Empire, not an undreaded foe, but one with whom Roman civilization and power feels perfectly competent to cope. England may in this and many other things see her hopes fulfilled. She stands now (where she has long desired to stand influentially) at Constantinople, having before her the ancient countries of the East—those countries which were the early home of civilization and all that has made the world what it is. England's desire is to renovate those countries. But does not the chapter we have been considering teach us, that out of those countries—observe, not from Russia, but from one of those countries that fall within the Greek branch of the Roman Empire THE Antichrist is to spring.* Has England considered this? Has she considered whether there may not be in the principles she is adopting, something that ignores Truth, and denies to the Bible that place which it ought to occupy among the nations, and therefore prepares the way for Antichristianism. To this question, I fear, one only reply can be given. But I reserve its consideration to a subsequent chapter.

* The words of Daniel are, "OUT OF ONE OF THEM came forth a little horn that waxed exceeding great," etc.—(Dan. viii. 9.)

CHAPTER II.

ENGLAND'S FUTURE COURSE IN THE EAST.

THERE have been from time to time periods when, by the introduction of new principles, the former order of society has been so changed that new eras have been constituted in the history of human progress. Thus was it when Constantine suddenly called the Roman Empire into the *profession* of the name of Christ : and when the hand of Charlemagne gave a new impress to the Western kingdoms of the Roman world : and when the Protestant Reformation brought the Bible into hostile conflict with the corruptions of ecclesiastical apostasy : and when the fierce spirit of infidelity, stimulated and evoked by the oppression and wickedness of pretended Christianity, burst forth in France in fury and destructiveness, effecting changes, which subsequent efforts may have modified, but have never been able to reverse. All such periods may well be esteemed eras in human history. A widely-spread impression seems to prevail that we are now approaching some such era ; and the impression would seem to be a just one if we are indeed arrived at a period when civilization, long banished from the East, is about to return to her primæval oriental seats.

Greece, Egypt, and Turkey, may, speaking in general terms, be said to represent the Eastern or Greek branch of the Roman Empire. And is there any region in the earth with which are connected such reminiscences of the past, or such expectations for the future? *There*, civilization found its earliest resting place. *There*, were Chaldea, Egypt, Tyre, Damascus, Greece—names that sufficiently remind us of what the East was secularly. And when we think of heavenly light, where did it ever shine as in Jerusalem? *There*, the Prophets testified; *there*, the Lord Jesus and His Apostles ministered. With one only exception, every Church mentioned in Scripture as founded by the Apostles was found in the Eastern branch of the Roman Empire. The early light of Christianity, before it was dimmed by failure, was all shed upon those regions. But if the East was the very centre and home of light, and of privilege, so also has it been the earliest and chiefest scene of all corruption. The natural knowledge of God—that which the works of creation teach respecting “His eternal power and godhead,” was, *in the East*, first perverted and lost. *There*, more peculiarly, men “professing themselves to be wise, became fools,” and turned from the living and true God to idols. *There*, science, art, philosophy, poetry, put forth their powers to throw a halo of brightness around the worship of “devils,” for such, says the Apostle, idolatry is. (1 Cor. x. 20.) And when we turn from the Gentiles to Israel, they indeed had received the written oracles of God, but they received them only to rebel. “The Jews,” says the Apostle, “both killed the Lord Jesus and their own prophets, and have persecuted us; and they

please not God, and are contrary to all men ; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway." And when the light of Christianity, rejected by Jerusalem, found a home among the Gentiles, and for a season burned brightly there, *in the East* commenced the corruptions which have since made professing Christianity a bye-word and a reproach. "Philosophy and vain deceit," and every kind of noxious weed flourished in the schools of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople. Under Constantine and his successors, pride, pomp, ritualism, and, not unfrequently, heresy, reigned in the so-called Churches of Christ ; so that in the beginning of the seventh century Mahomedanism found a palliation for its crimes and cruelties in the profligacy, and idolatry, and corruption, that had overspread Christianity in the East.

Mahomedanism, first under the Saracens, and afterwards under the Turks, fell like the scourge of God upon the East. Where has it not spread desolation ? The fallen cities of Greece, and of Egypt, and of Syria, and of Asia Minor, bear witness to the completeness of the ruin. It was the work of the hand of God in just retribution upon multiplied iniquity. The sleep of death has been sent upon these countries. But now it is being broken. They are being, as it were, called out of the grave. They are likely to arise in new vigour. Such a prospect does of itself justify our saying, that we are entering on a new era in the world's history.

Yet surely it must be a solemn thing to attempt the revival of such countries—countries about which God

has so plainly prophesied, and which He has so unquestionably smitten. That they will finally be revived—that the power of God will finally call them out of the grave to which they have been consigned because of their iniquity is most true. The Scripture most plainly declares that there is a time when “Israel shall be the third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land, whom the Lord of Hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hand, and Israel mine inheritance.” A striking prediction indeed; one that well justifies our saying, that not only our most interesting reminiscences as to the past, but also our brightest expectations as to the future, of the earth, are connected with those regions. But that hour is not yet come. The East, before it is made the home of righteousness and peace, will, as has been shown in a preceding chapter, become the especial sphere of one who “will cast down the Truth to the ground, and practise and prosper.” Who then that thinks on these things would not enter tremblingly on any plan for the renovation of the East?

In asserting that Antichristianism must arise and reign over the East, let me not be understood to mean that therefore every effort to introduce light or civilization there must necessarily be wrong. If final results were in that way to determine present action, nothing could have ever been done to spread light or blessing in such a world as this, which ever perverts its mercies, ever turns its blessings into curse. The introduction of Christianity itself has resulted in corruptions of which Popery, and the Eastern Churches,


and Ritualism everywhere, are the memorials. I freely admit, therefore, that it is quite conceivable that a nation like England, in attempting to renovate the East, might enter on those countries with the Bible in her hand, determined to maintain the exclusive claim of that Book of God against the deceits of the Koran, and the traditions of Ritualism. The East is over-spread with Mosques, and Churches, and Monasteries, and Seminaries, in which either Mahomedanism or else the dark corruptions of Eastern Christianity reign. The Temple and the Synagogues of Judaism likewise will soon reappear upon the scene. England might refuse to honour those fanes or to uphold that worship. She might keep herself apart. She might seek to spread the Bible, and Bible-schools, and Bible-missionaries, and might openly avow that she bowed to nothing else but the Bible as having the authority of God. That such a recognition of the Bible would not be in vain, is testified by many an occurrence in the past history of Protestant England, when the Bible was commanded to be chained to the reading-desk of every parish church in the land.

But England now has far other thoughts than these. She is anticipating a new era, not so much because she is entering on a new territorial sphere (which the East virtually is) but because she is entering on it with new principles. Hitherto, in all the past history of the world, whether we look at Paganism, or to the time of Constantine, or to Mahomedanism, or to Popery, or to Protestant nations, we find it admitted as an axiom by all, that religious Truth or that which was deemed to be religious Truth, should be primarily regarded in all

governmental engagements. The notion of ruling without it would in all ages have been rejected as visionary as well as evil. It has been reserved for these modern days to inaugurate the principle, that religious Truth is to be ignored in government—that it is to concern a government no more than it does a mechanic in making a machine. Such is the sentiment advanced by a well-known historian and legislator, and sustained in our own land; while another of our legislators avers that governments as governments should practically be Atheistic, not attempting to acknowledge God or to concern themselves about revealed Truth. The first reply one feels disposed to make to such an assertion is, that in that case it were well that governments should cease to be, for that which cannot or will not own God in His own world, has surely little title to be in it.

For governments to be in the full and proper sense Atheistic is impossible. Such a thing never has been, and never will be. The experiment was tried at the first Revolution in France, and what was the result? Order perished; society was broken up; and men gladly welcomed back priestcraft and despotism, as deliverers from a confusion that was beginning to resemble the confusion of hell. But it will be said, and truly said, by those who have adopted this sentiment, that they would not be supposed to mean that they wish governments to deny the existence of God, much less to make war upon His truth. When they say that they wish governments to be Atheistic, they merely mean that they would have governments not to interfere at all either in assisting or hindering the progress of

Truth. Even if the governor should know that the Bible comes from God, and that it alone is the one light of Truth, yet let him not as a governor act upon that knowledge; let him not assist in the distribution of the Book of God, let him not establish or aid schools in which it may be taught, lest by interfering about Truth at all, he should interfere too far, and become an ecclesiastical tyrant; or lest if one government should maintain the exclusive authority of Scripture, others should be encouraged in maintaining the authority of something else—the Koran perhaps, or Tradition; or lest some, who, like the Romanist, acknowledge not the word of God as alone authoritative; or like the Jew, acknowledge it only in part; or like the Infidel acknowledge it not at all, should be offended by measures that declare the Bible to be what it is—the one only Book which reveals the will of the great Governor of the universe to His creatures whom He has placed under responsibilities, that affect not time merely, but also *Eternity*. Well, if it indeed be so, if governors find themselves brought into a condition in which they find it impossible practically to acknowledge that which they know to be the word of the living God, it is a sufficiently clear evidence that the foundations of all things are out of course, and that the whole earth is in a state of rebellion against its Creator, its Lawgiver, and its Judge. We are accustomed to say that a province is in rebellion when the decrees and proclamations of its sovereign cannot be promulgated therein. Is not the earth then in avowed rebellion, if its governors cannot or will not promulgate the decrees of the great Lord



However, this principle, so far as it requires governments to be entirely passive as regards the religions of their subjects, will not be acted on. It is far too restrictive to suit the temper of the present latitudinarian hour. Both men and governments wish to be allowed to sanction and patronize any thing, and every thing, just as may suit their convenience or their pleasure. They would object to being restricted from patronising either the Bible or the Koran, not because they love the Bible, or like the Koran, but because they dislike being restricted at all. Restriction suits neither their interests nor their inclinations. He who wishes to secure a far-spread influence over this wide world, must learn to accommodate himself to the wide world's evil. The first Napoleon was an adept in this school—wise in his generation. In Holland, he flattered the Protestants; in Poland, the Jews; in Italy, the Romanists; and when he entered upon Egypt and the East, not only were his edicts prefaced with the motto, "There is one God, and Mahomet is His Prophet;" but in one of his proclamations yet extant, he hesitates not to declare that he was the appointed instrument of Heaven for destroying the Cross, and planting the Crescent in its stead. I do not assert that England has as yet advanced to the same height of audacious blasphemy, but I do say that she has entered on the same character of path. She has established her authority in every quarter of the globe. She reigns over regions which, as regards civilization and the like, owe much indeed to her forming hand. But religiously—how has she acted religiously? She might have declined to patronize, or honour, or endow,

any religious institution that refused to own as its basis the whole Bible, and the Bible only. But instead of this, she has thrown her sheltering wing over any thing, and every thing. The sacred tooth of Buddha rests among her regalia in Ceylon, in token that she acknowledges herself as the head of Buddhism there. In India idol festivals are honoured, Mahomedan and Brahminical seminaries endowed; in the Colonies, the Bishops and Priests of Rome subsidized; at home, Maynooth sustained. An Act is to be proposed to our legislature whereby Brahmin, and Mahomedan, and Christian schools in India, are to be placed upon a footing of entire equality—all similarly endowed, and secular education alone insisted on. The Koran probably will be taught in one school, and the Bible in another. Liberality, charity, policy, require it. The age of narrow-mindedness is past. We will adopt as our hymn—

“ Father of all ! in every age,
“ In every clime adored,
“ By saint, by savage, and by sage,
“ Jehovah, Jove, or Lord ! ”

The Scriptures indeed may tell us that “ what the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrifice to devils, and not to God.” But it would be difficult to believe that. It would be hard to believe that the worship of Jupiter was the worship of a devil. Jupiter was but another name for Jehovah.* The Scriptures may indeed tell us that no idolator can enter the kingdom of God, and

* [This very statement has, within the last fortnight, been made in Westminster Abbey, by an Oxford Professor (Max Müller) lecturing in the Abbey, under the auspices of the Dean. June, 1878.]

that there is one only name, even the name of Jesus, whereby men can be saved, but we can scarcely credit that. The way would be too narrow. Nothing can be worse or more hateful than bigotry. Such is the temper, such the language of the present hour. The men who say these things are not unfrequently distinguished by placidity and amiability of character. Placidity, no doubt, is greatly promoted by determining in every thing to please one's self, and to please others. The stern claim of God's Truth is that which chiefly disturbs the smooth flow of the current of human thought. When that claim is removed the current not unfrequently flows on without a ripple.

Is Turkey less likely to tempt England to Latitudinarianism than India or the Colonies? Will there be no inducement to flatter the Greek prelates and priests? Is not influence over them coveted even more than over the Mahomedans themselves, though that too is eagerly sought? And what country is so free to patronize everything as England? France and Austria are both fettered more or less by Romanism. But Protestant England has no feud with the Greek Church. It is able and willing to patronize that, and Romanism too. How courteous and flattering the expressions which the Archbishop of Canterbury has already lavished on the corrupt prelates of the East.*

* Not the present Archbishop, but one of his predecessors, at a time when Lord Aberdeen was Foreign Minister. The occasion was the mission of the first Protestant Bishop to Jerusalem. The letter, in which the expressions to which I refer occur, has never been withdrawn. Indeed, that it is still acted on, is proved by the difficulties in which Bishop Gobat finds himself placed, and by the persecution which has lately been

The manner in which England has taken her incipient step in the present Eastern conflict, too plainly indicates (if evidence were needed) what is to be expected in the future. The expedition into Turkey was undertaken under a government avowedly founded on the broadest latitudinarian principles. The head of that government, joined by one of its most influential members, at a time when a great effort was made throughout this country to restrain the audacious encroachments of Popery, openly and bitterly denounced that effort.* In their eyes, Popery and Protestantism were but different aspects of Truth. The two other members of the government on whom the management of the war chiefly devolved are men who, governmentally latitudinarian, but individually anti-protestant, have done much to destroy true Protestantism, and to lead back this country into the death of Ritualism. One of them, kind, amiable and philanthropic in character, in speaking of the admission of the Anglican, Presbyterian, and Romanist ministers into the hospitals of Scutari, significantly adds, "all

raised against him by the enemies of the Gospel in England. The Roman Catholics were quick to discern the character of the Archbishop's letter; and one of them published a pamphlet in which the doctrines of the Roman Church, the Greek Church, and the Church of England were set in parallel columns; and it was asked, what principle except one of unprincipled expediency could cause the Roman Church to be rejected, and the Greek Church to be honoured and flattered, when the doctrines of the latter, were no less than those of Rome, diametrically opposed to the doctrines of Protestantism.

• ° Lord Aberdeen and Sir James Graham.

doubtless equally good." There was once, at any rate, felt to be some difference between the systems which those ministers represent. The names of Cranmer, and Knox, and Bonner, were once suggestive of something like a difference. Is it the same thing for true Protestantism (I speak not of its base counterfeits) to tell the dying sinner that personal faith in God, through the one finished sacrifice on the Cross, is the alone means of salvation, and for the Priest of Ritualism to preach priestly ministrations, and prayers, and masses and sacraments? Is it the same thing for the dying eye to be directed to the one only Mediator between God and man, or to be turned towards the Queen of Heaven, as Mary has been impiously called, to whom, as has been blasphemously said, her Son has committed the kingdom of grace, reserving to Himself that of justice? Can omniscience and omnipresence be ascribed to Mary (for the hearer of universal prayer must be omniscient and omnipresent)—can such attributes be ascribed to Mary—Mary, whose body now lies in the dust of death, without ascribing to a creature the attributes of God? And is not that idolatry? And is it not written that no idolator shall enter the kingdom of God? Yet Mr. Sidney Herbert tells us that truth and falsehood are just the same thing, "all equally good;" and accordingly, in the British Camp (for the first time, I believe, since the Reformation) a tent was to be erected for the elevation and worship of the Mass,* and Romanist tracts addressed to the

* So at least was stated in the published letter of a Catholic Priest, and I have not seen the statement contradicted.

[At a subsequent period, when the fortifications of Cher-

Catholic Chaplain of the British forces in the East, are sent out under the immediate auspices of the English Government. Let us only add to this a Mahomedan chaplain and tracts, and a Brahmin chaplain and tracts, and a Jewish chaplain and tracts, and every other kind of chaplain and tract, and we complete the picture.

England, because of her separation from the idolatry of Europe, and her national confession of the Bible, has been for ages marvellously privileged—marvellously protected, whilst war and destruction were devastating the nations around. Can we wonder, then, that if England enters on the ancient countries of the East—countries which God has marked out in His word as the peculiar sphere in which His judgments against evil have been and will be *manifested*, can we wonder that if England enters on those countries with privileges such as I have described, that she should herself meet judgment? It is easy to explain away the dealings of God in judgment. It is easy to fix one's eye upon the secondary agencies, and to talk only of them. But are not famine, plague, and tempest, His instru-


burgh were completed, and the English fleet went there to be present at the inauguration, the Duke of Somerset, as first Lord of the Admiralty, and Lord Clarence Paget, as Secretary of the Admiralty, accompanied by the Admiral and officers of the Fleet, went on shore, by invitation, to be present at High Mass, purposely celebrated, no doubt, that England might be ensnared into the sanction of that which the England of former days reprobated as Idolatry and abomination. Can it be expected that the mercies which averted the Armada should be repeated?]

ments? "Is there evil" [*i.e.* calamity] "in the city, and the Lord has not done it?" Are wisdom, and energy, and prudence, and the power of prevision and arrangement, suddenly to fail in those in whom such qualities seemed almost inherent, and are we not to recognise God's hand in the failure?—a failure pronounced by one well qualified to judge, to be mysterious and inexplicable. We might just as well say that the fall of Tyre, or of Jerusalem, was not a judgment, as to say that the wasting away of the British army under the walls of Sebastopol was not a judgment. Yet we must not expect such judgments to be continually repeated. They are, in one sense, mercies. But God *may* say, "Why should ye be stricken any more? Ye will revolt more and more." He may say, as He said to Pharaoh, "Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth." It was, no doubt, very pleasant to Pharaoh to be raised up on the pinnacle of greatness. He little thought, while he was extracting the elements of his greatness from the sufferings of God's people, that his prosperity was in judgment, and that he was thereby being ripened for his doom. And now, if men should trample down the *principles*, if not the people of God, and be advantaged by it, and draw the elements of their prosperity therefrom, must not such prosperity be sent in judgment—must it not be the greatest of all judgments, except that indeed in which it will finally end, even utter and overwhelming ruin?

There have been some, doubtless, who have entered

on this course hesitatingly, and with a conscience ill at ease. Men who have been ready to say with Naaman, when he thought of attending his master into the house of Rimmon, "The Lord pardon his servant in this thing,"—men who have secretly trembled as they were sacrificing the Truth at the shrine of expediency, just as Darius did, when sorrowfully and reluctantly he cast Daniel into the den of lions. Darius could not trust God to preserve to him his crown, if he, on his part, preserved God's servant from destruction; and so, Daniel was sacrificed, and the crown kept. Nevertheless, sinful as such a yielding to self-interest and expediency is, the heart of one who mourns over the deed that he commits, is not so far distant from God as that of one who fiendishly exults at seeing the Truth perish, or even of one who looks on with the cold Gallio-like apathy of indifferentism. It is to be feared, however, that the hesitation once felt by some is fast giving way. He, who on the ground of necessity pleads for and perseveres in the path of expediency, will soon learn to defend it on the ground of its being right. Whilst there is confession of evil, there may be hope; for God can meet confession with grace. But what if the path be justified, or extolled, or gloried in? Can anything but judgment be expected then?

At present, many circumstances conspire to lull men into the sleep of latitudinarian indifferentism. Christians even—real Christians, have been so possessed with the notion that the world is steadily progressing towards improvement, that they have thought it wise to qualify their statements, and to divest Truth of its own proper dogmatic form, lest they



should offend those whose prejudices (they say) may for a time be borne with, seeing that they are advancing, slowly, perhaps, but surely, in the right path. But St. Paul did not compromise thus. "To men's consciences" he did indeed seek "to commend himself in the fear of God"; but he did not seek to commend himself to their wayward, or worldly, or ignorant natural feelings. "If I yet please men," said he, "I cannot be the servant of Christ." St. Paul was surrounded by philosophic morality as well as by ritualism and every other form of religiousness; but he spake and acted as one who was very sensible that his doctrines were utterly irreconcilable with, nay, utterly subversive of, everything that men had either originated, or moulded according to their own thoughts. He knew that the conflict between his system and every other system admitted of no compromise; that it was a war between truth and falsehood—a war of extermination. The sense of this, whilst it left him still gentle, humble, and full of love to souls, yet gave to his acts and testimonies a vigour and decision which are never found when the width of the distance that separates between Divine Truth and every form of human falsification is not appreciated; and when, consequently, it is supposed that the interests of Truth can be advanced by compromise. "I would," said the Apostle to the Galatians, "*that they were even cut off;*" who have seduced you from simplicity of dependence on the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God. And again, "But what things were gain to me, those I have counted loss for Christ; yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss, for the excellency of the knowledge

of Christ, . . . and that I might be found in HIM, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but the righteousness which is of God through faith in Jesus." (Phil. iii.) Unqualified statements these—suffering no doubt to remain as to whether he was to stand before God in a righteousness of his own, or in the righteousness of ANOTHER: and plainly declaring the fearfulness of the condition of those who set aside, by unauthorised additions, the simplicity of the gospel of the grace of God. Well indeed may we suppose that the indignation of God must wax hot against all who veil the declaration of His love to those who, having no righteousness of their own (for all mere human righteousnesses are as "filthy rags"), have proposed to them, as the free gift of God, the justifying righteousness of His Son. But what if it be rejected? There were in the Apostle's days many, and they too persons of whom St. Paul could say, that they had a zeal toward God, who were stern rejectors of this truth. Were they safe? Did their great zeal deliver them? Ah, no! "I have great anguish," said the Apostle, "and continual sorrow" on their behalf. "My heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved: for I bear them record that they have a zeal toward God, but not according to knowledge; for they being ignorant of God's righteousness [*i. e.* the justifying righteousness prepared by God in Christ], and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God. For CHRIST is the end of the law for righteousness to every one who believeth." How contrary such a

passage as this to the thoughts of Latitudinarianism. How do these words scatter to the winds all baseless hopes respecting the safety of those who spurn the justifying righteousness of the one Saviour! How, on the other hand, do they present a hope full of glory to the feeblest of those whose hope the Lord is.

At the time of that great conflict between light and darkness—the Protestant Reformation, the value of dogmatic statements on these, and kindred branches of Truth, was well appreciated.* But when the light of the Reformation waned, and interests other than

* How clear, for example, are such statements as the following taken from the French and the Helvetian confessions:—

“Casting away all opinion of virtues and merits, we do altogether rest in the only obedience of Jesus Christ, which is imputed to us.”—*Confession of France*, § v. *Art.* 13.

“Ye are saved by grace, through faith: and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not by works, lest any might have cause to boast,” &c. (Eph. ii. 8, 9). Therefore, because faith doth apprehend Christ our righteousness, and doth attribute all to the praise of God in Christ; in this respect justification is attributed to faith, chiefly because of Christ, whom it receiveth, and not because it is a work of ours, for it is the gift of God. Now, that we do receive Christ by faith, the Lord showeth at large (John vi. 27, 33, 35, 48—58), where he putteth eating for believing, and believing for eating. For as by eating we receive meat, so by believing we are made partakers of Christ. Therefore, we do not part the benefit of justification, giving part to the grace of God, or to Christ, and part to ourselves, our charity, works, or merit; but we do attribute it wholly to the praise of God in Christ, and that through faith. Moreover, our charity and our works cannot please God, if they be done of such as are not just; wherefore, we must first be made just, before we can love or do any just works. We are made just (as we have said) through faith in

those of Truth prevailed, the testimonies of Protestantism became enfeebled; division increased, and ignorance as to the real nature of the Gospel returned. At the time of the Reformation, what would have been thought if any one had insinuated, as Dr. Pusey and other Anglican Romanists have insinuated, that the controversy between Romanism and Protestantism respecting Justification is nominal, rather than real—that it is in fact, a strife of words? Such a statement could not have been ventured on, except ignorance had so shrouded men's minds as to render them incapable of appreciating the degree of absurdity, as well as falsehood, involved in such an assertion. But how does such a statement operate? It seldom effects fully the end designed. Few comparatively are induced to confide in the subdued, lamb-like tone which Ritualism, on such occasions, thinks fit to assume. Men, for the most part, are afraid of it: they remember too well what the terrible-ness of the ecclesiastical yoke is. Nevertheless, they find in such statements an excuse for indifferentism. They say, naturally enough—if controversies which have led some to become fierce and bloody persecutors, and have caused others to lay down their lives in torment, are affirmed by thoughtful men to have ori-

Christ, by the mere grace of God, who doth not impute unto us our sins, but imputeth unto us the righteousness of Christ; yea, and our faith in Christ He imputeth for righteousness unto us.”—*Helvetican Confession*.

How different this from the Romanist decree of Trent, which pronounces all who teach the justifying righteousness of Christ to be accursed.

ginated in mistake—if they who imagined that they were so essentially at variance, were in reality agreed, and differed only in form of expression, we may well be excused from entering on subjects in which misapprehension is so easy, and attended by results so terrible. I do not say that such reasoning is to be justified; but surely we cannot wonder that an age like the present, urged on by an infinitude of motives to give itself over to Latitudinarianism, should avail itself of so plausible a plea. Another favourite doctrine of the same school is, that doubt is a right and necessary ingredient in faith. “They have coolly and deliberately,” says Mr. Goode, “set about to show that faith can never have more than probability to rest upon; and that, in fact, if there were certainty, there could not be faith—as if faith was belief on insufficient grounds.”* Some, perhaps, may be led by such doctrines to give themselves blindly up to the authority of Rome; but others, and they the majority, will find in it an excuse for the happy liberty, as they esteem it, of scepticism. “Truth!” says one of our present rulers, “what is Truth? Surely if some bright seraph were to descend from yonder sphere above, he would tell us, that it became such as we, not to be seeking into mysteries, but rather to love and to adore.”† Plausible words!—yet utterly subversive of what the Scripture is, and of that which the Scripture declares itself to be as the revelation of God. To reveal means not to veil, but to unveil. “Secret things,” says

* Goode’s “Divine Rule of Faith and Practice.”

† I quote from memory and therefore will not answer for every word—but I have given the sentiment.

the Scripture, "belong unto the Lord our God; but the things that are revealed belong unto us, and to our children." We, says the Apostle, who are sent to declare the mysteries of God, use "great plainness of speech." "Henceforth," said the Lord Jesus, "I call you not servants: for the servant knoweth not what his lord doeth, but I have called you friends, for whatsoever I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you." Such are the privileges of believers. But Latitudinarianism gives heed to none of these things. It does not wish for certainty; it loves uncertainty: and therefore, taking its place by the side of Pilate, it willingly re-echoes his words, "What is Truth?" Like him, it waits not for an answer: it turns its back on revelation, and abandons it to its enemies, as readily as Pilate betrayed and abandoned Christ.*

* The growth of Latitudinarianism will no doubt be aided by the rise of the party who have been called "Broad Church"—a strange, self-condemning appellation when we remember that "Church" means a body *called out* of the broad into the narrow way. The names of Kingsley, Maurice, Scott, and Erskine may be mentioned as giving some notion of the tendencies of this school; though the very circumstance of its being "broad," renders it difficult to specify any doctrines that would be avowed by *all* the individuals who compose this anomalous body. Some love the pomp and pride of ritual ceremonies; some are philosophic moralists, inclined to think that science is the chief if not the only parent of miracles; some are Christian socialists; whilst others adopting the terms of evangelical Christianity (terms however which they use in new and peculiar senses) give thereby the apparent sanction of Scripture to statements which are found, when examined, to be utterly subversive of all truth. The tendency of this last-named section is to deny atonement by blood-shedding, and to

They who contend that governments should recognize all regard to religious truth and the moral principle of their regulations as past assumptions. They point to the past history of Christianity—in the period for example when Protestantism was established in our own country, and when an attempt was made to cause the Government and people of England to act as if they were members of the Church of Christ. They point to this and ask whether the attempt succeeded—whether it did not

amount to the assumption by which they suppose Human Nature and therefore all men were reconciled to God. But the Scripture never speaks of an *abstract* nature being reconciled: it speaks of *belonging and acting* being reconciled and that by faith in a *personal* Saviour. They pretend also that because the Son of God was pleased to assume human nature that therefore all men are united to Him. But we do not say that two times from the mere fact of their being *men*, are therefore united to each other. The mere fact of being possessed of a common nature does not unite two human individuals. To maintain such an identity would be to revert to the dreams of the Bektars, and this some of us have actually done. If men can ever convince themselves that all mankind are absolutely united to Christ—if that great and distinctive privilege of the believing Church is indeed to be assigned to the unbelieving world a platform is raised on which the benighted Latitudinarianism can construct just what it pleases and cover its falsehood under Christian names. It is bad enough to *assert* that all the baptized are by the fact of baptism quickened with new and heavenly life: but it is even worse to say that all men born into the world are united to Christ. In what can these things end except perdition? Some of this school (such as Mr. Maurice) openly reject the great doctrine of our faith—forgiveness of sins through the vicarious sufferings and death of the great Substitute.


end in the most disastrous failure? We reply, it unquestionably *did* end in failure. How could it be otherwise, when the attempt was founded on a fiction. The Government and people of England were not really brought into the Church of God : how then could they act as the Church of God ? Personal faith in Jesus, as revealed in the Gospel, alone brings into His Church ; and therefore a Church-position cannot rightly be assumed by those who have not personally embraced the Gospel.

The withdrawal of Governments, therefore, from a Church-position, and their determination to free themselves from principles, which (however binding *on the Church of God*) are not applicable to those, who like themselves, *are not in the Church of God*, cannot be regretted. We may deprecate the motives of the withdrawal, and the manner in which it has been effected ; but we cannot wish to maintain a fiction, nor to induce men to profess themselves to be what really they are not. What we protest against is this—that the withdrawal from a Church-position is made the excuse for withdrawing from something more. It is made the excuse for renouncing other principles, which, in virtue of *natural* relation to God, are binding on rulers and on their subjects, not because they are God's *church*, but because they are God's *creatures*.

It cannot be indifferent to God, whether or not, governments encourage principles which subvert such truths, as men, by natural conscience, are able to recognise. There are some truths which can be recognised by the converted only ; but there are other truths which men, as men, can and do acknowledge, for they

belong to a sphere in which man, as man, is placed. It is true, indeed, that the acknowledgment of such truths does not bring into a spiritual relation to God; yet the rejection of them involves in the guilt of infidelity. The consequences of despising the Gospel of salvation may be seen perhaps only in another world; but the rejection of truths which even natural conscience recognises, and which it should be one of the great objects of governments to maintain, meets with visitation even here; if not in the way of outward chastisement, yet in a more terrible infliction—a judicial hardening of the heart. The acknowledgment of such truths as the existence of God; the existence and exaltation of Christ; the fact of the Scripture being the revelation of the will of God, and therefore absolutely and without exception *true*, do not make men Christians; but the denial of such truths makes them infidels.

At present, I confine myself to one point—the acknowledgment of the Scripture. The Bible is a book sent by God into the world, with adequate evidence of its authority as the alone revelation of His will. None of the many books which we are accustomed unhesitatingly to receive as authentic and genuine, have such strong evidence of their authenticity and genuineness, as the Bible. When that evidence has been once presented, men cannot escape from the responsibility attendant on its reception. The governor of a province is required to own the decree of his distant sovereign, the moment such a decree duly authenticated reaches him. He is required to own it without addition and without mutilation. Either would con-




end in the most disastrous failure? We reply, it unquestionably *did* end in failure. How could it be otherwise, when the attempt was founded on a fiction. The Government and people of England were not really brought into the Church of God : how then could they act as the Church of God ? Personal faith in Jesus, as revealed in the Gospel, alone brings into His Church ; and therefore a Church-position cannot rightly be assumed by those who have not personally embraced the Gospel.

The withdrawal of Governments, therefore, from a Church-position, and their determination to free themselves from principles, which (however binding *on the Church of God*) are not applicable to those, who like themselves, *are not in the Church of God*, cannot be regretted. We may deprecate the motives of the withdrawal, and the manner in which it has been effected ; but we cannot wish to maintain a fiction, nor to induce men to profess themselves to be what really they are not. What we protest against is this—that the withdrawal from a Church-position is made the excuse for withdrawing from something more. It is made the excuse for renouncing other principles, which, in virtue of *natural* relation to God, are binding on rulers and on their subjects, not because they are God's *church*, but because they are God's *creatures*.

It cannot be indifferent to God, whether or not, governments encourage principles which subvert such truths, as men, by natural conscience, are able to recognise. There are some truths which can be recognised by the converted only ; but there are other truths which men, as men, can and do acknowledge, for they

belong to a sphere in which man, as man, is placed. It is true, indeed, that the acknowledgment of such truths does not bring into a spiritual relation to God; yet the rejection of them involves in the guilt of infidelity. The consequences of despising the Gospel of salvation may be seen perhaps only in another world; but the rejection of truths which even natural conscience recognises, and which it should be one of the great objects of governments to maintain, meets with visitation even here; if not in the way of outward chastisement, yet in a more terrible infliction—a judicial hardening of the heart. The acknowledgment of such truths as the existence of God; the existence and exaltation of Christ; the fact of the Scripture being the revelation of the will of God, and therefore absolutely and without exception *true*, do not make men Christians; but the denial of such truths makes them infidels.

At present, I confine myself to one point—the acknowledgment of the Scripture. The Bible is a book sent by God into the world, with adequate evidence of its authority as the alone revelation of His will. None of the many books which we are accustomed unhesitatingly to receive as authentic and genuine, have such strong evidence of their authenticity and genuineness, as the Bible. When that evidence has been once presented, men cannot escape from the responsibility attendant on its reception. The governor of a province is required to own the decree of his distant sovereign, the moment such a decree duly authenticated reaches him. He is required to own it without addition and without mutilation. Either would con-



stitute him a rebel. Just so, all rulers who have the Bible and its evidence presented to them, are bound to receive it as from the King of Kings—to receive it without addition, and without mutilation; and, having received, to honour it.

If the Great Enemy of Truth has led some to reject the Bible, as do the Mahomedans; or to mutilate it, as do the Jews by the rejection of the New Testament; or to add to it, as do the Romanists by their exaltation of the Apocrypha and Tradition—in all such cases it is the duty of every government that fears God, to refuse to honour or to aid, directly or indirectly, systems which avowedly set aside THE BIBLE from the place assigned to it by God. Observe, this is no question respecting that which the Bible contains. Suppose it were placed before us as a sealed book: we are bound to receive it as the Book of God, the moment we are acquainted with the evidence on which it is authenticated. Men sometimes talk of persecution. Are they wronged because their rulers own the Bible as being what it is? Are my children or my subjects to complain of being persecuted, because as a father or as a governor, I refuse to assist them in rejecting the Book of God? Am *I* not rather the persecuted person if I am to be constrained by those under me to aid that which I know to be sinful, or to withhold aid from that which comes marked with the authority of God? If I am to be forced to assist in propagating the doctrines of the Koran, or the Talmud, or Tradition, why may I not on the same principle, be required to assist the doctrines of Owen or Voltaire? Are parents and governors simply the servants of those beneath


them? Are they merely to express and give effect to the will of their children or servants or subjects, however mistaken or evil that will may be? Are the opinions of society, however false, contradictory, and various, to be regarded as the mind of God? Are we indeed to say, "*Vox populi vox Dei*?" If that were true, man must be holy as God is holy; and then they would be content to remain in the place that pertains to them as creatures. They would not arrogate to themselves the place of God, but would gladly say, "We are the clay, and thou the potter, and we all are the work of thy hand."

It will be said, perhaps, that there is a great deal in all this that may be *abstractedly* true, but that the need of a practical age like the present is, not abstract truth, but practicable principles. To this I reply, that there can be few mistakes more fatal than to suppose that it is always our *first* duty to enquire after "the practicable." If indeed we were living at a time when the principles of God had been rigidly observed, if there had been no departure from His will—no compromise of His Truth, then perhaps we might safely assume that "the practicable" was identical with "the true." But whenever there has been disobedience to God and departure from His ways, we shall always find that facilities for evil have so increased, and capabilities for good have so diminished, that "practicable" becomes well nigh synonymous with "evil;" and "impracticable" or "abstract" with "good." What were the circumstances in which Israel once found themselves, when, after long departure from God, some of them began again to enquire after

Truth? As soon as the long-neglected book of God was read and explained to them they all wept.* And why? Because they found there certain principles which in their then condition of weakness, they were constrained to regard as abstract impracticable principles, and they doubted whether they would ever be to them anything else than impracticable. The difficulties in which they had involved themselves were great; yet they turned repentantly to God, humbled themselves, and then grace met their confession. But suppose they had not acted thus? Suppose they had persisted in despising all instruction except that which they deemed "practicable" (which in such a case would have meant instruction calculated to subserve their own erring ways), how then would they ever have discovered what their real relation to God and to His Truth was? In that case they would not have repented—would not have humbled themselves—would not have amended their ways, but would have gone on proudly and carelessly until overtaken by a judgment that they looked not for. I repeat, therefore, that whenever, either in the church or in the world, there has been prolonged departure from the principles of God, the first and all-important question is, not what is practicable, but what is true.

Yet although I freely admit that many a thing right to be done, may now have become virtually impracticable, yet that to which I have above referred is not as yet impracticable. It is not impracticable for the government of England to refuse to aid the schemes of

* "All the people wept, when they heard the words of the law." (Neh. viii. 9.)



those who avowedly reject the Bible. It is not impossible for them to assist in the distribution of the Bible, and in the establishment of Bible schools. It is not impossible for them to say openly and intelligibly in the face of all men, "We honour the Bible and the Bible alone." But if instead of this they choose to temporise and to cherish every form of systematised falsehood by which Satan has destroyed the souls of men, what is to be expected then ?

It may not be long that the Government of England will have it in their power to own the Bible as the Book of God. If they persevere in making the government yet more and more the mere organ of the popular will—if they persist in placing in positions of legislative influence persons who avowedly reject or mutilate the Scripture—if the Mahomedan, the Jew, the Greek, the Romanist, the Brahmin, and it may be the Mormonite and the Socialist, are to legislate for those who reverence the Scriptures as the word of the living God, it will soon cease to be in the power of the government to own the Bible except at the price of owning and aiding every abomination by which Satan has morally desolated the world.

But many say, "We have entered on the path, and we cannot now withdraw ; nor can we refuse to proceed. We have agreed to honour and to assist *some* forms of error ; consistency requires that we should go on to honour and assist *all*. Even if it be a path of ruin that we have entered, none shall accuse us of inconsistency ; we will not now stop, we will tread it to the very end." In ordinary life such reasoning would be thought to indicate the very extreme either of vice

or of madness. But what men call madness when their own interests are affected, they praise as firmness when the interests of God are supposed to be the only interests involved.

There is, I fear, no reason to doubt that England will continue resolutely to advance in the latitudinarian path on which she has so deliberately entered. It is possible, indeed, that the influence of some who are beginning to discern the gulf that yawns before their feet, may, for a time, check the rapidity of her onward progress. But I have little hope even of this. The ancient countries of the East, on which England is about to enter, will offer to her latitudinarianism stronger temptations than have been presented either by Ireland or India. She will be urged on by an infinitude of motives to flatter Mahomedanism on the one hand, and the Greek superstition on the other. Whilst persuading these and other like systems to resign their hopes of exclusive dominance, and to sink acquiescingly into their place in the new system of coequality and fraternization, she will need to soothe their disappointment by flattering and honouring them to the very extent of her power. On fraternization such as this, based as it is on negation of Truth, ANTICHRIST will come as the scourge of God. They who set aside the definiteness and the definite claims of Revealed Truth are the sure preparers of his way. I have already shewn that he is to arise in the East, that is to say, in the *Greek* branch of the Roman Empire.* The East will be the

* See preceding chapter, and "Prospects of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman Empire," as advertised at end.

home also and centre of his power—the place of his glory, and the scene of his destruction. “He shall plant the tabernacles of his palaces in the glorious holy mountain [Mount Zion], yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.” “Armageddon,” in the north-western part of the Land of Israel, not far from Carmel, will be the place in which he will marshal his mighty hosts to meet their destruction in the valley of Jehoshaphat under the walls of Jerusalem. (See Joel iii.) Evidence upon evidence might be multiplied from Scripture to show that *the East* is the sphere in which those great events are to occur which will terminate the course of this present age. “*The Assyrian*,” is the designative name of Antichrist throughout the Book of Isaiah; and Jerusalem and Babylon are to be the great seats of his blasphemy and his glory. Would that the minds of Christians could be turned to view the *secular* progress of the world in the same light in which they have been accustomed to view its ecclesiastical corruptions. The character of their testimony would be wholly altered then. They would recognise as Truth much that they are at present wont to ridicule; and would eschew many a principle and many an undertaking which they now honour and sustain.

It is true indeed that these things do mark the world as being one vast Egypt, but in what other place do the ransomed family of faith sojourn? The bloodmarked door, the staff in the hand, the shoe on the foot, the feeding in haste on the slain lamb, all indicate the near presence of evil and the close approach of judgment, and typically mark the only

place which the true Church of God can in safety occupy, till the great day of visitation comes. Human progress apart from truth cannot be otherwise than Egyptian in character and in end. It may and it will succeed in rearing the throne of the last great Pharaoh of the earth; it may rest under the shadow of his protection for a season; but what will it have earned for itself in that day, when men shall "go into the clefts of the rocks, and into the tops of the ragged rocks, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of His Majesty when He ariseth to shake terribly the earth"—"when the great day of the Lamb's wrath shall have come, and who shall be able to stand?" (See Isaiah ii. 21, and Rev. vi. 17.) None will be able to stand except those who have found their shelter under His blood—"those who shall have washed their garments and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." The voice of mercy that speaketh of that atoning blood is not yet silenced. It is still said, "Men and brethren, through this man is preached unto you THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS; and through Him all who believe ARE JUSTIFIED FROM ALL THINGS." May God grant that none who read these pages may despise this testimony of love. There is no other refuge. It is only found by those who consent to tread "*the narrow way.*"

§ III.*

THE Providence of God has once more marvellously interfered in preventing Russia from establishing herself in the manner she desired within the Roman boundary. She has been obliged to relinquish her grasp upon the Balkan Peninsula, although at one time Constantinople itself seemed likely to become her prey. The danger of a fearful war which, in all probability, would have finally involved all the leading nations of Europe, has also been *for the present* averted. This is a mercy which all who fear God ought to recognise, for we are little practically conscious of the horrors of war. What if the Russo-Bulgarian atrocities (atrocities is a weak word to express the fiendish outrages perpetrated under Russian sanction in the Rhodope district) were to be inflicted on this country? Does not England deserve chastisement? Does she answer to her responsibilities? Responsibilities must always be proportioned to light and privileges received. Once more, however, undeserved mercies have, for a time at least, been granted us; an European war has been averted; but the respite may be very short. Threatening clouds still remain, and seem to be increasing every day.

Those who know what is written in the Scripture respecting the future of the dispensation in which we live, however thankful they may be for interposed


* This section was not in the first edition. With the exception of the few last sentences, it was written in August, 1878.

mercies, will never expect to see in human things progress towards good. We know that the darkest part of the night of evil is yet to come. If any one who has hitherto wielded power in the earth could have subdued the stubborn strength of evil, it would have been David; but with his dying lips he owned his failure and his incompetency. He had not subdued, and could not subdue, the strength of the sons of Belial. A stronger than he must come to effect it; and in due season He will come, and the sons of Belial will be grasped, gathered, and "utterly burned with fire in the same place." (2 Sam. xxiii. 7.) We must never forget that Armageddon and the Valley of Jehoshaphat, where the wine-press will be trodden, (*see* Joel iii.) mark the end of human progress in the present Dispensation. A knowledge of this prevents our being entangled in the interests of all human politics, whether the scene be tumultuous, or whether calm and besprinkled with present mercies. Our "polity [*πολιτευμα*] is in heaven:" our inheritance is in the new creation of God, of which Christ is the risen Head, in whom our life is hidden.

We have, nevertheless, reasons for watching with deep attention the progress of events. There are certain moral, and certain outward signs by which we may judge whether present progress is being made in the path that must be trodden before the appointed end comes. We have also to uphold the honour of God by maintaining the strict veracity of His Holy Word, and by showing how events have advanced, and are advancing, in the direction predicted by Him. Sometimes the stream of events takes a sudden bend,

and seems to flow backwards towards its source: at other times it flows onward in a straightforward course. On the present occasion has there been retrocession or advance? It is too soon, perhaps, to answer that question decidedly; nevertheless, if we judge by present appearances, we may say that there has been an advance.

The result of the present truce for so it has been called by one who has been actively engaged in forming it, has been to assert the determination of the European nations to control the future of the virtually vacated East. Russia has been practically made to understand that she is not to be the arbiter of Eastern destinies. This is in accordance with what Scripture foretells. Moreover, the old and most obstructive notion of the maintenance of the territorial integrity of the Turkish dominions has probably been finally renounced. It has also been agreed that the governmental supremacy of Mahommedanism as a religious system should be set aside, and that religious equality should be established. European principles are not to be subjected to Oriental. By these things the future of the East is as vitally affected as was that of Italy when Austrian and Papal supremacy fell, and Italy, after centuries of bondage, was thrown open to modern progress. And more than this; the proposed establishment of Austrian power in Bosnia and the Herzegovina is virtually a declaration that the States of Europe intend, through Austria, to watch and control events in the Balkan Peninsula, and, if necessary, in Constantinople itself. Austria acts as the vanguard of Europe in this direction, and there is



little doubt that she will, perhaps at no great distance of time, become the recognised guardian of the Danube. This seems to be one of the most marked results (and an important result it is) of the Congress of Berlin. The position assumed by England in Cyprus is no less important. As respects Asia Minor and Syria, England's position is analogous to that which Austria holds to the Balkan Peninsula. England may be regarded as virtually the vanguard of Europe in the direction of Asia Minor and Syria. She is to watch those countries, not for her own advantage merely, but for the general advantage of Europe, that their resources may be developed, and the capital and activities of the world may be attracted towards them. This, apparently, is the mission with which England, with the sanction of Europe (Russia excepted), has charged herself, and if she succeed in this, even to the same extent that she has succeeded in Egypt, the stream of events will, no doubt, rapidly flow on towards the appointed end.

We must not, however, be too confident as to this. The danger that has threatened Europe, though for the time averted, is not finally removed. Russia cannot be other than disappointed and irritated. If she had known the strength of resistance that still remained in Turkey, if she had thought that a concert between the European powers would have been effected, and that England would have remained firm as her opponent, Russia would, no doubt, have shrunk from entering into the war with Turkey. Probably she never expected or intended to establish herself at present on the Bosphorus, or to possess herself of


Constantinople. She knew that she would encounter the united opposition of Europe as to this, but she evidently expected to strengthen very materially the hands of her Montenegrin and Servian friends, and to secure for herself a firm hold on the greater part of the Balkan Peninsula. In all this she has been disappointed. Instead of the Montenegrins and Servians being strengthened, Austria (should the present arrangement be carried into effect) will be strengthened, and that with the sanction and support of Europe.

But another object of Russia, and in all probability her main object, was the establishment of a power in Armenia, and in the south-eastern corner of the Black Sea. She saw clearly enough the importance of that district. Thence from fortresses that she could easily make unassailable, she could advance on the utterly defenceless regions of Asia Minor and Syria. She would, for the present, care little for the Straits of Constantinople if she could reach by land the *Ægean* and the coasts of Syria, and so establish herself on the Mediterranean by other means. An advance towards the *Ægean* and towards Mesopotamia and the Persian Gulf, were of infinitely greater importance to her than the present possession of Constantinople, and would be less likely to alarm the European nations. She has, for the present, been checked as to this, but it is not likely that she has finally abandoned the object, for if she could once grasp the Tigris and the Euphrates, and from Syria threaten the Nile, and in Europe secure one strong ally to aid her, the rest of Europe would be in jeopardy indeed. The hordes of Asia are intended by God (so we learn from the Scrip-

ture) to be a menace to European civilization to the end of this dispensation. The present defenceless condition of Asia Minor and Syria, as well as other facts, attest the presence of the danger, and if it is to be averted, the European nations must learn to act together in a manner far different from that which they have hitherto done. They will have in many ways to re-consider their plans, and to abandon many of their heretofore most cherished thoughts. Nations, Eastern and Western, that fall within the scope of the Roman world, will be in some way or other attracted, or else forced by circumstances, into firmer compact union—a union closer than that which can be supplied by mere treaties, for experience has shown how easily the most solemn treaties can be set aside. Alliances will probably first be formed, and in some way secured by means more trustworthy than mere treaty-obligation, and the union thus established will finally become federal, and thus a new controlling centre (the last which this present dispensation will afford) will be established. It will continue for a short season, and then the end will come. This, of course, will appear Utopian and absurd to those who know not, or believe not what the Scripture declares, and a thousand difficulties to such a consummation may easily be suggested. The difficulties we admit; but God can remove them; and in due time He will remove them.

I have said, many cherished thoughts will have to be renounced. In France, for example, as well as elsewhere, there seems to be a lingering notion that the Western nations that fall within the Roman world might be formed into a Latin league with

France secularly, and the Pope religiously, at its head. This dream must be abandoned. An order of things is coming, in which no one nation is to rule supremely, and no one religious system to have exclusive dominance. Until misleading thoughts of this kind are renounced, there can be no fixed unity of action among the European nations. Advance towards the path which must finally be trodden will be hindered, and there will be danger of its being ultimately reached, not peacefully, but through convulsions and bloodshed. The like may be said of the dream of a Byzantine Empire. It is a misleading fallacy, which, if it continue to be cherished, may become the cause of numberless sorrows. No Latin Empire will be revived in the West: no Greek Empire will be revived in the East. It is not the Latin half of the Roman World, or the Greek half of the Roman World that is to rule, but *πασα ἡ οἰκουμένη* that is to say, the *whole* Roman World distributed into Ten distinct, but federally united kingdoms. There is no reason to suppose that the division of the East will, as to the limits of respective kingdoms, materially differ from that adopted by Cassander, Lysimachus, Seleucus, and Ptolemy, when they took their respective portions of Alexander's Empire, except indeed that the future of Syria will not exceed the boundary towards the south-east which the Roman Empire established for herself in the time of Trajan. It is manifest, therefore, that any statesman, or any country that is bent on maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire, or of any other one Empire in the East, must *ultimately* fail.



At present nothing would be more abhorrent to the minds of the statesmen of Europe than acquiescence either in the territorial or political arrangements that will be needful when the nations of the Roman World assume their final form. In what way they will be induced to assent to the necessary changes, time only will show. It may be that Russia will spread her formidable power over Asia Minor and the East, and terrify the nations of Europe into consolidation: it may be that Russia, acting upon the jealousies, ambitions, and discords so rife at present among the European nations, may excite a general European war, out of the convulsions of which the final order may evolve. It may be that the diabolic socialism which lurks in Russia, Germany, and Western Europe, may burst forth with volcanic fury, just as the Revolution in 1792, and throw Europe into a chaos of confusion, out of which another Napoleon may emerge to remould the shattered fabric. Or it may be that a last effort of sacerdotalism to quell the rising storm, and to secure for herself that pre-eminence which is slipping, and which (so far as the Roman World is concerned) will slip for ever from her grasp—it is possible that her insidious and unscrupulous efforts may raise a whirlwind that will desolate Europe. Or it may be that the strength of the rising plutocracy, which is to be the future pillar of each state, and the attractions of commerce (than which nothing acts more potently on the selfishness and covetousness of the human heart) may imperceptibly allure the European nations into a course in which concessions,

now deemed impossible, may be made easy. A new region, the like to which has never before been presented to the eye of human covetousness since Imperial Rome fell, is now open. The mighty East, and the resources indicated by the Nile, and yet more by that "great river, the river Euphrates," are now open to men who have means of action, skill, science, wealth, and energy, far greater than the world has ever yet possessed. The whole of central Africa is also opened up to their explorations, and it may be that England, operating in the East, may succeed in opening a sphere for human energy that may calm down rising passions and give new objects of interest, and employing the world's restless activities, gradually render possible things that seem impracticable at present. Such are the possibilities of the future—things that "may be." "May be" is all that we can say. God has appointed the end, and of that we are sure. But as to the means by which that end is to be attained, He has not revealed them, therefore we can only conjecture. It is, however, very evident, that if the Government of Constantinople knew its own interest it would gladly welcome the authority of Austria in Bosnia; would permit the development of Greece, and the development of Egypt; and would seek to make Austria, Greece, and Egypt, her friends, and not her foes. The like may be said of Italy. If she were wise she would seek to make Austria and Greece her friends, and would lay aside her petty jealousy and rivalry. Consolidation of the strength of the Roman kingdoms by union, and not by the exaltation of any one par-

ticular State, will characterise the closing period.* The grasping, however, of what she cannot hold, may yet prove Turkey's ruin. From present appearances it would seem that the Turks, as a body, have resolved not to bow their necks to circumstances. If this be so, Turkey will no doubt perish, and may drag down, or seriously imperil other nations in her fall. If England should persist in upholding the traditions of Constantinople in the same way in which France persisted in upholding Papal Rome, or if England should persevere (when God's appointed time comes) in withstanding the separation of Syria into an independent State, and in hindering the development and independence of Egypt and of Greece, she will utterly fail, and perhaps be disastrously smitten. Probably she will take warning from that

* The only statesman of Europe who has as yet, I believe, expressed the conviction that federal union of certain European nations is desirable, and will become necessary, is Señor Castelar. His democratic views, and his views on several other subjects, will have to be laid aside or modified, but his observations as to the necessity of federal union, though at present disregarded and scorned, will no doubt finally prevail.

The territorial changes that will take place in Austria, both in the way of increment and of subtraction will, no doubt, be more extensive than that of any other European State. She will, in all probability, be the European guardian of the right bank of the lower Danube, and finally, also, of Bessarabia. Her loss, however, of territories now united to her, but which do not fall within the Roman boundary, will be great. The changes which thus await Austria are so important, that it seems almost impossible to conceive how they can be effected without a great European convulsion. Yet they may be. Time can only determine this.

which befell Austria and France, in Italy, and abandon the hopeless effort of preventing that four-fold division of the East which, as I have shown, must in due time be effected.

She will not, however, avoid a more terrible snare. By planting her foot in Cyprus she has re-entered the East, and whether she immediately succeed or not, the principles she designs to spread will finally prosper and produce its renovation. The cities of Asia Minor, the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, Jerusalem and Assyria, and the cities which once rested on the Tigris and the Euphrates, will again rise from the grave of ages and shine with a bright, but deceiving lustre, the like to which has never yet been: but it will be a brightness kindled from the pit. The season of that which Scripture calls THE APOSTASY will have come; and THE Antichrist will reign. God will be abandoned, and the great adversary will rule with unhindered power. It will be a brief season, but it will be a season of the unity of concentrated evil.

Long ago, as I have shown in the preceding chapter, England has determinately entered on a course of godless latitudinarianism. In allowing her newly appointed Governor in Cyprus to raise there the English flag after it had been incensed by Greek priests and dedicated to Mary—the priests guarded and honoured during their idolatrous ceremonies by Turkish soldiers under British command—England has designedly showed the relation in which she intends to stand to all the idolatries and corruption which she may meet with in the East, or anywhere in the wide world. She will hide and degrade the

Bible, and exalt anything that it is deemed expedient to honour. She has prophets at home who, in Westminster Abbey and elsewhere, applaud her course; assail the Bible; and dishonour God. Many a sermon, and many a lecture delivered lately in London testify as to this. But I will not pursue this subject now. I hope on another occasion to return to it again. In the meanwhile I would solemnly warn all who have ears to hear, though they may be but few; I would say to them, "Flee ye from the wrath to come." The time is now near at hand when God "will thoroughly purge His floor, and gather His wheat into the garner, but He will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."

§ IV.

I HAD not intended to make any addition at present to the preceding observations, but an event that has occurred in India is so sadly confirmatory of the foregoing remarks that I can scarcely pass it by unnoticed.

We little thought (says the "Bombay Guardian" of September 14) when we penned our notice of the Gunputti festival last week that Sir Richard Temple had been honouring the elephant-headed deity with his presence. The "Dnyan Prakash" has the following account of the matter :—

"As announced in our last issue, His Excellency Sir Richard Temple paid a visit yesterday evening to Mr. Balwantrao Vinayak Shastri Patwardhan, at his family residence near Tulshibag, and graced by his presence the Gunputti festivities. His Excellency was accompanied by Mr. Hart, his private Secretary, and Captain Plant, A.D.C. Amongst the European gentlemen and ladies present on the occasion we saw the Honourable Mr. and

Mrs. Gibbs, Mr. and Mrs. Robertson, Mr. Elliot (tutor and guardian to His Highness the Maharajah of Baroda) and Mrs. Elliot, the French Consul with his wife and two other ladies, and Major Daniell. A kirtan of a celebrated preacher was provided on this occasion. His Excellency sat there for upwards of half an hour, and seemed exceedingly pleased with what he saw there. After the distribution of pan-supari, attar flower garlands, etc., the company broke up a little after 7 p.m. The police and other arrangements were excellent.

"So it appears that His Excellency the Governor had actually been invited a week before to grace the occasion with his presence, and had accepted the invitation. The kirtan performed was in honour of Gunputti, a recitation of his praises. Imagine the representative of Her Majesty in Western India, sitting in a grand apartment blazing with lights, with the image of Gunputti enthroned at one end, receiving the adoration of his worshippers! His Excellency sat for half-an-hour, exceedingly pleased with all he saw, apparently. Other Honourable Englishmen and Englishwomen were present. There are some among the natives of this country who deeply deplore the maintenance of these superstitions and degrading rites, and ardently long for the day when their country shall be free from the disgrace of worshipping these contemptible idols. One can imagine the surprise and chagrin that such will feel when they find that no less a person than Sir Richard Temple, with men of such repute as the Hon. Mr. Gibbs, has sanctioned these ceremonies by his presence. We have here simply a new illustration of ascendancy gained by the idea that it is the mark of an enlightened mind to be perfectly indifferent to any dishonour done to God. What a dreadful religion this Christianity must be! The natives one and all, as a body, shrink from it and cry out to be delivered from it. There is nothing so vile that they do not prefer to it. They are quite content to prostrate themselves before an image yet warm from the potter's hands, with tints scarcely dried, a ridiculous image of a being with a pot belly, riding on a rat, with an elephant's head, and to expend large sums of money—in some instances thousands of rupees—in honouring this image; they establish a paper

called the 'Exposure of Hypocrisy,' which has nothing to say against any religion but Christianity. Then we have distinguished professors from England, at the head of the Government College, coming forth in the English journals, with most elaborate and bitter attacks on Christianity; we have His Excellency the Governor, with other distinguished officials, professing Christians, repairing to one of the pageants held in honour of Gunputti; we have a highly educated native gentleman, one of the men whom Government and professors delight to honour, giving his own weight in rupees to the *bhuts* or mendicant Brahmins; we have the English papers, very careful to breathe no word of sympathy with evangelical religion, but with their columns widely open to all assaults on Christianity, and commendations of other religions; what could a stranger gather from all this but that the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ was something more deadly and dangerous than any other system? But we call to mind that Christ said: 'Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake,' and 'Men love darkness rather than light.' But we have not yet shown all the strangeness of the matter. The natives see the men occupying the highest positions in Government and in the Educational Department, with the secular papers, exerting their mighty influence to confirm men in their indifference to the invitations of Christ, and then insultingly asking the missionaries, 'What is the reason that you are not more successful?' It is not difficult to see who is the God of this world, though it be the vaunted 19th century we are living in. We make it our boast that we do not put men in prison for preaching the Gospel, in these days; but we draw a cordon of obloquy about the preachers and those who sympathize with them, which answers the same purpose."

A narrative like this requires no comment. The Governmental condition of India is evidently becoming one of defiant apostasy. Principles which have long been taught in Balliol College, Oxford, Westminster Abbey, and elsewhere, are bearing their fruits,

and England, which more than any other Gentile nation under heaven has been favoured by God with peculiar light and peculiar blessings, seems foremost in unfurling the standard of rebellion. From the acts of the Heads of the Admiralty, and of the officers of the British Fleet, a few years ago at Cherbourg, and from those of Sir Garnet Wolseley in Cyprus, and from the yet more daring deed of Sir Richard Temple in India, we may easily augur what the Governmental course of England in the East and elsewhere will be, and with what principles she will inoculate Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Threatening dangers are gathering around the whole of Western Europe, and England is menaced in Asia also.* The treaty recently signed at Berlin seems likely to prove nothing more than a truce, and that a truce ill-observed. The contest between the savage hordes of the North, and the civilized nations of the West,

* Since the above was written, the dangers arising from the intrigues of Russia in the East have become very manifest. The storm may be lulled for a season, but it is not over. It cannot be expected that European civilization should establish itself in Armenia, Mesopotamia and Assyria, without a struggle : and when it has established itself, it will find in Russia and the Asiatic hordes, enemies that will never be reconciled. The ancient Roman Empire was obliged to guard its boundaries with unceasing vigilance ; and the Ten Roman Kingdoms will find themselves under the same necessity. Indeed, their foes will be more potent and more numerous. It is vain for nations to think now of beating "their swords into ploughshares." In another Dispensation it will be so, but *now* the ploughshare is to be beaten into the sword. See Joel iii. 10. Peace, wherever it may exist, will have to be purchased by recognised supremacy of strength.

for the possession of the all-important East, is certainly not doubtful as to its *final* result, for the West will ultimately prevail, but oceans of woe may (I do not say will) break upon it first. Ancient Greece, when about to arise into pre-eminence, was first well-nigh crushed under the hoof of Persia, and when ancient Rome was about to be exalted, she passed through struggles with Pyrrhus, with the Gauls, Hannibal and Mithridates,* which seemed at times to threaten her very existence. It may be that the nations of the Roman World may have to reach their appointed pre-eminence through wars, and calamities, and woe, or it may be comparatively peaceful progress. A few months perhaps may determine this question. To abandon God for idols is ill preparation for the future, whatever that future may be.

The course followed by our secular rulers in India, Cyprus, and elsewhere, is one which cannot be contemplated without terror by any who fear God. God is not mocked. They who sow to the wind must sooner or later reap the whirlwind. That whirlwind may be delayed, but it will surely come at last, and then, who shall stand? (See Jer. xxx. 23.) Yet how can we wonder at the course followed by our secular Governors (surrounded as they are by vast difficulties, and sore temptations) when we remember that which has taken place, and is taking place, within our ecclesiastical and religious circles at home. There, the dread of disruption is leading into a course of compromise, whereby well nigh every doctrine of our faith—nay, even the truthfulness of Scripture itself is left as “an open question.” Let us take

* See Note in Appendix.

for a moment a retrospective glance at the past, especially at the changes which have taken place in England during the last fifty years.

Three hundred years ago, a light kindled from God—a light greater than any that had visited the earth since the Apostles died, was sent among the nations of Western Europe. In England and Scotland that light—the light of the Protestant Reformation—brightly shone. It was, indeed, encountered by the darkness, and Cranmer and others, had to give their bodies to be burned. Yet the light prevailed, for God favoured it : and as the result, thousands and tens of thousands of souls who would otherwise have known for ever “the second death,” are now resting in blessedness above. The traditions of men, which had sunk the nations down into a depth of idolatry and superstition as great or greater than that found in the ancient Pagan world, was made to give place to Holy Scripture, whose authority was acknowledged as supreme. The so-called Church which had virtually supplanted Christ, and assumed to itself offices which pertain to Christ alone, was dethroned, and Christ and His saving blood exalted. Marvellous blessings these. Outward blessings also were given : and whilst the other nations of Western Europe groaned under systems of which the Bastille was the secular, and the Inquisition the ecclesiastical symbol, Protestant England struggled on till every trace of secular and ecclesiastical oppression was effaced. Yet Protestant England was ungrateful, like Judah of old, and a sore chastisement was prepared for her.

In Oxford, fifty years ago, a body of persons who, by subscription and by oath, had bound themselves to uphold the doctrines of Protestantism, banded together to undermine and subvert those doctrines. They were few at first, and their efforts were disregarded or contemned. Nevertheless, they gradually increased and prospered. God permitted it. It was a chastisement from His hand; a chastisement well deserved. England, and more especially Oxford, had never favoured the path into which Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and others like-minded, would have led them. They for the most part valued the Reformation politically, but they valued it not religiously. They were conscious of many a corruption; they were aware that the first Reformers would have made the Prayer Book bow to the Articles; but the world wished it otherwise; and to the world they listened. They ignored the solemn truth that he who would be the friend of the world must be the enemy of God. During the eighteenth and the earlier part of the nineteenth century, Oxford never favoured, and often persecuted those who truly and fully preached the Gospel of the grace of God. Nevertheless, they hated Romanism. The writings of the new Tractarian party were regarded with alarm. Dr. Pusey, when he ventured to propound in the University pulpit the doctrine of Transubstantiation, was for a time suspended as a preacher: and Dr. Newman when he broached the doctrine of non-natural interpretation, and applied it to the Articles, was formally condemned. The doctrine of non-naturalism was justly regarded as one by which the very foun-

dations of society were shaken, the distinctions between right and wrong confounded, and stability and certainty in human intercourse rendered impossible.

But the revival of mediæval Sacerdotalism, with its once rejected dogmas and superstitions, was not the only chastisement inflicted on Oxford. At the close of the great continental war, France, Switzerland, and finally Germany (spheres from which Englishmen had been long cut off), began to be revisited. Germany became especially attractive to many, both from Cambridge and Oxford. There Coleridge drank in poison more deadly even than that which he had imbibed at Rome, and became one of the first and most successful instruments of pouring a tide of semi-Neologian and semi-Romanist mysticism into England. Hundreds, of whom better things might have been expected, listened, though his words were as wild and meaningless as the poems of Ossian, and he himself was, according to his own confession, floating "rudderless and hopeless" on an ocean of doubt. Dr. Pusey, too, when as a young man he visited Germany, did not pass through it unscathed, but he was warned in time, and retraced his steps. Happy would it have been for him, and happy for thousands of others whom he has since beguiled, if, when he felt his need of something to lean on, he had turned to the authoritative voice of God in the Scripture, and not to the supposed voice of the Spirit in the Church. Germanism, however, reached Oxford. Baron Bunsen was one of the chief instruments of propagating it there, and Dr. Arnold was brought under his deadly influence. Here, again, we have to regard the chastening hand of God. Fearful as is

the destructive agency of Sacerdotalism, Rationalism is no less potent to destroy. These are at present the two chief instruments which the god of this age is wielding. Truth falls before them. If Sacerdotalism applied the principle of non-natural interpretation to the Articles, Neology applies it to the Scriptures too, and thus the same moral plague (which in the fourth and fifth centuries made Alexandria what it was, and finally brought down the scourge of Mahomedanism upon the vitiated Christianity of the East) was brought into Oxford, and found in Balliol College a resting-place, where it now reigns supreme. Sacerdotalism and Rationalism contend with each other, but they both wage a deadly war with the Scriptures of Truth. A fearful change, therefore, has, during the last fifty years, been wrought in the condition of Oxford. It has reared, indeed, a memorial to the martyrs, who, for the sake of Protestant truth, gave their bodies to be burned, but it has reared that memorial as a witness against itself, for the very principles for which the martyrs died, are in Oxford denounced and trampled under foot; Keble College and Balliol College are evidences of this.

Keble College stands in Oxford as a memorial of the triumph of Sacerdotalism and Tractarianism over the Reformation and Protestant Truth; and seeing that the Reformation was assuredly the work of God, it stands as a memorial of a triumph that man has gained against the Truth of God. If the doctrines taught at Keble College be true, the doctrine taught by Luther respecting a sinner's justification is false; and if the doctrine of Luther on this subject be false,

the doctrine taught by the Apostle Paul was false, for Luther's doctrine and Paul's were, on this subject, identical: and Paul spake in the power of the Holy Ghost. The time will soon come when God will Himself declare, before saints and angels, whether Keble College was reared for, or against, Him and His truth.

§ v.

St. Mark's Day, 1876, was, as I firmly believe, a memorable day in the history of Christendom. On earth, for the most part, it was passed unnoticed, but its record remains in heaven, awaiting there the final judgment.

On St. Mark's Day, an assembly of persons, distinguished and illustrious by their talents and social position, were gathered together in Oxford to witness and to honour the inauguration of the Chapel of Keble College. Among them, and at their head, appeared the Archbishop of Canterbury, the successor of Cranmer the martyr, and the present head and representative of professing Protestant Anglicanism. There, surrounded by the symbols of revived mediæval idolatry (for there were statues and representations of angels and saints, more numerous than I can here recount),* and in near proximity to the place where our

* In the authorised description of the inauguration of the Chapel, published in Oxford, more than five octavo pages are devoted to a description of its adornments. On the north and south sides saints are depicted in Mosaic panels. Mingled with the Apostles we find St. Catherine, St. Anthony, St. George, St. Boniface, St. Edward the Confessor, St. Agnes, St. Cecilia, St. Barbara—twenty-eight saints in all.

Now, we must remember that the use here made of the blessed name saint is to be distinguished from the sense in which God uses it in the Scripture, for there it is applied to the whole family of faith, even to the weakest and most unworthy. Here it is applied to those whom Sacerdotalism has canonized. Paul, Peter and John, would have repudiated both the title con-

martyred bishops died, he spoke words of congratulation and encouragement of, and to, the very men who had revived the principles which had brought those honoured martyrs to the stake. "Things," said the Archbishop, "have gone on prospering with this Oxford." Casting a retrospective glance over its recent history, he adds, "This University has felt the effect of great varieties of opinion. . . . Changes come, but this great institution remains essentially unchanged, and honours honest convictions in whatever forms they express themselves; and the youth of each rising generation learns the great lesson that the honest man who honestly expresses his opinion is entitled to their love and admiration, whether they quite agree with him or not." (Cheers.)

Now, considering the circumstances in which this oration was made, and considering the authority and official position of the speaker, considering the weight of influence of the body of which he is the head, considering also the quietness with which that body and the nation at large have received the declaration, I cannot but believe that God regards the day on which it was spoken, as a day on which England as a nation sealed her renunciation of those principles which brought our martyred forefathers to the stake, and intimated her willingness to smile on and to cherish the practices and doctrines against which those martyrs had protested unto death. Is not this

ferred, and them who conferred it. The whole place is a temple of mediævalism built on the ruins of fallen Protestantism. It is a backward step into blackness of darkness which we dare not hope will ever be retraced. See page 41 of published report.

apostasy? But the Archbishop deems it no apostasy; he looks on it as progress. "Things," he says, "have gone on prospering with this Oxford." If, indeed, the substitution of Sacerdotal traditions for the rules of Holy Scripture, and if the revival of principles which in the middle ages made Western Europe groan under a system, marked secularly (as I have already said) by the Bastille, and religiously by the Inquisition; if the dissemination of principles that virtually cancel the Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews, and nullify the Gospel of the grace of God, and that utterly destroy the lesson which our two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, symbolically teach—if this be progress, then we may truly say that there has been in the last fifty years great progress in Oxford—but it is progress away from God.

Ignatius Loyola might have had honest convictions, and so probably had Caiaphas when he crucified Christ. But what are "honest convictions" when they are the fruits of a dark and hardened conscience that has rejected the light of the Word of the living God? If "honest conviction, wherever found," is to be entitled to our "love and admiration," what is there within the vast circle of the world's apostasy from God that we may not be asked to love and to admire? Sir Richard Temple might plead that the worshippers of Gunputti were honest in their convictions, and that therefore he was quite justified in honouring, loving, and admiring them.

If it be prosperity to advance in this kind of path,

Oxford, no doubt, has greatly prospered during the last fifty years. In Balliol College, the Archbishop finds, apparently another object for our admiration, for a few weeks after his visit to Keble College he is present at the inauguration of the Hall of Balliol College, and his speech is again laudatory. Nothing, indeed, can be more contrasted than the principles of which Keble College and Balliol College are respectively the symbols. Nevertheless, the Archbishop teaches us that if honest conviction be found in both, both may be honoured, and be made the objects of our "love and admiration." Yet what form of evil doctrine is there that once defiled the schools of Alexandria, and caused the scourge of Mahomedanism to fall on the corrupt Christianity of the East, that does not now flourish in Balliol? I might state the case even more strongly. The Archbishop knows, more accurately than I do, the estimate in which the Bible is held in Balliol. Is the progress of Balliol during the last fifty years, indeed, to be made a test of the advancing prosperity of Oxford? Is the prosperity of Oxford to be measured by the degree in which the young of the rising generation are taught to honour, love, and admire the honest convictions that are found in that College? Is the change that has taken place in Balliol since 1828 to be deemed one of progress—progress towards God? I knew pretty well the condition of Balliol then, being acquainted with many of its resident Fellows, one of whom had been my private tutor. Dr. Tait had not then, I believe, commenced his residence. I can confidently affirm that there was not one of the Fellows of Balliol

that would not *at that time* have repudiated the principles that afterwards characterised the Tractarian School, and yet more, the doctrines that now dominate in Balliol. They would have refused even to associate with any man who dared to avow such principles. The Bible throughout Oxford, though in many things grievously disobeyed, was, nevertheless, revered as veritably the Word of God. Its authority was maintained as against Tradition, and against the living authoritative voice of the Spirit in the Church, and likewise as against "the verifying faculty" and "inner consciousness" of Neologians. But such testimony for the Bible has been abandoned now. The Bible has been put down from the place of authority it once occupied, and if success in the effectuation of this be prosperity, Oxford has no doubt greatly prospered during the last fifty years. Whether or not it be true prosperity, the last great day will show. At the present moment, could a corporate testimony be obtained from Oxford that Christianity was a system that came from God? I have high authority for saying, it could not.

Among the incidents that have occurred during this period of advancing prosperity in Oxford (as the Archbishop deems it) we have to note the appointment of Dr. Max Müller to one of the Professorial chairs in the University. No such appointment would have been permitted before 1828. Dr. Max Müller, under the auspices of Dean Stanley (who is also of Oxford), delivered in the spring of the present year the Hibbert Lectures in Westminster Abbey. In those lectures we find such statements as the following

(I quote from the reports as given in the public journals):—

“We learn, if we are not afraid to learn it, that the same Unknown whom the poets of the Veda invoked as Dyaush-pitar, Heaven-father, whom the Greeks called *Ζεύς, πατήρ*; and the Romans, Jupiter, was and is the same Unknown, for whom also we can find no better name than Our Father who art in heaven. Virtually, the theory of a primeval revelation is the same as that of an Ashantee priest, who knows that his fetishes are Gods, because they tell him so. He found that the word *Fetichisme* was first used in 1760, by an anonymous French writer, now known to be the President De Brosse, the correspondent of Voltaire. De Brosse, being dissatisfied with the opinions of his day on the origin of mythology and religion, betook himself to studying the customs of the lowest African savages, as described chiefly by Portuguese sailors. He held that all nations, except the Jews, began with fetish-worship; the next step was polytheism, the next monotheism. His exception in favour of the Jews showed his bondage to prevalent theological ideas, for if he had looked as keenly for fetishism, into the Old Testament, as he did into the records of Egypt, Greece and Rome, he would surely have found traces of it in the Seraphim, the Urim and Thummim, to say nothing of the golden calf and the brazen serpent.”

How can any one who reveres and worships the One true God and Jesus Christ whom He hath sent, read such statements as these, and not tremble? The friend of Voltaire, in Professor Max Müller's opinion, did not go far enough when he hesitated to place the statements of Scripture respecting the Seraphim, the Urim, and Thummim, and the Brazen Serpent, on the low and degraded level of Fetishism. All that is said therefore in Leviticus respecting the High Priest and his garments in service, and his breast-plate, are to be ranked, according to Profes-

sor Max Müller, with the lies and abominations of Fetishism. Yet what more holy, what more blessed than the thoughts connected with the breast-plate with which the typical High Priest appeared in the presence of the glory of God, bearing on that breast-plate the names of God's accepted people engraved on precious stones of brightness and beauty, and associated with fulness of light, Urim, and fulness of perfectness, Thummim—a fulness provided in Christ by God for His people. Yet this typical pledge of God's faithful mercies is now to be regarded as Fetishism; in other words, we are to esteem the appointments of the God of love and truth as the inventions of Satan, the father of lies. Again, I read in the Scripture that all the gods of the nations are idols, but that it was Jehovah who made the heavens: and again, that what the Gentiles sacrificed they sacrificed to devils and not to God. The difference, therefore, between the object of Gentile worship under the name of Zeus or Jupiter, and Him whom we worship as Jehovah of Hosts, is no less a difference than that which exists between devils and God. Professor Max Müller affirms that it is one and the same Being that is worshipped under these diverse names.

But I will not enlarge. The extracts speak for themselves. For myself, I regard the delivery of these Lectures in Westminster Abbey as a national sin, provoking God's wrath and judgment, and I believe that wrath and judgment for these, and like things will surely come unless these sins be speedily acknowledged and repented of. If the authority of

our Queen had been similarly outraged, indignation would have been expressed (and justly) from one end of our country to the other; but when the God of Heaven is insulted, and His Word (that Word which He has magnified above all His name) is represented as having no more authority than the legends of Ashantee Fetishism, there is silence. No voice is raised in the way of protest or remonstrance. It is a national sin. It has been committed in a national building, under national auspices.

Nor has Cambridge lagged behind in this race of evil. She goes out of her way to confer on Dr. Darwin an honorary degree. The public Orator of the University pronounces a fulsome panegyric on him and on his labours, though the result of those labours is to deny that which God has authoritatively revealed respecting His work as the Creator. Does Cambridge rejoice in this result? It might seem so; for the honour has been ostentatiously conferred: and I believe I am correct in stating, that not one voice has been publicly raised in protest against the deed. Is that deed forgotten in Heaven? If any think that it is, the Last Great Day will fearfully undeceive them. "Thou hast magnified thy Word above all Thy name," are solemn words. No doubt statements far more advanced than those of Dr. Darwin have been made by Huxley and others; yet it is very evident that if Dr. Darwin's theories be accepted as true, the history of Creation in Scripture must be rejected as false. When once the Scripture account of Creation is rejected, it matters little whether it be supposed that man was evolved from mud or from oysters, or not

evolved at all. They who even tacitly sanction writings, or writers, that impute untruthfulness to the Word of God, are scarcely less guilty than the writers themselves.* It is not difficult to make ourselves partakers of other men's sins. Sins contracted through connection with others may lead, both for time and for eternity, to results little expected. England need not look far to see some of the consequences of the principles that she is recklessly cherishing under the name of progress. Can she be insensible to the moral and social condition of Germany? The Germans themselves tremble, and many of them say, not untruly, that from England flowed the poison that is now spreading moral desolation in their midst. An Englishman, Lord Bolingbroke, influenced Voltaire, and Voltaire influenced Frederick the Great, and Frederick the Great, in the madness of his infidel liberality, sheltered with one hand the Jesuits expelled from other lands, and with the other scattered broadcast the seeds of Infidelity, whence has sprung that harvest of Neologianism which has brought Germany into her present condition. What that condition is, the following extract will show. I quote from an article on "*The Literature of German Materialism*," published in "*The Times*" of Nov. 7th, 1878:—

"A stream of materialistic literature has poured steadily forth from the Press. And it is not literature speaking the language of science and addressing a small circle of cultivated men and women. Materialism has appealed to the people, and

* There are some who see no difficulty "in the organic springing from the inorganic, nay, man himself from Chaldean mud," i.e., "from the commonest brick or sun-dried clod."—*See Christian Observer*, March, 1869.

its ablest exponents, such as Vogt and Büchner, write in a homely, lucid style which plain men and women can understand.

"We might name a dozen books as fair samples of this literature. . . . Their common characteristic is, that they are materialistic in the full sense—Materialism naked and unashamed. We know that some of the writers to whom we refer would deny the propriety of the description; they would even say that it was meaningless. We quite admit that some of them have, especially of late, shown a great desire to effect a compromise between the two great schools of philosophy. Witness for instance, the curious speculations by Professor Hæckel in a recent number of the '*Deutsche Rundschau*' about *Zellseelen* and *Seelenzellen*—speculations which go to show that each cell of every living organism has its soul. But let us submit a few questions to some of the writers in question and mark their answers. What, to put at once a leading question, is man? The reply of not a few seems to be, a bucket of water and a few pinches of phosphorus. What is thought? 'Thought,' says Moleschott, 'is a movement of matter;' 'without phosphorus no thought.' '*Geist* and *Seele*,' says Hæckel, 'are only higher and combined or differentiated powers of the same function which we speak of in the most general way as force, and force is a general function of matter. We know no matter not endowed with force, and, *vice versâ*, we know no forces which are not connected with matter.' Matter is almost deified. 'Motion and matter,' says Büchner, 'are alike eternal.' 'All our life,' Vogt somewhere observes, 'the life of all organisms, the whole telluric and cosmic life, is built on the principle that matter remains eternally the same.' 'Matter,' says Wiener, 'is and always has been eternal.' No mercy is accorded to teleology in any form. How was the world created? 'Purely through physical and chemical forces, without organic substance, without a known Creator, nay, without a leading idea, the world exists.' (Vogt.) What is the purpose of the world? 'The laws of nature,' according to one answer, 'are rude, inflexible powers, which know nothing of morality or pity.' 'The search after a cause for the world,' says Büchner, 'is like

going up an endless ladder.' Richard Schuricht—who, if he writes ironically, is no coarse caricaturist—will not allow men the satisfaction of believing that they are the subjects of fixed, necessary laws; that is not quite correct. Nature does, indeed, conduct her operations according to immutable, inflexible, determined laws; but the collocation of the forces of Nature, to use an expression of Dr. Chalmers, their relation to each other, is accidental. Necessity is, therefore, only a special case of chance. Man, the world, all that therein is, is but the product of an accidentally existing universe—one of the bubbles on the surface of the ocean of Being which will by and by burst.

"It is useless for any one to try to hide the irreligious or rather anti-religious character of much of this literature. The subject is a delicate one; but no one, the theologian least of all, can afford to shut his eyes to this grave characteristic of so much of modern German speculation. Atheism is written on many pages of the materialistic and Social Democratic literature. And, be it said, it is not timorous Atheism which crouches under cover, speaks an esoteric language, seeks no converts, asks merely to be let alone, or strikes at its foes only from behind with the weapons of irony and innuendo. Not at all; it is Atheism which comes out into the open, displays its menacing form with effrontery, speaks its mind roughly and freely—Atheism active, militant, angry, intolerant, and fanatical. It addresses not merely professors and men of science; it speaks the *patois* of the common people. The tactics of secret sapping and ambushes are not to the taste of Büchner or Hellwald, or Marx, or journals of the stamp of the 'Volkstaat' They have no desire, common to some opponents of Orthodoxy, to translate the Gospel narratives into beautiful pastorals or idyls. Religion in any form is in their eyes the Bastille of the human mind. We hesitate to quote typical passages from this literature; it is, however, perhaps not true wisdom to hide their character. So let one or two sentences serve as samples of dozens. 'God did not create the world,' says Büchner, 'but the Theist created God, and thereby all the injurious consequences which flow therefrom.' The same writer observes:—

“Theism or belief in a personal God leads, as all history clearly shows, to Monarchism and priestly rule; Pantheism, or belief in an all-pervading God, leads, where it is in the ascendancy, to contempt of the senses, denial of the Ego, to absorption in God, and to a state of stagnation. Atheism or Philosophical Monism alone leads to freedom, to intelligence, to progress, to due recognition of man—in a word, to Humanism.”

“Socialism,’ says the ‘Fürther Wochenblatt,’ a Social-Democratic journal, echoing the sentiments of Karl Marx, ‘is a child of Atheism, and the beginning of a great period of atheistical culture.’ ‘He who takes from the people Heaven,’ says the ‘Volkstaat,’ ‘must give it the earth.’ ‘When all is over with Heaven, the people is justified in reclaiming the earth.’ We prefer not to quote samples of the dull and lumpish ribaldry of Vogt in his unscientific and weaker moments, or of some of the satirists of Social Democracy. But one or two extracts from graver authors may not be out of place. ‘Religions,’ says Arnold Ruge, the friend of Strauss and Feuerboch, ‘are all alike in this; they rest on stories or myths.’ Hellwald says:—

“The task of science is to destroy all ideals, to manifest their hollowness and nothingness, to show that belief in God and religion is deception; that morality, equality, love, freedom, rights of man, are lies, and at the same time to prove the necessity of all these errors for human development.”

Well, England is following the same course. She is imitating the Liberalism of Frederick of Prussia, and sheltering Jesuitism on the one hand, and Neology on the other. “Honest conviction is to be honoured and loved wherever found.” It is true that there are sometimes in some minds sore misgivings, but they comfort themselves with the hackneyed adage, *Magna est veritas et prævalebít*. It is true indeed that Truth is mighty, and in God’s appointed time it will prevail, but not in this Dispensation. This Dispensation is to close with the reign of

Antichrist; and Antichrist is the servant of Satan; and Satan is the father of lies. God also "will send on men strong delusion that they should believe a lie." Falsehood, therefore, is to prevail—not Truth. Indeed, it seems monstrous that any should talk of Truth prevailing when they themselves are acting and inducing others to act as if there were no such thing as Truth. They are the servants not of Truth, but of Truthlessness. No latitudinarian can stand under any other banner. When once men have abandoned the Bible as the one perfect standard of Truth, and have consented to compromise, they have entered the road to apostasy and ruin; and whether they advance far in it or not, in the path of apostasy they stand. The effect of the principles now working around us must, if unrestrained, dissolve society into its units; and men are becoming aware of this, and are shrinking from the gulf that yawns before their feet. They will welcome, therefore, an iron hand if it saves them from anarchy and ruin; and that iron hand will be found in Antichrist. Him, therefore, they will welcome: him they will serve: and him they will finally worship. That end, indeed, is not yet reached, but we are advancing towards it. Yet, even the true Church slumbers, and refuses to recognise either the preciousness of the truths that are being abandoned, or the deadliness of the principles that are being received.

§ VI.

A new era commenced in the history of the world when the principles for which Cranmer and the Protestant martyrs died, were governmentally adopted in England: when the voice of the Bible was recognised as supreme; and the guidance of the so-called Church repudiated and renounced. The Reformation was not perfect; the Reformers were not perfect; but the great *principle* of Protestantism was perfect, viz., that the Bible, and the Bible alone, is the one test by which all things are to be tried. Three hundred years have passed since this great principle was formally established in England. The Reformers did not quit the Church of Rome because they repudiated dogmatic truth; on the contrary, they averred that there could be no true light, no right government, no right practice, where dogmatic truth was not stedfastly maintained. Accordingly, they had "creeds," and they had "articles." They refused to permit the Church of God to become a Babel of conflicting sentiments. This at least was their principle; and to it the early Reformers honestly desired to adhere.

It is true, indeed, that in the course of Protestantism there have been inconsistencies and errors, great and many. It emerged out of thick darkness, and before it had time and ability steadily to consider its course, it was assailed by the servants of Satan, both

from without and from within. Nevertheless, when we compare the history of those countries in Western Europe that have favoured Protestantism, and the history of those that have endeavoured to crush and stamp it out, which of the two classes have been most marked by mercies from the hand of God? Have England and Scotland received no special deliverances—no special displays of God's goodness? Does the history of Great Britain present no contrast with that of Italy, France, and above all with that of Spain—dark, superstitious, degraded Spain? This may be denied by some. Blindness and perverseness can deny anything. There are those with whom it is useless to argue. We should not think of arguing with a man who persisted in maintaining that the sun rose at midnight, and that it set at noon.

It is not here my object to review the chequered history of Protestantism. It has had its lights and its shades; but it must be confessed that the shades predominate. Truth is a precious deposit, but they who hold it may be unfaithful to their trust. Judah of old was long upheld, and received many a distinctive mercy, whilst the rest of Israel were sunk in idolatry and corruption. Yet, Judah, too, proved unfaithful, and finally took the lead in rejecting and crucifying the Lord of glory.

During the greater part of the last century, the history of Protestantism in England was one of peculiar darkness, and although at the close of that century much light was sent, yet Protestantism, for the most part, has not so received it as to become proof against the temptations of the hour. On the

contrary, it has yielded to them, and has joined in with the cry of human progress, and has linked itself in ten thousand ways to the secularity of the age. Its rowers have brought it into deep waters. They find themselves surrounded by many a perplexing doubt, and many a difficulty. They are restless, uneasy, and sometimes dismayed; but instead of finding fault with themselves, and confessing their sin, and the sin of their forefathers, in misusing and corrupting the precious truths which God at the time of the Reformation restored, they have found fault with the truths themselves, have abandoned them, and substituted for them new dogmas; and in doing this have abandoned and defied God.

Things having drifted into a position such as this, it has become needful for the leaders of religious thought (as they are called) to consider what course they should in the future pursue. Should they maintain the great principle of Protestantism, and honestly adhere to the Bible as the one authoritative standard concerning God and His Truth, or should they renounce it? And if they renounce it, should they unite with Sacerdotalism and accept its principle of Church infallibility, or should they take their stand by the side of Neology, and quench the authority of the Word of God by the dogma of the "verifying faculty"? Or should they refuse to establish any certain standard of Truth; treat all things as open questions; assert that it must be expected that there should be different "schools of thought;" that all should be honoured in their place, and thus, while professedly sanctioning nothing, become virtually the

sanctioners of everything. This evidently is the course preferred in England. Truth, that is to say, Truth as a fixed, certain, and unchangeable thing, is to be regarded as unattainable. It cannot, therefore, be adopted as a basis of action. Uncertainty, which is only another name for truthlessness, must be made for the future the new centre. This, let it be remembered, is entirely a new principle; and seeing that it excludes the authority of God from the ordering of human things, must vitally affect the institutions of society, whether secular or religious, throughout the whole world.

Quietly and stealthily this principle has for years been creeping into England, and now seems hopelessly and irrevocably to have leavened society to its very centre. Its adherents, gentle and lamb-like in their ways, are welcomed by the easy-going indifferentism of the day. Men like that which is lamb-like in appearance, and care not to enquire whether or not, under the semblance of a lamb, there be hidden the voice of the dragon. Accordingly, when the Archbishop enounced the principle he did in Oxford, and carried that principle into action at Keble and at Balliol, he did but sanction the principle which society in England has, for the most part, if not avowedly adopted, yet practically acquiesced in. It is in fact England's principle, and yet it is one that utterly nullifies the radical principle of the Reformation; abandons the Bible; and in abandoning it, renounces the government of God.

By some it was expected, that the great evangelical body in the Church of England, the successors of

Whitfield, Romaine, Toplady and Newton, would have aroused themselves to a sense of the requirements of the hour, and have combined for the defence of the Holy Scripture against its daily increasing enemies. Lengthened opportunities had been afforded them of considering the nature and growth of revived Sacerdotalism and Rationalism. They knew the deadly character of the judgment pronounced in "the Bennett case," and in the case of the "Essays and Reviews." Ecclesiastical rulers, and secular rulers, have both shown an eagerness, whilst restraining certain excesses, to extend the limits of the Church of England, so that it might include the very things which the Articles were written to condemn. Sacerdotalists have become potent, and Neologians have become potent. It is now no longer wise to treat them as enemies: let them be treated as friends. Words must not be too rigidly interpreted, and the Law, in questions of Divine Truth, must be made more elastic than it is when applied to human things. The temper of the day requires this, and it must be yielded to. Such are the sentiments of the hour. In the presence of such circumstances as these, to take up a position of faithful, uncompromising antagonism to the whole current of human thought around us on behalf of God's unbending Truth is, indeed, an arduous task, for which God alone, by special grace, can strengthen or qualify. I am free to admit that at the present moment, the true Church of God, whether within the Establishment or without, does not possess sufficient knowledge, or holiness, or unity, or grace, to enable it to assail with effect its mighty adver-

saries, or to carry out faithfully the purposes of God. There never was, I believe, a time when we all had more reason to say, "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because His compassions fail not. . . . Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord." Yet, although we may not be able to assail with effect the citadels of our foes, there is no reason why we should fly before them, much less enter into compacts, or form alliances with them. To do that, is adding sin to sin.

Lately the Evangelical body in the Church of England had a great opportunity for faithful protest afforded them. They were invited to attend a Congress at Croydon, over which the Archbishop of Canterbury was to preside. They knew well what he had recently said at Keble and at Balliol. They knew that if they went to the Congress, it would be to sustain the Archbishop in the position he had assumed as the protector of the disciples of Sacerdotalism, and of Neology, as well as of Evangelical Truth, and that he there stood as the advocate of their being all bound together in the holy bonds of Church fellowship. They knew that at the Congress there were to be triplets in which the Sacerdotalist, the Neologian, and the Evangelical were to be combined as if co-ministers of Christ and servants of the same Master, ready also to attest this by communicating together at the Table of the Lord, having indeed certain acknowledged variations of sentiment, but only such as might be expected to attach to those who belonged to different "schools of thought." In doing this, all that definiteness and separateness of

Truth for which the Apostles and our Protestant martyrs laboured and died, was virtually renounced. The banner of Truth was abandoned for that of Latitudinarian compromise. Association was formed with the enemies of the Bible, and Evangelicalism consented to go with the current which is bearing the world onward to its final doom. What was Samson when he lost his Nazarite separation? He was blinded, toiled in the prison-house, and ground corn for the Philistines. God's Word cannot alter. He has distinctly said, "Be ye not unequally yoked with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with him that believeth not? [απιστου] . . . Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing." If we deliberately disobey this injunction (especially at such an hour as the present), if we divest ourselves of our own proper liberty of word or action by placing ourselves under the control of bodies or individuals whose principles we know to be contrary to God, what can we expect but judgment? Amalek is not Israel; and Israel is not Amalek; and the God of Israel hath sworn that He will have war with Amalek from generation to generation. (Exod. xvii.) There are systems towards which the Spirit of God places itself in everlasting antagonism. What can be more hateful to God than latitudinarian comprehensiveness? It brings down the Truth of the living God to a level with the lies of Satan; denies that darkness is *essen-*

tially contrary to light ; and affirms that evil is not altogether devoid of elements of good.


There are few things about which Satan is more anxious than accrediting evil by good, and with that object he seeks to bring his servants into real or apparent connection with the servants of Christ's Truth. See his effort to effect this at Philippi. There, indeed, he was defeated by the faithfulness of Paul, who cast out and silenced the unclean spirit. With Jehoshaphat Satan succeeded. He linked Jehoshaphat (in an enterprise in itself innocent) with Ahab, therefore great wrath was against Jehoshaphat from the Lord. Great, indeed, was Jehoshaphat's dishonour and sin. He knew that Micaiah was the servant of the Lord ; he knew that Micaiah spake to him with the voice of God ; he knew that the other prophets were lying prophets who spake in the power of an evil spirit allowed to come forth to deceive ; yet he joined with the liars, and sat calmly by whilst the servant of God was consigned to the dungeon, there to eat the bread, and drink the water of affliction.

It is difficult to imagine a greater act of baseness than that of Jehoshaphat in thus calmly abandoning the servant of God to his persecutors, or to conceive a greater act of presumptuous daring than that of following Ahab to the battle-field after the warning that had been sent him immediately and directly from the throne of God. When once a believer is drawn into the mighty current that is rushing by, he may be carried on he knows not whither.

The lesson taught through Jehoshaphat is a lesson

for all generations. It is an utter mistake to imagine that we are at liberty to debate as if it were an undetermined question whether or not we may ally ourselves with men who are opposing God. This chapter respecting Jehoshaphat decides that point for ever. We are not at liberty to place ourselves in circumstances where our own individual freedom of word or action is restricted by any bond cast around us by the influence or authority of any person, or any system that we know to be acting in contrariety to God. Yet the whole temper of the day, in the Church and in the world, is against such restriction. It says the bond is irksome, and I will break it; and this disposition will increase and develop itself more and more, till men shall openly say of Jehovah and of His Christ, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us."


I am aware, indeed, that under great pressure of circumstances and strong temptation, there may be great and grievous aberration that may be temporary only, and be repented of. But then the repentance must be unmistakably marked by confession and manifest retracing of the steps. It must not be pleaded in excuse that other great bodies under the pressure of present circumstances have likewise yielded. This may be, and is true, but it only affords another ominous sign of the strength of that mighty retroceding current which is sweeping men to perdition. It supplies to those who are wise, another intimation that they have to escape without a moment's delay from the threatening danger, whatever the isolation, whatever the trial that may ensue.



Society is in hopeless confusion : it is discarding the Word of God, and rushing headlong into ways that lead into utter distance from Him. Shall we not hasten our escape from the bewildered throng, even though we might in result find ourselves hiding in the cave of Adullam, or hunted as a partridge upon the mountains ? Better to be there for a season, than to be lost in the blackness of darkness for ever.

It is useless to conceal from ourselves that these questions are vital. They affect not time only, but eternity. "The wrath of God is revealed from Heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness." If this be true of the idolatrous pagan world, how much more fiercely must that wrath burn against corrupt and idolatrous Christendom ? How much more fiercely must it burn against a professedly Protestant nation, which is becoming divided into three great classes : one eager to return to former idolatries ; the second questioning the truth of Scripture, scoffing at the thought of salvation through the vicarious suffering and obedience of Another, and many of them rejecting all that God has revealed of Himself, as the Creator as well as the Redeemer : while a third class stand idly by with Gallio-like indifference, or else speculate which of the two parties (if either) it may be most for their interests to encourage ; ready, when they deem it expedient, to smile on both ; sometimes dropping a weight into the scale of the one, sometimes into that of the other. God is evidently calling His own people to repentance. He is calling Protestants to consider their ways, and to purge

themselves from corruptions and lies which, for expediency sake, have long been tolerated. If they refuse to do this, if they refuse to acknowledge the heinous sinfulness of religious falsehoods, and instead of humbling themselves for past unfaithfulness, they consort with and sanction those who are eagerly rushing into the paths of death, what can they expect but ruin? The voice that calls them to repentance now, may cease to call much longer. It must cease when "the hour of temptation" that is to try them that dwell upon the earth comes; and have we not reason to fear that that hour has already commenced? When men persistently neglect, or pervert the light which God has mercifully given them in His Word, and love or acquiesce in the darkness that Satan has gathered around them, it must be regarded as a token that they are approximating to that condition of thought and feeling which will cause God to send the "strong delusion" that He has threatened in His Word. How obstinately men have from year to year asserted that the Antichrist is already come; that his course is nearly ended; and that the season of the Church's last conflict is not merely not future, but well nigh completed; whereas it is altogether future, and for it God is now calling His people to prepare. Not a particle of the twelfth chapter of Revelation has yet been fulfilled. It describes the now approaching period when the servants of the Truth will have to meet the last onset of their great Enemy, who will come down "having great wrath, knowing he hath but a short time." We are ill-prepared for that conflict now.



We are little able to stand girded with Truth, having on the breast-plate of righteousness, and wielding the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. That is a weapon of which at present we little know the use. Our hands, moreover, are too feeble to wield it with effect. It is a time, as I have already observed, when we have *all* reason to say, "Let us search and try our ways, and turn again unto the Lord."

Years ago it had become very evident that the Church of God was about to enter on a conflict with Sacerdotalism, Infidelity and other enemies, more extensive and more deadly than any in which it had ever before engaged. It was very manifest that that conflict could not be carried on successfully except from the ground of Truth, for God could not sustain His servants in occupying a position underlaid with falsehood. He requires them to hold "*unadulterated*" Truth, and to use "sound speech that cannot be condemned." Leaven is to be extirpated from the dwellings of the Israel of God. Did the Evangelical body in the Church of England arouse themselves to the necessity of this? Did they give themselves, body and soul, to reforming, to rectifying their position according to the Scriptures; or have they acquiesced in the counsel of those who have wished to defend the Prayer Book as it stands, and to maintain themselves in that death-like status which the Church of England in the eighteenth century occupied.* True

* The tendencies of the High Church party from the days of the Stuarts to the present time have, in political questions, and in questions concerning the relation of the Church to the State, been no doubt more Protestant than Romanist: but it is

Evangelicalism is separated from High Churchism by differences as essential, though not so numerous, as those by which it is severed from Tractarianism or

otherwise in questions of doctrine. Evangelicalism will therefore fatally deceive itself if it imagine that it will be expedient for it to seek the patronage of that once compact and still influential body. The most moderate of the High Church party, both in the last and in the present century, have always refused to accept the doctrine of Justification as taught by true Protestants, and have resolutely rejected the 17th Article in its literal meaning. They have been Protestants, therefore, only in name. Thus Bishop Burnet in his work on the Articles, when speaking of Justification by Faith, says, "Our faith, which includes our hope, our love, our repentance, and our obedience, is the condition that makes us capable of receiving the benefits of this redemption and free grace." Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer, would have utterly repudiated this statement as fatally destructive of the Truth of God. Indeed Gardiner (of Winchester) attacked Cranmer on this very point, alleging (what is quite true) that Cranmer, in his "Homily on Salvation"—the Homily sanctioned in the 11th Article, had so treated of Justification as to exclude "charity"; urging also that Cranmer's statements were nullified by the fact that Justification was received in Baptism. With reference to the last point, Dr. Burton, the Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford in 1831, than whom perhaps there never was a more moderate, or more amiable High Churchman, says: "Every baptized person is justified; his past sins are forgotten; his faith is counted to him for righteousness: and if he should die before the commission of actual sin, he will undoubtedly be saved. This is the doctrine of the Church concerning Justification. It is the first step in the application of God's scheme of redemption to a sinner; but the Church never confounded Justification with Salvation. . . . That a man is *justified* by faith, but that his final *salvation* will depend upon the manner in which he receives the influence of the Spirit, is the doctrine

Rome. It is clearly the duty of the real servants of Evangelical truth to recognise the *essentiality* of these differences, and to renounce connection with anti-Scriptural doctrine wherever found. God emphatically calls them to cleanse themselves from the corruptions they have too long tolerated, to quit the position they are at present occupying, and to draw nearer to the Bible and to Himself. The retention of the *status quo* would in itself be sufficient to entail

of the Church of England, of the Lutheran Reformers, of the Fathers, and of the New Testament."

Salvation as secured by promise, and salvation as accomplished in its manifested results, are of course two different things. The question in debate respects the former of these. The Scripture says, "whom He justified, them He also glorified." (Rom. viii. 30.) The Scripture associates justification and final salvation as inseparable links in the same golden chain. This, Luther, Cranmer, and every true Protestant has believed. This, the Fathers, Rome, and the High Church have systematically denied: and if they who denied it had not borne sway in the Anglican Establishment during the last century and the commencement of the present, Tractarianism would not have succeeded as it has done in its fell design of trampling down Protestantism and Scripture Truth in England. If Evangelicalism cringes to High Churchism, and refuses to hold towards it the same position that Toplady, and others like him, held, it will be as salt that has lost its savour. It is Protestant only in name. The disposition that has been recently manifested among some of the Evangelical leaders (one more especially) to represent the differences that separate the High Church from the Evangelical body as imaginary, or non-essential, is an ominous sign indeed. The Evangelicalism of Toplady and Newton has, I fear, become a thing of the past. There is not only no advance, but manifest retrogression. Most thankfully would I have formed an opposite conclusion, but I dare not.

the withdrawal of His countenance and sustainment; but what if from that *status* they seek to maintain a connection with Sacerdotalists and Sceptics, and to acknowledge them as linked in Church communion with themselves? Any who attempt to occupy such a position as this, will surely find themselves naked in the day of their calamity. Let them think of the closing night of Saul's awful history, when he sank to the earth before the words of Samuel, and learned too late that "obedience is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

Very sorrowful is it to speak thus; but is it not a duty? Is it not a time that requires strong words and decided, uncompromising action? We are not only living in the midst of corrupt and decaying Christendom, but we are dwelling in that part of it in which Antichristianism, in its full consolidated strength, is to reign. Early in the history of Christendom, we find Hegesippus, of whose history we know little, writing thus: "The Church continued until " then [the commencement of the second century] " as a virgin pure and uncorrupt; whilst if there " were any that attempted to pervert the sound doctrine of the saving Gospel, they were yet skulking " in dark retreats; but when the sacred company of " the Apostles came to the end of their course, and " the generation of those who had been privileged " to hear their inspired wisdom had passed away, " then also the conspiracy of godless error commenced " by the fraud and delusion of false teachers, who, *as* " there were none of the Apostles left [the deadly

"doctrine of Apostolic succession was not accepted
"by Hegesippus] thenceforth attempted without shame
"to put forward their knowledge falsely so called,
"and to bring it into antagonism with the preaching
"of the Truth."*

How different would the past path, how different would the present condition of true Christians have been, if they had believed and laid to heart this early testimony to the Church's failure! Yet, although attested by Scripture, and every day confirmed by fact, they have not believed it. In every age they have been dreaming about progress, and have never recognised the perpetuity of the retrogression. Hegesippus lived in the second century, just at the time when those corruptions were arising which afterwards overspread the East, and brought down on it the fell scourge of Mahomedanism. In the West, the writings of Augustine shed, for a season, a glimmering and uncertain light, but it was soon quenched by the advancing darkness; and mediæval sacerdotalism reigned with well-nigh undisputed supremacy till Wicliffe and Luther came. Their work was not faultless; yet it was blessed, for they upheld and exalted the Bible against the traditions of men. But the early energy of Protestantism soon decayed. Its efforts were checked, its course impeded, its more faithful servants persecuted and destroyed; while those less faithful, temporised, and ceased to struggle. Protestantism, becoming nominal, nationalised and secularised itself; and the current of evil flowed on just as proudly as before. It is true, indeed, that the great

* Eusebius, "Eccles. Hist.," lib. iii. § 33.

principle of Protestantism has not failed ; but they who have professedly accepted it have failed. They have corrupted themselves, perverted the Scripture, and are now betraying it to its enemies, as the citations already given in this pamphlet abundantly testify. We are now living in the ruins of Christendom, and have indeed to say, that "the foundations of all things are out of course." We have already seen apostasies, but we are soon to see THE APOSTASY : we have seen varied forms of antichristianism, but we are soon to see ANTICHRISTIANISM itself in its systematized completeness : we have seen antichrists, but we are soon to see THE ANTICHRIST. When of old a prophetic roll was sent to Jehoiakim King of Judah, full of denunciation against his wickedness, and the wickedness of his people, Jehoiakim's conscience trembled, but he stifled its voice, and cast the roll into the fire. Christendom has not yet done that. It has indeed received a roll infinitely more terrible, more full of lamentation, mourning, and woe, than that which was given to Jehoiakim, or to any who preceded him. It has not dared to burn the roll : but it has either hidden it, or else perverted and misinterpreted its testimonies. But when the time really comes for the last book of Scripture to be fulfilled, when those last forms of evil of which the Revelation speaks shall have been manifested in their completeness, and God's servants shall with living power force on men's unwilling ears the long despised testimonies of God, their consciences will at last tremble. The facts that God has predicted, the evils that He has denounced, the judgments which He has said should come, will be too

near them, too vividly present to their apprehensions, to be any longer disregarded or despised. The only alternative then will be, to repent, or to blaspheme. They will choose the latter. They will blaspheme God, trample down His Truth, and destroy His servants, until their tongues can no longer speak, and their hands no longer act. The day of man will cease; and the day of God will come.

Is the Church of God (I mean the true Church) able at present to meet and to wrestle with the circumstances that are about to bring on this awful consummation? I think not. The true genuine principles of Antichristianism are springing up thickly around us, but their character is not apprehended, nor is the end to which all things are fast tending discerned. Hence timidity, doubt, and compromise, even amongst God's own people. The heavenly unity indeed of the true Church cannot be lost, for it is secured in Christ risen: but its practical unity in the earth (apart from which God cannot be duly served, or the testimonies of His Truth maintained) may be, and has been lost, for we certainly now are no longer "perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." The Apostle expected this of the Church once; and surely he would not have expected from them that which was impossible. But we are this no longer. Discord, not unity, marks our present condition. Divers thoughts, and divers utterances prevail. We behold a confusion not unlike that which reigned at Babel when God there confounded the speech of men. It is a chastisement—a well deserved chastisement. The walls of Truth which once begirt the Church

when it stood as "the pillar and ground of the Truth," are fallen just as truly as were the walls of Jerusalem when Nehemiah went round that city by night and viewed its desolation. "The walls were broken down, and the gates thereof consumed with fire." It is not otherwise now. The walls that should have begirt us have fallen; and yet many do not even recognise the fact. To be enabled to recognise it is a special mercy; and it is a greater mercy still when we are enabled to recognise the disastrous consequences, and to humble ourselves and to mourn. At present we have no strength to effect a restoration. We have no Nehemiah to direct us; no Ezra to teach us; yet we need both instruction and control. We are not more devoid of unity than of powers of right government; and yet government is essential. We cannot act efficiently without it; but it is not sought after, or even desired. How then can we expect that it should be supplied? Powers too, of discriminative judgment are lacking; for rubbish is often mistaken for stone, and stone for rubbish. Progress under such circumstances is impossible. This is just our condition now. If we wait and humble ourselves before God, we may learn from these things profitable lessons of which we may one day prove the value; but more than this we cannot at present say. Yet it is better to be ever so discouraged, despised, or afflicted whilst cleaving to outcast Truth, than to find rest, quiet, fame, or honour, by deserting to the banner of Falsehood, or placing ourselves within the lines of the enemy. Society is dividing itself into two great classes. Over the one is written, "withdrawal unto perdition;" over the other,

"faith unto the saving of the soul." If at the present moment, when that hour of temptation is so nigh which is coming "to try them that dwell upon the earth," we should deliberately join the first of these classes, it is scarcely to be expected that we should ever leave it again. Hence the awfulness of compromise.

It will be well for us to read the prayers and confessions of Daniel and of Ezra (*see* Daniel ix. and Ezra ix.), and solemnly to consider the circumstances under which those confessions were made. Are not the corruptions of Christendom, in the midst of which we are living, infinitely worse and more appalling than those which Daniel and Ezra beheld in Israel? Are we sinning that grace might abound? Is it because our eyes are dim and our hearts hardened, that we feel less humbled than they? We should read also the *ninth* chapter of Ezekiel. On whom was the mark of preservation placed? Only on those "who cried and who sighed" for all the abominations that were being committed around them. Doubtless they did not cry and sigh for those abominations without forsaking them. There is a time for protest; and there is a time for action. Mere protest is not now sufficient. Action—firm, decided, uncompromising action is that which the present hour requires. It requires that we should take up a place of avowed antagonism to such persons, doctrines, and practices as are by the Word of God condemned. It requires that there should be the distinct avowal of the need of a new Reformation. Is fraternization with falsehood the same thing as separation from

it? If not, which does God's Word require? No doubt, our consciences, when not deadened, will answer and say, "It demands separation." But the universal cry of society around us is for union; and to that cry even the people of God listen. Men say, We execrate all Shibboleths. Their own Shibboleths they are right in execrating; but they forget that there are Shibboleths that are the Shibboleths of God. To renounce *His* Shibboleth is to renounce Truth. The circle of Truth is drawn by God; it is determined in His written Word; and to widen it is to destroy His work.

It is not in our power to change the current of the day, but we may seek grace to humble ourselves before God, and to wait expectantly until He interferes for His people's and for His Truth's sake. That He will interfere before the present Dispensation closes is certain.


When the Latitudinarianism that is now spreading around us shall have developed itself into Antichristianism, and have become consolidated in Jerusalem and in the East, God will again arouse a remnant of His people, and will enable them to testify with an energy and with a power that will penetrate the kingdoms of the Roman world to their very centre. All that the Prophets have spoken, and all that the Lord Jesus has in the Book of Revelation declared respecting the closing hours of the Dispensation in which we live, will be then set forth in a simplicity and power that cannot either be evaded or ignored. The consciences of men will be forced to recognise (whether they avow it or not) that they

and Israel and the nations are placed in the very circumstances which, ages before, the Word of God had delineated. It will be a time when many of the true people of God will be gathered together into greater unity and pearl-like separateness than ever has been since the Apostles died. It will indeed be the period of a new Reformation. The lessons afforded by the last three hundred years of Protestantism will not be unheeded. They will be remembered and laid to heart: and the shoals and quicksands on which Protestantism has made shipwreck will be avoided. Yet the period of this new testimony will be brief; its sphere (like that of the Protestant Reformation) limited: its effects transient. The governmental power of the Ten Kingdoms of the Roman World will be, at that time, peculiarly in the hands of Satan, who will wield their united strength unrestrictedly. He will silence therefore the revived voice of Truth, and will again succeed in trampling down the work of God; but not until the servants of the Truth shall have maintained against him a struggle that shall bring honour to themselves, glory to their Lord, and salvation to multitudes of their fellow-men. Although trampled down upon earth, they will be overcomers in the sight of Heaven. Their record there is written thus: "They overcame him [the dragon] because of the blood of the Lamb, and because of the word of their testimony, and they loved not their lives unto the death." And although we, who are living at this present period of discord, ignorance, and retrocession, have neither the knowledge nor the grace that will be needed for such a tes-

timony, yet it should be our effort to search out and to cherish those doctrines, principles, and practices, which will give to that testimony its power. Let us take heed that we do not check or chill by cold indifference, any aspirations or habits of thought and action that tend toward that hour of renovated service in the Truth. From the present time onward, it may be expected that there will be some (they will at first perhaps, be a few scattered individuals), who will give themselves earnestly, humbly, and prayerfully to the searching of the Word of God, expecting to find in the Truth there taught, such definiteness, clearness, and harmoniousness as to preclude uncertainty, and to afford a solid basis for practical unity. Thus seeds may be scattered, and hearts prepared, for the period when God will raise up faithful ministers, able to teach and able to govern; and when He will also give, to some at least among His people, grace to welcome and to receive the instruction and the guidance thus graciously vouchsafed. It is vain for Truth to be spoken, if hearts are not prepared to receive it. There is One only who can open the mouth to speak, and give also the anointed ear to hear. The present Babel of conflicting sentiment that is found even among assembled Christians now, will cease then. Scripture will then no longer, as now, be distorted and perverted, but will with living power be unfolded from Genesis to Revelation. The account which God has given of the days and mode of His creation, in the first pages of His Written Word, will no longer be permitted to be charged with inexactness or untruthfulness, nor will the visions of the Revela-

tion be so explained as to make them sanction the very things which they were written to condemn ; nor will the vicariousness of Christ's obedience and suffering on behalf of His people be rejected ; nor will it be denied that the atoning oblation once made upon the Cross does by itself alone secure the justification, preservation and final salvation of all those for whom it was presented ; nor will it be attempted so to extend the scope of atonement as to include any except the family of faith. On the contrary, the Scriptures will again (for the first time since the Apostles died) be so unfolded as to confront with the testimonies of God's own heavenly light that mighty system of concentrated falsehood and cosmopolitan comprehensiveness which Satan will have raised up, and by which he will make Babylon (the last great centre of the renovated East) the mother of all the harlots and of all the abominations of the earth. Truth and its servants have already had to encounter many terrible adversaries. Their conflicts with Pagan, and yet more with Ecclesiastical Rome, as well as with the Greek Church and Mahommedanism in the East, have been deadly : but a yet more fearful struggle awaits them with that last great System, and that last great Head of evil, whose character and course are in the Revelation portrayed. Satan is now fast preparing his servants for the elaboration of that system of harmonised Truthlessness which he is about to organise in the East, and God will, in due time, call forth His servants also for the defence of His equally organised system of Truth. At the present moment, if we scrutinise the signs of the times with sufficient

care, we shall see indications of a division taking place among the professed servants of Christ, some gathering around that banner on which doubt, uncertainty, and compromise are inscribed; whilst others are being gathered to another centre where truth is recognised as being one, where doubt gives place to certainty, and where "yea and amen" are recognised as the only words that beseem the testimonies of the faithful servants of Christ. Very divergent are these paths; very different the ends to which they respectively lead; but one or other of them we must all enter. Neutrality and inaction will be found to be impossible. We shall all be drawn within, or towards, those lines of thought and action by which Satan is leading on to the last great systematised development of evil, or else our feet will be directed towards those paths that lead to the renovated testimonies of revealed Truth. If we see not the honour and the blessedness of disinterring, as it were, from the grave, the long buried testimonies of the Prophets, and of the Revelation, and causing them to throw the light of Heaven on that closing period of darkness and evil with which the present period of the world's history is to conclude—if we appreciate not the honour of such a service as this, it is to be feared that our inward eye is becoming too dim to be able to distinguish between darkness and light, evil and good, the ways of Satan and the works of God. Even true believers may fall into a condition of apathetic blindness. To believers who had defiled their *priestly* garments it was said, "I counsel thee to buy of Me gold tried in the fire, that thou mayest be rich; and white



raiment, that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy nakedness do not appear; and anoint thine eyes with eye-salve, that thou mayest see." In considering the relations of Christ to His people, we have to remember, not only His love in sending to us as sinners the Gospel of His saving grace, or His kindness in nourishing and cherishing those who are brought by that Gospel into His fold, but we have also to remember that as the Priest who watches over the heritage of God, He draws nigh to His people to inspect their condition, and to see whether they are adequately answering the requirements of God. As One whose eyes are as a flame of fire, and His feet like unto fine brass as though they burned in a furnace, He draws nigh in the power of the Divine Holiness, not indeed that He might destroy His people (for He has saved them by His grace), but that He might *prove* them. He has left them in the earth not only to be the witnesses of His grace in saving sinners, but to be subjects also of that separating, sanctifying power that makes them servants to the Father and to Himself in a world that knows Him not. Blessed are they whose ears may now be opened to hear what the Spirit said unto the Churches. When they who have imagined that they were "rich and increased in goods," suddenly discover that they are, on the contrary, "poor and miserable, and blind and naked," it is no wonder that their hearts should feel broken, and crushed, as it were, to the very dust. Great exercise of spirit will thus, no doubt, be caused to many; but however trying the discipline, it is better to pass under it rather than to be left

unprepared to meet the dangers that are closing in around us. Our estimate of the preciousness of God's *grace* will not be lessened, but greatly increased, by finding that it can extend even to the taking away of defiled *priestly* garments, and to the restoring us to positions of honoured service which we have justly forfeited. (See Zech. iii. 3, 4.) Never was there a time in the history of God's people when there was greater need to seek deliverance from the darkenesses with which we have surrounded ourselves, and to hasten our escape from every thing that is by the Word of God condemned. By TRUTH only can the loins be girded. What can we expect if we persist in dallying with FALSEHOOD?

We cannot too carefully remember that Truth and Falsehood are no less distinct, separate, and contrasted, than are Christ and Satan. The circle of Truth is that in which Christ acts: the circle of Falsehood is that in which Satan acts. "He [Satan] was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the Truth because there is no Truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a Liar and the father of it." (John viii. 44.) Of Himself Jesus saith, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the Truth. Everyone that is of the Truth heareth my voice." (John xviii. 37.) After reading such words as these shall we not pray that we may have grace to repent and to seek to undo the work of post-apostolic Christendom, and to bring back ourselves and others to a recognition of the well-nigh obliterated and forgotten, though once vividly marked lines

by which God separated His Truth from the surrounding lies of the Deceiver? "Sanctify them by Thy Truth. Thy word is Truth." The Scripture is the touchstone. Shall we eschew its use, because we dread the consequences? No doubt its use will cause us sorrow and humiliation: but is it not better to be as "the bruised reed," rather than to be strong in a strength that comes not from God? "He will not break the bruised reed, nor quench the smoking flax, until He send forth judgment unto victory." But there are some who will not be as "the bruised reed," and what do we find written respecting them: "They shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the gardens that ye have chosen. For ye shall be as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water. And the strong shall be as tow, and the maker of it as a spark, and they shall both burn together, and none shall quench them." (Isaiah i. 29—31.)

APPENDIX TO FIRST EDITION.

NOTE ON THE CONTINUANCE OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

FEW things in the history of the world are more remarkable than the manner in which, under the providence of God, the name and form of Imperial Roman authority has been preserved and transmitted from age to age throughout all the convulsions of the Roman Empire.

The history of the four Gentile Empires, whether Chaldean, Persian, Grecian, or Roman, is treated of in the Scripture, so far as that history is connected with Israel—God's people, in Jerusalem. Indeed one of the great purposes for which those Empires were raised up, was, that God might, through them, fulfil His purposes towards His rebellious people. Accordingly, from the time of Augustus to Trajan and Adrian, He greatly strengthened the Roman Empire, and used it against Israel. But after Adrian had given that tremendous blow which he was allowed to inflict upon Jerusalem, the Roman Empire soon began to wane and crumble. But it was not to crumble so as to perish, but only so as for the Romanum Imperium to become

a divided Imperium, to be distributed finally among ten kingdoms.

Nothing can be more plain, if we read the seventh of Daniel, than that the Scripture regards the *fourth* Empire as existent *until* "the Ancient of Days sits," and the authority of the Gentiles terminates.

The following remarks of Dr. Tregelles on this subject are interesting and important.

Speaking of the kings of the barbarian tribes that had broken in upon the Roman Empire, Dr. Tregelles observes:—

"In some cases the kings, whose power had arisen within the Roman earth, sought and obtained imperial recognition from Constantinople. This was the case in England, where, during the days of the Heptarchy one sovereign bore supreme rule, being acknowledged as an associate in the empire by the reigning emperor in the East. Hence, we find on Saxon coins the title of *ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ*, as borne by the Greek emperors, and the she-wolf with Romulus and Remus. Thus did the invading rulers, who had established themselves in this country, identify themselves with the authority, the institutions, and with the historical associations of Ancient Rome.

"Although from the year 476 there ceased to be an emperor reigning in the West, the authority of the imperial name was not finally extinct in its original centre of dominion. Odoacer, the king of the Heruli (a tribe issuing from the shores of the Baltic), who in 476 had deposed Romulus Augustulus, was invested, at the request of the Roman Senate, with the title of Patrician, by Zeno, the Eastern emperor; and under

this designation he exercised sovereign power; Theodoric, the king of the Ostrogoths, by whom Odoacer was displaced and slain (in 493), had been educated at Constantinople; and it was as a province of the empire, and under the (disregarded) condition of tribute, that he received the grant of Italy from Zeno. In the middle of the following century, the victories of Belisarius and Narses united to the empire of Justinian the Carthaginian provinces, Italy, and the islands of Sicily, Sardinia, and Corsica. That part of Italy which continued to belong to the empire after the Lombard invasion, was ruled by a governor bearing the title of *Exarch*, whose abode was at Ravenna. Thus was the direct authority of the emperors maintained over Rome, and other portions of the West, till the year 731.

“Seventy years had not passed from that date, when Charlemagne, the monarch of the Franks and the German tribes, was (in the year 800) solemnly crowned emperor, at Rome, by the Pope. This has been regarded by some as though he thus became the *remote* successor of Augustulus: it was, however, rather as the associate of Irenè, then ruling the eastern empire, that the imperial dignity and name were conferred on the western conqueror.

“In his family the imperial title continued with diminished lustre; at Coblentz, in the church of St. Castor, his descendants agreed to divide his territories; and after various vicissitudes, the title of Roman Emperor, together with the supremacy over Italy (*real* at that time), was appropriated, in the person of Otho, 962, to an elective German monarch.

But though his rule was *principally* beyond the Alps, yet for ages it was considered that the imperial title was not rightly his, until he had been crowned in Rome as Emperor of the West.

"The latest traces of the power of the eastern emperors in the West are to be found in the Italian islands and the territory of Naples. Much of the latter was conquered from the Lombards, in 891, by the generals of the Emperor Leo; and even after the Norman kingdom of Naples had arisen, in the eleventh century, the claim of Constantinople was not withdrawn; nor was it till 1157, that William of Naples was acknowledged as king by the Greek emperor.

"Thus it was by gradual steps that changes took place in the Roman earth; and thus plain is it that the sovereignties of South-western Europe not only *were*, but *were considered* to be, perpetuations of Roman power.

"And this sometimes led to *formal* transactions resembling the ancient assumption of an associate in the empire. Thus, in November, 1337, the Emperor Lewis, the Bavarian, met Edward III. of England at Coblenz; and there at the church of St. Castor, where the empire had been divided five hundred years before, he constituted him Imperial Vicar of all territories and peoples on the left bank of the Rhine, with authority to coin money in those districts,—an authority on which he acted at Antwerp. This imperial title was distinctly declared in an Act of Parliament in the time of his grandson Henry IV.; and it explains part of the ceremonial

observed in the three-fold coronation of Queen Elizabeth, first as Queen of England, second Queen of Ireland, third 'Sovereign Lady and Empress of all Nations and Countries from the Islands Orcades to the Mountains Pyrenees.'

"Thus, though the Ottoman arms destroyed the imperial name and power in the East in the fifteenth century, its different western branches have continued, whether as bearing imperial or royal names. It was common to consider France as *successionally* holding the empire of the West; while even to our days the head of the Germanic body was styled Roman emperor and successor of Augustus."
—See TREGELLES on Daniel, pp. 70, &c.

The following extracts from Sir F. Palgrave's "Rise and Progress of the English Commonwealth" may be read as confirmatory of the preceding statements :—

"It has been supposed, that a universal change took place in Europe about the sixth century, and that the laws and policy now established must be traced entirely to the chaos occasioned by the general wreck of nations; but these opinions cannot be easily reconciled to familiar facts. Whether we consult the chronicle or the charter; whether we inspect the seal or the coin, we shall find the Goth and the Frank, and the Lombard, copying the state, and assuming the dignity of the former masters of the world. The barbarian chieftain sought to identify himself with the monarch to whom he succeeded. Clovis received the consular diploma and the purple robe from the Emperor of the East. Theodoric wished to appear as the colleague, not the rival of Anastasius; and he therefore preserved not only all the forms, but all the spirit of Roman institutions. . . . The fur-clad Ostrogoth never addressed the Conscript Fathers but with reverence, respect, and submission. The legislation of Rome was adopted by the Visigoths at Arles, and imitated at Toledo; and the throne of the Frankish kings was surrounded by functionaries designated by the same names as in the court of the Emperors, or performing analogous duties."—*Palgrave*, pp. 360, &c.

"The adoption by the barbarian sovereigns of the

machinery and maxims of the Roman Government, was indeed the natural and obvious result of the circumstances under which they were placed. . . . The pre-eminence of the Frankish line may perhaps be traced to the time when Merobandes . . . was decorated like Clovis with the Consular honours.”—*Palgrave, ibid.*

“Political sagacity taught the barbarian chieftain to assimilate himself to the conquered. Warily and considerately did he attempt in the first instance to legalise his dominion by obtaining the sanction of the head of the Empire. He sought to be obeyed rather as an associate, than as an invader. The Romans retained their own laws; their municipal administration was not abrogated or subverted; and wherever a Roman population subsisted, the barbarian king was entitled to command them with the prerogatives that had belonged to the Roman Emperor.”—*Palgrave, ibid.*

“Frederick Barbarossa (A.D. 1150 — 1190), the greatest after Charlemagne of the Latin Emperors, amended the federal jurisprudence of Lombardy, which as yet had not been reduced into writing, by consulting the constitutions of the Eastern Empire; and he studied the military code of the Greeks at the time when Western Europe was fully under the dominion of feudality.”—*Palgrave, p. 506.*

“The Roman Empire, or Fourth Monarchy, was not destroyed by the termination of the Imperial Governments, the founders of the barbarian dynasties . . . being the inheritors, within their respective kingdoms, of the imperial power.”—*Palgrave, p. 318, margin.*

NOTE ON THE CRIMEA.

THE relation of the Crimea, anciently called the Chersonesus Taurica, to the Roman Empire may be gathered from the following epitome of its history.

It formed a part of the ancient kingdom of Bosphorus, which was bounded on the east by Colchis; on the west by the gulph of Carcinites; on the south by the Euxine; and on the north by the Tanais or Don, where that river falls into the Sea of Azof. This kingdom, therefore, besides the whole of the Crimea, comprised a large district in Asia, on the east and north-east of the Black Sea.

This district, so important, as commanding the Sea of Azof, the Black Sea, and Circassia, was brought under the influence, if not the control of Rome, after the death of Mithridates. That Prince, after having been defeated by Pompey in Asia Minor, retired to the Crimea with the intention of marching thence across Europe to unite with the Gauls, and then to invade Italy. Pompey, when he heard that Mithridates was in the Crimea, declined to follow him there; observing that cold and famine would do more against him than all the Roman legions. Soon after he had reached the Crimea, he was deserted by his army and by his son Pharnaces, and died by his own hand in Panticapæum, the modern Kertch. Upon this Pharnaces hastened to submit himself to the Romans. Sending ambassadors to meet Pompey, at Sinope, he said, that he had foreborne to assume the title of King till Pompey's pleasure was known, and that he placed

himself and his kingdom in the hands of Rome. Upon this Pompey bestowed the kingdom of Bosphorus on Pharnaces, with the title of friend and ally of the Roman people.


When the civil war broke out between Pompey and Cæsar, Pharnaces availed himself of the opportunity to break his connection with Rome. After some considerable successes, he was met by Cæsar and defeated. It was on this occasion that Cæsar used the well-known words, "*Veni, vidi, vici.*" Cæsar instantly deposed Pharnaces, and appointed Mithridates Pergamenes King of Bosphorus in his room. In the meanwhile, however, Asander, who had been left to govern in the Crimea during the absence of Pharnaces, attacked Pharnaces on his return and murdered him. Mithridates Pergamenes, in the endeavour to carry out the intentions of Cæsar, attacked Asander, but was defeated and slain. After this the Romans did not attempt to displace Asander. Nevertheless, that the influence of Rome must have continued great in the Crimea is evident from this, that Asander was so chagrined by Augustus Cæsar giving the command of the Bosporan troops who served in the Roman army to Scribonius, instead of to himself, that he destroyed himself. Scribonius then usurped the kingdom, but was driven out by Polemon, on whom Augustus had bestowed the kingdom, with the title of friend and ally of the Roman people. It was Agrippa, the friend of Augustus, who sent Polemon against Scribonius; and it is said that Agrippa at his death bequeathed the Crimea to Augustus, but on what ground he considered himself entitled to the Crimea does not appear.

Dio states that he could throw no light on the point.* In the reigns of Caligula and Claudius we still find the kings of Bosphorus appointed by the Roman Emperors; and in the reign of Trajan we are told by Eutropius that the King of Bosphorus was received under the Emperor's protection. In the reign of Antoninus Pius also, the King of Bosphorus came to Rome to treat with the Emperor about the Emperor's protection. In the reign of Aurelian, as far as can be gathered from Lucian, the relation of the kings of the Bosphorus to Rome was the same. Still later we read of the Bosphorans protecting Justinian II. when that Prince was deposed by Tiberius; until, induced by the bribes of Tiberius, they intended to deliver him up, but were prevented by the flight of Justinian; who afterwards, when he was restored to power, revenged himself on the Bosphorans by one of the most bloody massacres that history any where records. This cruelty, however, so aroused the Bosphorans that they took arms against Justinian, proclaimed Philippicus Emperor, and after defeating Justinian, established Philippicus in the Empire. This was in the eighth century, and may be said to terminate their historic connection with the Empire of Rome.

From this we may infer, that although the Romans never sought to make the Crimea a province, yet that

* The words of Dio Cassius are these. After stating that Augustus inherited the greater part of Agrippa's possessions, he adds, *ἐν οἷς ἄλλα τε καὶ ἡ χερρονήσος ἢ πρὸς τῷ Ἑλλησποντῷ, οὐκ οἶδα ὅπως εἰς τὸν Ἀγριππᾶν ἔλθουσα*: "Amongst which were other things, and likewise the Chersonese, near the Hellespont, which came into the possession of Agrippa I know not how."

they wished to maintain there a nominally independent kingdom under their protection and virtual control. The European powers now will probably not wish to make the Crimea their possession, or to incorporate it with Turkey; but will wish to maintain a control over it, on account of its relation to the coasts of the Euxine. This appears to have been the very position which Rome held toward it.

The South-western coast of the Crimea, the scene of the present struggle, is, in some of the best atlases, marked as belonging to the Roman Empire. The Romans certainly exercised a marked control over it to a very late period. The ancient Cherson, the ancient Eupatoria (probably Inkermann) and Portus Symbolorum or Balaklava, were the chief settlements in this South-western district. Of these places, Cherson, or Chersonesus, was the most celebrated. It was so called because of its situation, having been built on the peninsula which is formed by part of the bay of Sebastopol, and the harbour of Balaklava. Dr. Henderson visited its ruins from Sebastopol in 1812, and observes that it was built by Greek colonists about the year B.C. 600, and became a flourishing and magnificent city. For a long time it remained independent of the kings of Bosphorus; but at last, from fear of the Scythians, threw itself into the arms of Mithridates. During the period of the Roman conquest, they formed themselves into a free republic, and afterwards rendered the imperial arms essential service by making a diversion in favour of the Romans in attacks on their eastern neighbours. In the time of Diocletian they  against

the Sarmatians, and thereby secured the tranquillity of the eastern portion of the empire, and they afterwards assisted Constantine the Great by making an expedition against the Goths on the Danube. They were originally governed by a president (*πρωτεύων*) of their own, but A.D. 835 the Emperor Theophilus sent a military ruler (*στρατηγος*) to regulate their affairs, and especially to conduct their expeditions. In the eleventh and twelfth centuries this celebrated city finally sank, and many of its materials have been used in building Sebastopol, but it was long the ally of Roman civilization against the hordes of the north. The peninsula on which this city was built was defended by a wall carried across from a bay in the harbour of Sebastopol, to Balaklava. (See Dr. Henderson's "Travels in Southern Russia.") As the civilization of the Greeks found an early home in this little corner, so it would seem that Roman civilization and influence held its ground there to a very late period. Are we not now about to see the place which the Roman nations will choose for the establishment of their influence in those regions?

February, 1855.

The subjoined remarks were not in the Appendix of the First Edition.

APRIL, 1879.

Many years have elapsed since the preceding Appendix was written. The anticipation of its concluding clause has not been fulfilled. France and England, after the conclusion of the Crimean war,

sank down into a kind of lethargic inaction, of which Russia was quick to avail herself. Her intrigues prospered, and she has now succeeded in grasping no small portion of that Mithridatic power which she has ever coveted. She has freed herself from restrictions that fettered her in the Euxine, has greatly strengthened herself in Armenia, has recovered Besarabia, has humbled Roumania, made Servia virtually a dependency, and secured for herself in the Balkan peninsula the means of exercising, whenever she pleases, those disturbing influences which she knows so well how to employ.

Nevertheless, by the blow which, under the providence of God, she has been permitted to inflict on Turkey, Russia (unwittingly no doubt) has done much to facilitate the progress of the Roman nations in that path which they are, by the appointment of God, finally to tread. In no part of the Roman World will any one religious system be allowed exclusively to dominate, nor will any religious system be permitted to disown the supremacy of the civil power in all civil questions. Neither Romanism nor any like system can *dominate* in the West, nor can Mahommedanism *dominate* in the East. At the end of the Crimean war, the Government of Constantinople engaged to accept the principles of civil and religious liberty as adopted in Western Europe; but the engagement was not carried into effect, and France and England took no effectual measures for enforcing it. Russia well knew how to profit by the sluggishness of her rivals. She fomented strife, secured for herself a *casus belli*, acted, and the result is that in European

Turkey at any rate, the dominance of Mahommedanism has ceased. Jews, Christians of all denominations, and Mahommedans, are to have equal civil rights and freedom of worship. Even the political and social principles of Western Europe, hateful as they are in the eyes of autocratic Russia, have been accepted and even favoured by her in the countries which she boasts of having emancipated. She is right no doubt in thinking that small States, democratically constituted, can without much difficulty be thrown into disorder by a crafty patronising neighbour. She knows that democratic monarchies have really no principles of cohesion stronger than that which may keep clay and iron together in brittle and precarious union, but she knows not that God has appointed that certain nations whose institutions have that brittleness, are nevertheless to be *the* nations before whom, for a season, Russia and every other government on earth must bow, until the appointed hour for the fall of these privileged nations comes. Then, indeed, they *will* fall, smitten, however, by no earthly hand, and when they *do* fall, every government on earth, as at present constituted, will fall likewise. But this Russia knows not. The wisdom of Daniel is no wisdom in her sight. "None of the wicked shall understand, but the understanding ones shall understand." Russia, therefore, in putting down the exclusiveness of Mahommedanism and in promoting the political and social principles of Western Europe in the East, has unconsciously been strengthening her rivals and aiding the progress of the Roman nations in their appointed course. She has thrown down

barriers which were to them fatally obstructive. Her present territorial gains may, and finally will be, taken from her, but the countries which she has unwittingly strengthened, (although they have yet many difficulties to struggle through,) will ultimately attain, in association with the Western nations, a strength before which she will be obliged to bow, even as the Mithridatic Pontus, and Scythia, and Parthia, and Persia, bowed before the supremacy of Imperial Rome. Another effect of the recent achievement of Russia has been to show to the Roman nations more clearly than before, the necessity of acting firmly and unitedly *together*. The interests of France, Great Britain, and Austria, are more and more felt to be identical as respects the aggressions of Russia: and this feeling Spain, Italy, and Greece, will soon thoroughly share. To all these nations the possession of the Mediterranean is a vital question. The Mediterranean is called in Scripture "the great sea," and actually it is so; for God's providence has made it the centre of the world's greatness. Shall Europe possess it or Asia? For ages that question has agitated the world. In the days of Nebuchadnezzar, his conquest of Egypt, and of Tyre with her dependencies, gave him the lordship of the Mediterranean Sea. Persia extended her conquests further. In addition to Egypt and Syria, she held Asia Minor, with the coasts of the *Ægean*. In the days of Xerxes, Asia seemed to have the then civilised parts of Europe prostrate at her feet, when suddenly Greece arose, and the tide of conquest turned. Europe, under Alexander of Greece, and subsequently

under the Cæsars of Rome, prevailed. The Rhine the Danube, the Nile, and the Euphrates were brought under European guardianship and control. In the days of Trajan the power of Rome was firmly established on all these rivers, and extended over the seas into which those rivers respectively fell; and when the closing period of the Roman nations comes, it will be firmly established there again.

Yet Rome, while establishing her power in the East, had to cope with countless difficulties. In encountering Mithridates she engaged in a struggle that for a time seemed to threaten her own existence. Mithridates, (whose dominions rested on the Euxine, which he virtually commanded,) "maintained "a most bloody war with the Romans for the space "of forty-six years, and alone gave them more trouble, "as their own writers witness, than Pyrrhus, Hannibal, and the powerful kings of Syria and Macedon "had done altogether."* Her struggle also with the Parthians was long and deadly. The Sarmatians and Scythians (of whom the Muscovite Russians are the successors) were ever ready to avail themselves of every season of Rome's weakness. Lastly, the Persians, before whom the Parthians succumbed, became Rome's lasting enemies, and it was in conflict with them that Julian fell. On her eastern frontier, therefore, Rome never knew tranquillity or rest. Thus conflict between European civilization and the turbulent and comparatively barbarous tribes of Asia is one that commenced in the earliest ages, and since it commenced may be said never to have ended. It

* "Universal History," Vol. IX., p. 542.

is a struggle too that will continue up to the very time when "the sovereignty of the world shall become the sovereignty of our Lord and of His Christ;" for the gathering of the kings of the whole Roman World (τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης) at Armageddon, will be caused by the sudden assemblage of Asiatic hordes against that great city which European civilization is about to resuscitate in the East.

It would be folly to suppose that European power could again establish itself in strength on the banks of the Tigris and the Euphrates without encountering countless obstacles and dangers—if not overwhelming disasters. Evidently there are obstacles which GOD'S hand only can remove. The object of Russia clearly is, to add the Pontic and Mithridatic power to her own Sarmatian and Scythian strength. Moreover she wishes to grasp the countries in which the Parthian power once predominated. Hence her advance in Central Asia. She would like to creep onward towards Persia, and to command the mouth and the valley of the Euphrates. Once there, and holding Armenia and the coasts of the Euxine, what would become of Asia Minor, Egypt, and the Ægean? The Romans found it hard to conflict with Mithridates and with the Parthians and with the Persians *separately*. What if the mighty Sarmatian and Scythian power of Russia should be added to the strength of those other enemies?

Such is the kind of conflict on which the nations of Western and South-Western Europe have entered. They have before them a task not unlike to that


which ancient Rome undertook when her legions, under the successive leaderships of Sylla, Pompey, and Caesar, entered the East. She saw the necessity of securing all the countries that lie between the Mediterranean and the Euphrates, and Trajan saw the necessity of securing Assyria also; and he secured it. The same task is being undertaken by Europe now. Just at the present moment there is a lull in the storm, but it is a lull merely. The struggle is not over. Whether it may be long and deadly; or whether the way of the Western Roman nations may be smoothed so as for the resuscitation of the East under their guardianship to be quietly and speedily effected, it is impossible for us to say. When the Scripture speaks not, we must be silent. To the eye of man there are difficulties which seem well nigh insurmountable. The leading Roman nations, although in many respects strong, are in other respects weak, chiefly because of internal dissensions. It is a period, too, when the truths, systems, and agencies, social, religious, and governmental, which were once revered, are being renounced. It is a time of transition, and a time of transition cannot be a time of stability and strength. Circumstances may sometimes compel (as we have seen of late) certain nations to act together, but their union has been precarious, and co-operation difficult. Indeed, of late years subjects of contention have been multiplied rather than diminished among the European nations. Many are discontented with their present territorial limits; others with their political connections; and many of the larger States would not be displeased

to have a safe opportunity afforded them of absorbing their weaker neighbours. Romanism, too, has not yet fought her *last* battle for supremacy, and she knows how to find, even in Socialism and Radicalism, allies. By these and various other like causes too numerous to be mentioned here, concurrent action among the Roman nations seems, at the present moment, well nigh impossible. Yet, without systematic, concurrent action, how can the difficulties and dangers which threaten the East be successfully encountered? Will these dangers assume a magnitude that shall compel union, or will the union be attained by other and more peaceful means? Russia, foiled in Europe, will now, no doubt, devote her energies to the spread and development of her Asiatic power. This is in itself a danger which can scarcely be overrated. But even if this were otherwise, there are difficulties of vast magnitude in the condition of the East itself. The history of Europe during the middle ages has shown us how mighty is the strength of Feudalism and Ecclesiasticism combined. Humanity fell prostrate before it, and groaned in hopelessness. So now in Turkey. The union of the governing classes with a religious system so potent and deep-rooted as Mahommedanism, has produced analogous effects. The strength of this union is not yet destroyed, and may yet prove the ruin of the Turks as a people. It is by no means impossible that their present perverseness and obstinacy may bring down speedy destruction upon their heads.

But when these difficulties shall have been overcome, and when Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, and the

Islands of the *Ægean*, shall have consented to receive the laws and institutions of the West, the yet more arduous work will remain of welding them and the other nations of the Roman world, into close and compact union with each other. The union must be far more complete and real than is now found in any of the European kingdoms *separately*; for in all of them party spirit and personal ambition (as has of late been disastrously manifested in England) so hinders concord as to render prompt and decided action well nigh impracticable. What the world now requires is not merely a civilised centre—it needs a *governmental controlling* centre, and that efficient, stable and strong. It needs a centre in which sufficient vigour and sufficient strength should be found, to make it not only the main-spring of the world's energies, but *the controller* of those energies also. At any period of the earth's history the establishment of such an Imperial centre must be difficult, even if the power were to be vested in one nation or people only, as in the case of Rome anciently; but the difficulty is infinitely increased if the power is not to be vested in one nation only, but in a combination of nations. It is true indeed that of late years, many of the nations thus to be combined, have, in various ways, politically and socially, become more assimilated than once they were. Yet many differences still continue, and at present, there is not a nation in Europe that could be persuaded to believe that anything but ruin would ensue, if it ceased to make its own individual aggrandisement the primary object of its efforts. Even though it may be admitted that union

is strength, and that a nation may be damaged, rather than profited by its neighbour's weakness, yet the thought that it would be wise to sacrifice individual freedom of action for the sake of confederated strength, is a thought so repugnant at present to all European notions, that its mention would meet not only rejection but scorn. And when we remember further that in the nations which are to be thus united the prevailing desire of well nigh every heart is to free itself as much as possible from all control, and to make its own will its law—that society is in fact being disintegrated, and that men are becoming more and more (to use the language of Scripture) like “the fishes of the sea, like creeping things that have no ruler over them,” we see in the way of a union such as that proposed, obstacles which to the eye of man seem absolutely insurmountable. If men's minds become imbued with the thought that there is nothing in the earth that can be implicitly rested in as true—if they are taught that there is no Hell, no Devil, no eternal torment—that there is either no God, or else that He has made no intelligible revelation of His will—if men's minds are to be divested of the influences of fear, reverence and hope, springing from the recognition of an unseen and eternal world, and of an unseen Almighty Ruler and Judge, there can be only one of two results: there will be either unrestrained licentiousness of thought and action, or else forcible restraint by a hand strong enough to enforce its will. We cannot wonder therefore that at a moment like the present, men who are sufficiently thoughtful and saga-



cious to discern the tendencies of the hour should tremble. They see the moral chaos that is spreading around them. They see the strongest governments assailed and even shaken by Atheistic Socialism. They anxiously look for some one to arise to control the rising floods, and to force or guide them into channels in which they might flow harmlessly. They look back regretfully on men that have been—the Agamemnons and Alexanders of former days, and long that some one endowed with like and greater powers should arise, suited by his wisdom, energy and strength to be the “King of Men.” Mark the sentiment of the following passage. It does but embody the thoughts of many a mind. The writer after describing the recent disentanglement of Mycenæ and its long-buried relics, including the giant frame of Agamemnon, thus proceeds:

“But why was this discovery reserved for the latter end of the nineteenth century? It is made in the very nick of time. What is it that all Europe is looking for? It is the KING of MEN, the great head of the Hellenic race, the man whom a thousand galleys and a hundred thousand men submitted to on a simple recognition of his personal qualities, and obeyed for ten long years. Here are his arms, shield, and all his familiar accoutrements, as well as the sword and other weapons that had become in a manner part of his own natural frame. It was only a mile and a half from the very spot where these are found that PYTHAGORAS walked one day into the Temple of JUNO, and recognised for his own the shield he had carried in the Trojan War under the

“form of EUPHORBUS, who perished by the hand
“of MENELAUS. Let the shield of AGAMEMNON
“be hung up amid a number of other shields of
“antique form. Let the greatest men of this, not
“degenerate age, be invited to prove their true identity. The man who, as soon as he enters, can single
“out the shield of the KING of MEN, and say, ‘That
“‘is mine,’ must be the man to head the entire Greek
“race and the races mixed with it in their impending
“struggle with the remnant of the Asiatic Power. It
“must be a true Philhellene, a scholar, a statesman, a
“man of unflinching courage and irrepressible enterprise, full of resources, and ready to look in the face
“a rival or a foe. He must have sat at HOMER’S
“feet and learnt his lore as PELIDES did the learned
“Centaur. The man who can challenge for his own
“the Shield of AGAMEMNON, now waiting for the
“challenge, is the true Emperor of the East, and our
“easiest escape from our present difficulties.”*


This passage will no doubt, be generally regarded as a *jeu d’esprit*, written merely to amuse. Nevertheless, words lightly spoken may have in them a more serious meaning than those who use them care to acknowledge. Whether the desire expressed by the writer was intended seriously or not, it is one that will, at no long distance of time, be substantially fulfilled. A “KING of MEN” will arise (and that from Greece), around whom all who desire greatness apart from God will eagerly gather. All the qualities that men have idolised in the Roman, and in the Greek, and in the Assyrian of ancient days, will be

* Leading article of the “Times,” December 18th, 1876.

found united in "The Coming Man." The greatness of the past will re-appear invested with new glories. *Assyrian*, as respects the seat of his government: *Greek* in origin and in character: *Roman* as to the territorial extent and strength of his power, he will be "wondered after" as one who after having been, and ceased to be, had suddenly attained a recovered being. "He was, and is not, and shall be present," are the words in which the Scripture describes his disappearance and his revival. "All," therefore, "whose names have not been written from the foundation of the world in the Book of Life shall marvel." (Rev. xvii.) Men have desired to be led and to be governed by a man after their own heart, and God will permit that desire to be fulfilled. Satan will prepare and present to them their King, and they will welcome, serve, and at last "worship" him. (Rev. xiii.)

Pythagoras, and the story about his claiming the shield of Euphorbus, is referred to in the preceding extract. I do not for a moment suspect the writer of being a Pythagorean. He would, I doubt not, denounce the doctrine of Pythagoras respecting the transmigration of souls as false and evil; and so indeed it is. Yet, with most of the lies of Satan, some element of perverted truth is mingled. The doctrine of the transmigration of souls is altogether a lie; but the migration of devils from one person or being to another person or being is not a lie. The devils who, at one moment dwelt in the maniac, the next moment entered into the swine. (See Luke viii. 27.) In this case, the power of Satan was seen

in a form that made even the ungodly to tremble. But it is not always thus. He can also invest with Absalom-like attractiveness, and can enable his servants to entrance and fascinate men by endowments that he is able to bestow. Evil spirits die not with the men in whom they have dwelt; but they can enter into other men, and live on in them, so that at any moment the principles and habits of the mighty ones of the past, may be reproduced in the mighty ones of the present. And although at different periods of the world's history there are necessarily circumstantial differences in the mode and form in which its evil is developed, yet the essential principles of the past and present are the same. There is a fearful continuity, therefore, in the living power of evil. Neither the terrors of God's Law, nor the ways and testimonies of Christ in holiness and in grace, have shown to men their utter distance from God, nor their subjection to the power of that evil one "who worketh in all the children of disobedience." The "true Light" hath shone, but it hath shone in the midst of darkness, and "the darkness comprehended it not." There is no repentance. The eye is darkened that it cannot see, and the ear heavy that it cannot hear. The coming "King of Men," therefore, will be welcomed and idolized when he appears. They who saw no "beauty" in Christ that they should desire Him, will see all beauty and attractiveness in Antichrist, and him they will admire. At this very moment the change that is taking place in society is, that they are withdrawing from the Person and principles of Christ, and are eagerly



advancing towards the principles and person of Antichrist. Yet whence his origin? God tells us. He says it is from the abyss—"the bottomless pit." His last revealed association, what is it? He is found linked in triple union with the Dragon [Satan] and with the lying Prophet. Out of the mouth of the Dragon and of Antichrist and of the lying Prophet were seen to issue "spirits of devils working miracles, that go forth to the kings of the whole οἰκουμένη, to gather them together to the battle of the great Day of God, the Almighty." The great men of the earth that have been (whether great in what men call glory, or great in crime) have only partially, and in a fragmentary manner, foreshadowed him whom Scripture emphatically designates as "THE King." "Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it."

This is the King who will mould the reviving East, and weld into compact unity the now divided countries of the Roman World. This is the person for whom the nations are waiting, to supply the "strong government" which they say (truly enough) they need. They will indeed be governed, but governed by a hand that knows not to show pity, and will lead them to Tophet—not to Heaven. Such is the light which the Scripture sheds upon the East as now reviving under the hand of man. It is to be the sphere where the energies of unregenerate man, sustained and ordered by a power which Satan has never yet been allowed to put forth among men, will find

the last sphere of their development. It will be the sphere where "the vine of the earth" is to flourish. Plant it in Jerusalem: let its branches spread over the land of Israel, and thence over all the countries of the Roman World—in that vine you will see the earth's most favoured and most cherished plant, yet what are its clusters? They are clusters that are to be "cast into the great wine-press of the wrath of God." (See Rev. xiv.) It is a vine that is "of the vine of Sodom, and of the fields of Gomorrah," their grapes are grapes of gall—their clusters are bitter. (See Deut. xxxii. 32.)

Such are the warnings of God as to the now near future. "Shall a trumpet be blown in a city, and the people not be afraid?" It would seem so. The trumpet surely is blown, yet we see not the fear.

WHILST engaged in writing the last of the preceding pages, some papers were sent to me from Scotland, bearing on the controversy which is now agitating "The Free Church" in that country as to the relation which should be held by it towards Neology and Neologian teachers. From one of those papers I have taken the extracts which I subjoin. Perhaps I should scarcely use the word "extracts," for I have quoted nearly the whole pamphlet. It supplies the best *condensation* that I have yet seen of the doctrines current among the Neologians of Germany. No one, after reading it, can say that they are ignorant of what is meant by the term "Neology." This is the system which so many are now anxious to establish in England, yet, lest (if it were suddenly presented in its completeness) its hideousness should terrify, it is being introduced gradually and in fragmentary portions. But, however fragmentary the portion, it is part of a mighty system, and that system is one of rebellion against the King of kings. We have to remember that the loyal in heart must not only have no sympathy with rebels, they must also stand in avowed antagonism to them. The standard of Absalom is not the standard of David, and when those standards are once reared in hostile antagonism, he who is not against Absalom must be regarded (and justly) as being against David. If we do not avowedly and unvaryingly take our stand *against* a

system such as this, we must be looked upon as traitors to God and to His Truth. Neutrality, in such a conflict, must be looked on as a token of spiritual death. Can those who fear God sit tamely by whilst they see society leavened with the principles of Hell? Wherever these principles prevail, Truth must perish, and Society become thoroughly prepared for the manipulation of the hand of Antichrist.

I am the more anxious that the subjoined extracts should be read, because the statements are accompanied by the names of their authors. It is true, indeed, that some have been more daring than others. Paulus, for example, and Strauss have advanced where Olshausen and Bauer, and even Schleiermacher would refuse to follow. Yet this is only a question of degree. The path trodden is the same. The authorship of the Scriptures by God, or else His veracity as their writer, is by all these men impugned. It has often greatly pained me to hear the names of Olshausen and Bauer and Schleiermacher spoken of gently, if not approvingly, even in Evangelical circles. No admixture of truth can sanctify falsehood, any more than the admixture of wine or sugar can neutralise arsenic. Precious truths (said a well-known Christian nobleman) may be used as "the devil's corks to give buoyancy to an infernal engine."

"Prophecy," says the Apostle, "came not in old time by the will of man: but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Peter i. 21.) Daniel was one of those who spake as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, and he calls the

Scripture "The Scripture of Truth." David's dying words were, "The spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue;" and it was David who said, "Thou hast magnified Thy Word above all Thy Name." The Lord Jesus also said, "The Scripture cannot be broken." The Apostle Paul said, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God." Let these solemn attestations to the truthfulness and authority of Scripture be borne in mind in reading the subjoined extracts. If it be true that God has "magnified His Word above all His Name," in what relation to Him have *they* set themselves who have dared to utter such things as are in those extracts recorded? "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." It is a fearful thing to read of that "judgment and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries." (See Heb. x. 27.)

Yet let us beware lest, terrified by these blasphemies, we should be tempted to seek refuge with those who, whilst professing to reverence Revealed Truth, do nevertheless dishonour and betray it. Judas professedly followed Christ, yet he betrayed Him—betrayed Him with a kiss. The supremacy of the Scripture is only in name recognised by those who exalt the Traditions of the Church, or the supposed living voice of the Spirit in the Church, into co-equality with the Word of God. To do this is to degrade the Bible, and is an act of rebellion against the authority of God. There never was a person who gave himself to follow the Traditions of the Church, or the living voice of the Spirit in the Church, who did not utterly abandon that light which God hath

sent forth to guide us to His holy hill and to His tabernacles, and substitute for it another light kindled from beneath.

There is another danger also against which we have to guard. After having read statements so evil and so revolting, we may be tempted to content ourselves with a vague and careless recognition of the inspiration of Holy Scripture without seeking a deep, accurate, close acquaintance with that which is therein written. We cannot duly reverence Holy Scripture unless we pray for and strive after a knowledge of all that is therein revealed: for in no other way can our minds be brought into true subjection to God, and in no other way can we be "thoroughly furnished unto all good works." If during the last fifty years, the true Church of God in this country had been really subject to the Word of God, and had striven to walk steadfastly in its light, we may confidently affirm that neither Neology nor Sacerdotalism would have triumphed as they have done. Their triumph is a chastisement to us all—a chastisement which our worldliness and carelessness have well deserved.

There are many in the Free Church of Scotland who know and who value the Gospel of the grace of God. I trust that they may prove faithful in their present trial. If they consent to own as ministers of God, men who refuse to struggle with every power of their being against such statements as are cited below—if they continue in communion with a Church that refuses (no matter on what plea) to remove such men from its ministry, where do they place themselves? They place themselves in open disobedience to one of

the plainest and most solemn of the warnings of the Word of God: "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 11.) We do far more than bid him God speed if we receive, sustain, and honour him as a minister of the Church of God. Holiness and Truth are indeed sacrificed to expediency if we do this. It is a fearful thing to purchase peace by casting out of our house the sword of the Spirit. "Suppose ye," said the Lord Jesus, "that I am come to send peace on earth? I tell you Nay; but rather DIVISION." Truth cannot be received in a day like this, if it do not SEVER.

The following abstract of Neologian doctrine is from the pen of that well-known scholar Dr. Robert Young, of Edinburgh. He, at any rate, is alive to the danger.

With Bahrtdt ("Briefe über die Bibel," Leipzig, 1800) the angel that announced the birth of John the Baptist to Zacharias was only a flash of lightning, mistaken for a heavenly messenger, and the conversation but a waking dream. With Paulus ("Exegetische Handbuch") the smoke from the pan of incense, as it ascends to the roof and catches the glimmer of the evening lamps, becomes straightway the angelic visitant. Alarm excited by the apparition affects the aged priest with a shock like paralysis, and makes him dumb till the joy of paternity loosens afresh the strings of his tongue; or else he punishes himself for the entertainment of a momentary doubt by maintaining a voluntary silence, after the Jewish manner, for a certain period. With some (Paulus, Heidenreich) the narrative is a family record;—with others (Schmidt's "Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese") the legend so prevails in it that it has no historical

value whatever. With Eichhorn, Kaiser, Wegscheider, De Wette, Winer, Hase, Fritsche, Ammon, Strauss, Hoffmann, and others, the genealogies of St. Matthew and St. Luke cannot both be true. They were composed, according to others (Schmidt, Schleiermacher, etc., etc.), in the belief that Joseph was the father of Jesus. Paulus hints that some young man, by concert with Elizabeth, obtained access to the Virgin Mary as the angel Gabriel, and thus became the father of Jesus. Schmidt (Eck, Paulus) thinks the account of the taxing in Luke ii. too contrary to fact to be worth attempting to clear from its difficulties. The annunciation of the birth of Jesus to the shepherds at Bethlehem is only the approach of a messenger bearing a light, accompanied by a party of youths singing and making merry, or the play of an aurora or some meteor in the midnight sky, interpreted into an angelic vision, when the shepherds have ascertained the birth of Jesus on their return from the field.

Jesus was born among shepherds, merely because the historian knew that several heroes had such an education, Cyrus, Romulus, etc., and the gods too, Apollo, Jupiter, etc. The standing of the star over the house of Christ's nativity is not to be taken, according to Olshausen ("On the Gospels," *in loco*), as more than a figure of speech, or as precluding the necessity of inquiry on the part of the magi. Their visit to the young child is settled thus (Krug):—Some Arabian merchants, happening to be at Jerusalem, visited Bethlehem in the course of their perambulations, and hearing of the distress of the strangers in the town, relieved them with money and other things, and wished their child good luck, and left them. All besides this is mere historical embellishment. If Luke's narrative of the presentation in the temple be true, Matthew's of the flight into Egypt must be false (Schleiermacher, "Ueber den Lukas," § 47).

According to Strauss ("Leben Jesu," i. iv. § 39) the statement of Luke and Matthew that Jesus was born in Bethlehem is destitute of all valid historical evidence, nay, is contravened by positive historical facts. John the Baptist and Jesus play into each other's hands, by pretending not to have known each other till they met in public during their ministry ("Wolfen-

büttel Fragments"). Bauer treats the notion that God should have spoken at the baptism of Jesus, and on other occasions, in a national dialect, as absurd ("Hebra. Mythologie"), while the circumstance is variously explained by others, most resolving it into a thunderclap—and the dove into a lambent flame, or a flash of lightning. The idea of angels or devils is a mere assemblage of incongruities, the creation of ignorance and sloth (Schleiermacher, "Glaubenslehre"). The temptation of Christ is only a dream or vision (Paulus); or it may have been some Pharisee, prompted by his sect to make offers to Jesus, which the Lord rejected—and straightway thereupon he happened upon a travelling caravan that gave him food, or upon a pleasant breeze that refreshed him (Henke's Magazin: "Naturalischen Geschichte"); or, again, the narrative may be only a parable (Schmidt, Schleiermacher, Usteri, Theile). Some represent the plan of the Messiah to have been a purely political one; that his hope was to revolutionise the Jewish nation, and re-establish the glory of the theocracy; others that he had two plans at two distinct periods, the former a political one; and that only on the subversion of it he adopted the latter, which was spiritual (Paulus, Venturini, Hase).

Strauss believes that Jesus at first took the same position as John the Baptist, in relation to the kingdom of the Messiah, and that it was only by slow degrees he allowed himself to be persuaded into the idea that he was the Messiah in his own person (Strauss, "Leben Jesu," p. ii. c. iv. 62). When Christ promised thrones on his right and left to his apostles, he merely accommodated himself to their Messianic prejudices, or else spoke in irony (Kuinöl, *in loco*; Liebe, in Winer, "Exeg. tud."), ridiculing the inordinateness of their pretensions. Although the Church of Christ soon did embrace Gentiles, this was clearly not a part of his plan ("Wolfenbüttel Fragments"): therefore the command of Christ to "go and teach all nations" has no historical truth. Our Saviour's knowledge of the discreditable life of the woman of Samaria was obtained from some passer-by, who warned him not to converse with so disreputable a person (Paulus). Others go further and say that the story itself has no foundation in fact (Strauss). It is a legend, an

idyll, a poetical representation. The call to the apostles in the words "Come after me!" "Follow me!" is merely an invitation to accompany Jesus in a walk (Paulus). Either John's or Matthew's account must be erroneous—both cannot be true (Fritsche, *in loco*). Jesus learned Nathanael's character when he went to the wedding at Cana, so that there was nothing supernatural in his knowledge of him (Paulus). Lücke thinks there was nothing unusual in Christ's seeing Nathanael under the fig tree. To suppose anything miraculous in the incident is not a little extravagant (Strauss). The miraculous draught of fishes was a happy fortuity, united with accurate observation of where the fishes lay, on the part of Jesus (Paulus); impossible to imagine such a miracle out of the realm of Magic (Strauss); a legend in fact, of the same class as Pythagoras's telling the number of fish taken at a draught, which he had no natural means of knowing. Christ's call to Matthew meant no more than that Jesus was now ready to go home with the publican to dinner, according to the invitation he had previously received (Paulus). That ever Jesus appointed the seventy Evangelists is unworthy of credence on the authority of Luke alone (Strauss). Matthew and Luke directly contradict each other in the circumstances attendant on the Sermon on the Mount. The woes recorded by Luke are owing to the inventive fertility of that author (Schleiermacher).

The Lord's Prayer, given by Matthew, is an interpolation of the writer (Schleiermacher, Sieffert). Part of Christ's charge to his Apostles is pronounced unsuitable to their circumstances (Sieffert, Schulz). When Jesus propounded the question to the Pharisees, if David called the Messiah Lord, how was he also his son? he intended to show them that David was not the author of the cx. Psalm (Paulus). The first Gospel was not written by Matthew, but by some one considerably more recent than any Apostle (Schulz). The relation between Jesus and Nicodemus was possibly no more than the fabrication of tradition, and adopted by John without having any basis in reality (Strauss); while the conversation between them is in some parts so improbable that it never could have been maintained by

Jesus, but claims, in its greater part, John as its author (Paulus). The discourses of Jesus, in the fourth Gospel, are free inventions of John (Bretschneider). The author of Matthew's Gospel was not an eye-witness of the events he records (Schulz, Sieffert, Schneckenburger). The course of events described by John is partly fictitious (Strauss). The style of Mark is one of palpable exaggeration, which is natural to him (Strauss). Schleiermacher calls Luke's epithet of "sinner," applied to the woman who anointed our Saviour, a false inference of the narrator.

The casting out of devils is only a figure or a parable (Fritsche, Olshausen), and demoniacal possession was nothing more than some form of insanity or epilepsy. The lunatics have lucid intervals, when they go to synagogues, and there learn about the Messiah the particulars they blurt out in the course of their cure. The possession of the herd of swine at Gadara is on a par with the story of Balaam's ass : it means only that the maniacs rushed towards the herd, and drove them into the sea (Paulus) ; or that they fell into the sea by accident before Jesus landed (Krug) ; or that, during the absence of the herdsman, who went to meet Jesus, a few strayed over the precipice into the deep (Schmidt). The prayer and fasting necessary to the expulsion of demons means that the patient should use spare diet to effect a radical cure (Paulus). The cure of demoniacs was the easiest kind of miracles, because all resolvable into psychical action. Sometimes they only fancied themselves cured, because the crisis of their affection was broken by the work of Jesus (Venturini, Kaiser). The Evangelist John was too enlightened to sanction the notion of such miracles by the record of them (Eichhorn, Herder, Wegscheider, De Wette). The cure of the leper is merely pronouncing a leprous person over whom the contagious stage of the disease has passed sufficiently recovered to be viewed as clean in the eye of the ceremonial law (Paulus). Matthew's informant must have mistaken the blind man's guide at Jericho for a second blind man. The blind men were cured by the removal of the irritating dust from their eyes, by means of a lotion previously prepared (Venturini). Or touching their eyes removes the film or scale that hindered clear

vision ; and inserting the finger into the ear of the deaf is to remove the indurated secretion that stopped up the orifice ; and touching the tongue of the dumb is severing, by some mechanical means (a caustic powder, for instance), the ligature that forbade its distinct articulation (Paulus, "*Natural History of the Life of Christ*"). The washing in the pool of Siloam may mean a protracted cure of blindness by means of the bath. The healing of the blind man in John ix. is an incredible narrative ; perhaps it never occurred (Strauss). The cure effected in the woman with the issue of blood was through the emotion she experienced on touching Christ, which caused a contraction of the relaxed vessels, and ultimately a cure through attention to the prescriptions of our Lord (Paulus, Venturini, Koster). Christ's acquaintance with semeiology enabled him to predict the time of improvement in the condition of the Centurion's servant ; or he sent a disciple who effected the cure in his stead (Paulus) The cure of the paralytic, at the pool of Bethesda, was merely the conviction of a hypocrite. The resuscitation of the little damsel was her recovery from a swoon by medical treatment. The restoration of the widow of Nain's son is to be regarded in the same light. The resurrection of Lazarus was his reviving from a state of lethargy by means of the stream of warm air that entered his sepulchre on the rolling away of the stone (Paulus, Gabler)

The resurrection of Lazarus is not only in the highest degree improbable, but totally destitute of external evidence (Strauss). The calming of the storm at sea is a myth, representing the protecting power of Jesus and the troubles of the Church (Schneckenburger, Strauss). The walking of Jesus on the sea merely means on the lofty ridge of the sea shore ; and Peter's and his own meeting in the sea is swimming or wading in the shallows (Paulus, Bolten, Henke's *Magazine*, Schneckenburger). The fish caught by Peter with the stater in its mouth represents a fish worth the required sum, caught and sold for so much, while Peter opens his own mouth, instead of the fish's, to recommend it for sale (Paulus, Hase). The feeding the multitude by a miraculous multiplication of bread is Jesus and his disciples producing their spare stores to supply the indigent,

and inducing those of the company who had provisions to distribute those also, so that all were fed (Paulus, Weisse); or a mere parable (Paulus, Venturini, Kaiser).

The transformation of water into wine resolves itself into a present of wine, such being customary at wedding feasts, and the command to draw it from the water jars a pleasantry on the part of Jesus, who had deposited it there; that John took it for a miracle because he was tipsy (Paulus, Hase). The cursing of the barren fig-tree is a mere prediction, grounded on certain appearances in the tree that it would speedily wither (Herder, Gratz). The transfiguration of Christ was not real, but an ecstatic vision on his part and that of the disciples (Ran, Gabler, Kuinöl); or it was a dream (Kuinöl, Venturini) of Peter, James, and John in their sleep on the mount, aided by a flash of lightning on their waking, the voice of thunder, and the apparition of two strange men; or it was a preconcerted interview with two secret adherents of Jesus, whose talk awakens the sleeping Apostles; that these imagine Christ invested with superhuman glory because, as he stood on the peak of the mountain, the rays of the morning sun fell upon him with unwonted brilliancy, reflected perhaps from a sheet of snow; that a luminous cloud shut out the two men suddenly from view, and that one in departing used the form of address contained in the narrative; or it is a mythus suggested by the glory of Moses (De Wette, Bertholdt, Credner, Schulz, Kuinöl, Gratz); or finally a metaphor or allegory (Weisse)

Christ never could have explained his resurrection by the sign of the prophet Jonah (Paulus, Schulz); Judas the traitor was an honest man, misunderstood (K. Ch. L. Schmidt); or a deluded one, exhibiting even in his despair an apostolic greatness (Hase); or else seeking an object decidedly good by questionable means (Paulus); wounded self-love was the motive of Judas for betraying his master, not covetousness (Kaiser, Klopstock). We know nothing of the price at which Jesus was sold, Matthew's authority being insufficient to fix it, the sum being suggested by Zechariah's prophecy (Strauss). The gospel of John is in error in stating Christ to have eaten the paschal supper with his disciples (Olshausen). The institution of the Lord's supper is not mentioned by John, because it was

unknown to him (Bretschneider). Jesus had no idea of instituting his memorial supper till it glanced upon his mind from the sight of the loaf and the wine on the table before him (Paulus, Kaiser).

The agony in the garden was only some malady with which the body of Jesus was suddenly attacked, perhaps a cold, contracted from the damp clayey soil bordering on the Kedron (Thies, Paulus, Heumann); or it may have been severe regret at the prospect of parting with his friends (Schuster). The angel strengthening him was a man (Venturini), or a parable (Eichhorn, Schleiermacher, Gabler), or a poetical embellishment. Even Neander seems willing to give up the angel and the bloody sweat as inexplicable; Strauss regards them and the threefold prayer of Jesus as mythical additions to the narrative of the betrayal. John has transposed erroneously the agony in the garden into an interview with the Greeks (Theile). Our Saviour's last discourses and prayer, so far from being his, are peculiarly the composition of John, and speak a language that could not have been employed by Christ. The Lord's full prescience of his sufferings is explained by his having some friend in the Sanhedrim, who informed him of the designs of his enemies; and the approach of his captors could be easily anticipated, as he saw them from a distance, lighted by their torches. Jesus did not heal the ear of the high priest's servant cut off by Peter, but merely handled it to ascertain the extent of the wound, and then prescribed what would do it good (Paulus). Peter denied his Lord eight times. Only one of the accounts of Judas' death can be apostolic, both cannot be true (Schmidt). The field of blood derived its name from a cause no longer to be discovered, but having no relation to Judas (Strauss). The potter's field was entirely suggested by the passage in the prophecy quoted by Peter. We do not know with certainty even that Judas came to a violent death.

The statement that Pilate washed his hands, and pronounced Jesus a just person, owes its origin to the Christians alone, who were concerned for the reputation of their Master, and is not a fact. Jesus must have been three times clothed with the purple robe, and five times drink must have been offered to him according to the Evangelists. Probably there is nothing his-

torical in the narrative, but the whole tissue is spun out of the prophecies. The rending of the veil of the temple never took place at all (Schleiermacher, Paulus, Strauss). The same must be said of the resurrection of the dead saints on the death of Christ ; the violent earthquake may have laid open some tombs, which, being found empty from the decay of the bodies, suggested the idea that the dead had arisen and forsaken them (Paulus). The angels play at hide and seek with the several visitors of the sepulchre (Strauss). The angel that rolled away the stone was a flash of lightning which struck the stone, and threw the guards to the earth : or an earthquake accompanied by flames of fire bursting from the earth (Schuster) : or it was an oriental figure of speech to ascribe the personal conviction of the women, that Jesus was risen, to the suggestion of an angel (Fædrich) : or the women peeping in the dusk of the morning, mistook the grave-clothes for angels (Bauer, Schmidt, Eichhorn) ; or two men, secret colleagues of Jesus, the two that personated Moses and Elias at the transfiguration (Paulus, Bahrdt, Venturini). Mary took Jesus for the gardener, because he had borrowed the gardener's clothes (Paulus). The prohibition to touch him, addressed by Jesus to Mary, was occasioned by the nervous and painful sensitiveness of his body just after crucifixion ; after living several years beyond the period of his crucifixion Jesus at last died (Brenneke) ; he died of natural maladies and fever (Paulus). Jesus did not die on the cross ; his seeming death was a collapse or swoon ; or it was a simulated death, confiding in medical skill to easily repair the injury inflicted on his frame by crucifixion ; or the semblance of it was occasioned by a potion administered to Jesus by his disciples without his connivance (Bahrdt). The revivification of Christ was brought about by the smell of the unguents wherewith he had been anointed, together with the air of the cave, and the salutary shock of the earthquake acting upon a young body not destitute of vital power (Paulus, Schuster). The disciples stole the body, according to the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, so that there was not even the semblance of a resurrection, but the whole story is a shameless fraud. The ascension was not real, but a vision produced in the disciples (Steudel) ; or it was his raising himself up on tiptoe to bless his disciples, and his gradually

withdrawing from them till a mist, and the olive-trees on the hill, hid him from their sight, when his two secret colleagues again appear to affirm his ascension.

The angels that attended the ascension of Christ were thunder and lightning, that seemed to say, what the Apostles already thought about the disappearance of their Master, viz., that he had gone up to heaven; or else the circumstance was only a vision of the imagination, or only the garniture of the narrative suggested by the genius of the age, for which we are indebted to the historian alone. Judas hanging himself is nothing more than disease induced by remorse of conscience; or, again, nothing more than that extreme remorse itself. Mr. Wakefield, in his "*Sylva Critica*," observes that Judas may have died from dysentery occasioned by distress of mind. There were two distinct traditions, according to others, regarding the manner of Judas' death, that Matthew adopted the one, and that Luke followed the other. The cloven tongues of the Pentecost were flashes of lightning pervading the room where the disciples met, accompanied by a storm of wind and thunder, and to the excited minds of the apostles bearing the appearance of the miracle (Moschius "*in Bibelfreund*;" Heinrichs). Heumann thinks it a vision or semblance presented to the eyes of the disciples in a state of ecstasy. Eichhorn allows that there was a crash and noise, but makes the tongues of fire an oriental figure for enthusiasm and eloquence: they were electric sparks. The gift of tongues was fluency in prayer and preaching; or it was the utterance of unintelligible sounds (Eichhorn, "*Allgem. Bibliothek*"); or it was the foreign Jews speaking in languages they knew already (Paulus); or it was the occasional introduction of foreign words or phrases in their discourse; or it was interpreting the prophecies so sensibly that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were struck with wonder who used to call the Galileans fools (Herder); or it was bursting away from the trammels of the old Hebrew which Heinrichs says was spoken at Jerusalem at the feasts, and expressing themselves each in his vernacular tongue (Kleinus).

The lame man said to be healed by Peter and John (Acts iii.) was an old impostor, feigning congenital lameness, and stripped of his mask by the apostles (Thies). The angel who liberated

the apostles (Acts v.) was lightning, or an earthquake, the angel's address being only the current of their own thoughts; or, more likely still, it was the jailer who let them out, but kept the secret to himself, and they ascribed it to a celestial messenger (Eichhorn, Thies, Eckermann, Heinrichs). To the same causes is attributed Peter's release in Acts xii. Stephen's seeing "the glory of God" at the time of his martyrdom was a flash of lightning in the heavens (Hengel); and his vision of Christ was only the persuasion of ecstatic emotion. The angel that directed Philip to journey toward Gaza (Acts viii.) was a strong impulse, or instinct—or a dream of the night (Eichhorn, Eckermann, Heinrichs). Paul's vision of Christ on the road to Damascus was either a dream or a crash of thunder, accompanied by lightning, most likely the former, for Paul was a man given to visions and ecstasies. The raising of dead Dorcas to life was recalling her from a swoon. That Cornelius saw an angel is denied; it was a dream of the gladness of his mind when he had determined to send for Peter, of whose fame he had heard. Paul's vision of the angel before his shipwreck was of the same kind, impressions of his waking hours renewed in sleep.

Christ uttered no prophecies; he renounced the power: many prophecies in the Bible are of doubtful character, obscure, and imperfect, and some made after the event (Ammon). They are a mere poetical dress given to affairs acted in the prophet's lifetime (Eichhorn). Jesus spoke with contempt of the Hebrew prophets (Wegscheider). Some were of doubtful character (Ammon); and some spoke in a state of delirium. The whole theory of prophecy savours of fatalism (Wegscheider). There are no clear prophecies in either Testament. Not one in the Old Testament clearly refers to Christ (Eckermann, Bahrdt, Bauer, Ammon). Christ did not foretell his own resurrection (Paulus). The whole body of prophets were impostors (Scherer). No evidence can prove inspiration—can prove a miracle (Wegscheider). Miracles are only startling natural events, designed to arrest the wonder of a barbarous age, but explicable without departure from the ordinary course of things (Paulus, Anton, Eck, Bretschneider, Bauer, Kaiser). *The most extraordinary in the Bible are only myths or allegories*

—the creation, paradise, the serpent, the fall, the flood, Babel, etc., etc. (Bertholdt, Bauer and Dathe's *Glosses*, Meyer, Götter, Wegscheider, etc., etc.). Need we add after this that Christ is not divine, that man is not depraved, that the atonement is a theological figment, that the Bible is but a book of fables with a moral purpose, that reason is everything with us, and God is nothing? There are worse things than those we have given, but we have purposely withheld them.

As to these things, I can only say that if I had written some of them, especially the blasphemies uttered respecting Elizabeth, and Mary the Mother of our Lord, I should have thought that I had committed that sin which never can be forgiven. In this our country, "the seat of the scoffer" is not often so arrogantly and unblushingly assumed as by these German writers, although the words recently spoken in Westminster Abbey fall little, if at all short, of those recorded above. "Virtually, the theory of a primæval revelation is the same as that of an Ashantee priest, who knows that his fetishes are gods because they tell him so." Such were the words reported as used in Westminster Abbey in the Hibbert lectures.

I scarcely need say that the doctrines of Dean Stanley,* and many others less advanced than he,

* The following extract is from "The Record" newspaper. "Dean Stanley, in his Lectures on the Jewish Church, as reviewed in our columns in three successive numbers, by a reviewer of eminence in the Church of England, has gone fearful lengths in accepting, as to all the sacred books falling under his notice, the latest dates for their origin that the most extreme German criticism has even ventured to suggest. The results of the analysis to which the Dean's volume was subjected were, according to the judgment of our competent reviewer, reduced to the following propositions :—

1. That there is no supernatural or Divine element in the Old Testament Scriptures.

belong to the same school of thought. The extent to which these doctrines have permeated society is

2. That whatever permanent truth there is in their teaching is not peculiar or original to the Hebrew prophets, but is either an embodiment of the moral wants of human nature, or a plagiarism from Greek philosophy.
3. That the Canonical and Apocryphal books stand on precisely the same footing of authority and credibility.
4. That in neither the one nor the other was there any inspiration possessed, beyond that ordinary action of the Spirit on the minds of men to which all that is great and true is to be attributed.
5. That no promise of a Divine person who should offer a true propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world is included in the sense of the prophetic books, or can properly be gathered from their language.
6. That the Lord Jesus Christ was the greatest of all prophets, but that He only bore the sins of men in the sense of fulfilling that universal moral law of human life by which one suffers for another, and which has its constant accomplishment in the common relationships of man with man.

"Such," said our reviewer, "seems to our apprehension to be the underlying principles of these lectures. We repeat that we speak of the book and of its author so far only as he is reflected in its pages. Whether these propositions really represent his belief and express the whole of his faith we know not, nor have we anything to do with the question. It lies between himself and God, and we venture not to intrude upon it. We only express our honest conviction that these are the propositions assumed in the lectures to be true, and that of any higher, better principles, we are able to find no trace."

Another and more subtle form of unbelief seems to be contained in that principle, which we exposed in our review of the "Life of Thomas Erskine," by which we are taught that the revelation contained in the Bible, is no longer to be our chief source of knowledge as to Divine things, and that its

evidenced more or less every day. Thus in *The Record*, newspaper of May 16th, 1879, I read:

“‘A Member of the University’ writes to *The Guardian* as follows:—‘Doubts have been cast from time to time on the statements that unbelief is prevalent at Oxford. It may be worth while to observe the language of the *Oxford and Cambridge Undergraduates’ Journal*, a newspaper much occupied with reports of athletics, and certainly not an alarmist on religious matters. I read in the current number:

“It must strike any one at all acquainted with Oxford life,

teaching is of no validity unless confirmed by our inner conscience or light. This was the teaching of Mr. Maurice, whom we are now required to accept as included within the comprehensive embrace of the Church of England. How far this is extending may be seen from the following letter published in the *Spectator* of last October 27th. It comes from the Rev. B. H. Alford, a clergyman who is half-brother of the late Dean, and the successor of the Rev. Mr. Fowler, author of the “Essays on the Church and the Working Classes,” who has been since promoted by Dean Stanley to the living of Islip, where he became the successor of the excellent and Evangelical Francis Trench. Mr. Alford’s letter is headed “The Authority of Texts,” and he thus addresses the Editor of the *Spectator*:—

Sir,—I conceive that there is a text which is itself an authority against the arbitrary authority of texts. “The word of prophecy” is treated by St. Peter as belonging to a transition state. It is well to take heed to it, as to “a light that shineth in a dark place” (2 Peter i. 19), but only until it is superseded by something brighter, “until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.” What is that but saying that the written word must eventually “commend itself to the conscience,” and is but of passing validity until so confirmed? Or, as Mr. Brown-
ing says in “Aurora Leigh”—

We all must read, you see, before we live,
Till slowly the ineffable light comes up,
And, as it deepens, drowns the written word.

I am, Sir, etc., B. H. ALFORD.

that the most unsatisfactory part of our undergraduate character is the way in which so many of us are inclined to dogmatise on the most sacred subjects of religion. Indeed, for some of us, the notion covered by the word 'sacred' would seem to be banished from our minds altogether. . . . Young men are known to pride themselves on being absolutely devoid of the 'religious faculty'; and a clever undergraduate . . . could stigmatise the Christ of the Gospels as — but I hesitate to print the profane conclusion of the speech: how is it that many of our Dons, who have never declared themselves on the subject, are supposed to be adverse to the claims of revelation? And why is it that so many, who are known to be earnest believers of orthodox Christianity, often speak as if an acceptance of the historical truth of the Resurrection would rob them of all title to the intellectual respect of their pupils?"

"This account, (says the correspondent of *The Guardian*,) and more to the same purpose, entirely agrees with testimony to be gathered in friendly intercourse with young men of almost every college. I am at a loss to understand the advantage of shutting our eyes to facts, because we wish that they did not exist. If we face them, a remedy may perhaps be found."

I have already exceeded due bounds in treating of this most painful subject: otherwise, I should have added some remarks on the meetings of the Congregational Union in London and Liverpool during the last year, and on the late discussions in the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland. Those two bodies also, have been penetrated (shall I not say, been fatally penetrated) by the principles of the day. A compromise may be attempted; but if it be effected, it can only be by the abandonment of God and of His Truth. What profit is there in

the preservation of a body from which God has withdrawn His blessing ?

The fact is, that we are confronted by two mighty bodies, one of which will believe nothing that it pleases them not to believe: the other will believe every thing (no matter how contrary to reason, fact, and Scripture) if only it be attested by a Body which it pleases them to accredit with Divine power. These two systems are producing two palpable effects. They are utterly quenching the light of revealed Truth ; and they are subverting the natural principles which men have recognised as binding—things which “nature itself teaches.” The disorganisation thus produced will be a danger from which men will seek to shelter themselves by placing themselves under the protection of some hand strong enough to protect their temporal interests from ruin ; and that hand will be found in Antichrist. It appears to me very evident that the last great “withdrawal into perdition” (*ὑποστολή εἰς ἀπώλειαν*) has set in, and that nothing henceforth will effectually stay its progress. What was once said of Pharaoh is equally true of the last great Head of Gentile power, “Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.”

We read in the sixth of John, that there was a time when many of the disciples of the Lord Jesus “went away back (*ἀπηλθον εἰς τα ὀπισω*), and walked no more with Him. Then Jesus said unto the twelve, Do ye also wish to withdraw (*θελετε ὑπαγειν*)? Simon Peter answered Him, Lord, to whom shall we go away (*προς τινα ἀπελευσομεθα*)? The words of eter-

nal life hast Thou; and we have believed, and have known that Thou art the Holy One of God" (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ).

The hour is coming—I might rather say, it is already come, when Christ repeats this question, and says to them who have the ear of faith, "Do ye also desire to withdraw?" They do not desire to withdraw. They "have an unction from the Holy One," and they "know all things, and need not that any one should teach them;" that is to say, they are fully instructed in all the questions that concern this closing controversy between the last great lie of Satan and the truth of the living God. They shall assuredly "abide in Christ," and shall not be ashamed away from Him (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) at His coming. (See 1 John ii.) That which the Spirit once said to the Churches, may still be heard by individuals: "*He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.*" There are some who shall have this "ear," and shall keep the hour of Christ's patience. "Because thou hast kept the hour of my patience [there is great cause for patient endurance now], I also will keep thee from THE HOUR OF TEMPTATION which shall come on all the world (πᾶση τῇ οἰκουμένῃ), to try them that dwell upon the earth." How marked we may expect the separation to become of those who are "of withdrawal unto perdition (ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπωλείαν), and those who are of faith unto the saving of the soul" (πιστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ψυχῆς)!

WORKS BY BENJAMIN WILLIS NEWTON.

TRACTS ON DOCTRINAL SUBJECTS.

- No. I.—OUR ALTAR. Heb. xiii. Price 2*d*.
 No. II.—AN ERRONEOUS MODE OF STATING THE GOSPEL CONSIDERED. Price 3*d*.
 No. III.—ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS CONCERNING ATONEMENT AND ITS RESULTS CONSIDERED. Price 2*d*.
 No. IV.—ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS CONCERNING ATONEMENT AND ITS RESULTS CONSIDERED.—PART II. Price 3*d*.
 No. V.—ERRONEOUS STATEMENTS CONCERNING ATONEMENT AND ITS RESULTS CONSIDERED.—PART III. Price 3*d*.

THOUGHTS ON THE APOCALYPSE. Second Edition, revised. Price 8*s*. 6*d*.
 AIDS TO PROPHETIC ENQUIRY. First Series. Second Edition. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

BABYLON: ITS REVIVAL AND FINAL DESOLATION. Second Series of "Aids to Prophetic Enquiry." Price 3*s*.

PROSPECTS OF THE TEN KINGDOMS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE CONSIDERED. Third Series of "Aids to Prophetic Enquiry." Second Edition, revised. Price 7*s*.

MAP OF THE TEN KINGDOMS OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Price 2*s*. 6*d*.
 Intended to suggest the probable territorial arrangements that will be found in the Roman Empire when finally divided into Ten Federal Kingdoms.

THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF ISAIAH. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

THOUGHTS ON SCRIPTURAL SUBJECTS. Price 4*s*. 6*d*.

ROMANS VII. CONSIDERED. Second Edition. Price 1*s*. 6*d*.

MODERN DOCTRINES RESPECTING SINLESSNESS CONSIDERED. Price 6*d*.

GOSPEL TRUTHS. Second Edition. Price 1*s*.

ORDER OF EVENTS CONNECTED WITH THE APPEARING OF CHRIST. Second Edition. Price 6*d*.

JESUS WASHING HIS DISCIPLES' FEET. Price 2*d*.

THE DAY OF THE LORD. Price 2*d*.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CHARACTER AND SPREAD OF SPIRITUALISM. Price 3*d*.

DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE RESPECTING BAPTISM. Part I. Price 6*d*. Part II. Price 8*d*.

THOUGHTS ON PARTS OF LEVITICUS. Vol. I. Second Edition. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

ON THE PROPHECIES RESPECTING THE JEWS AND JERUSALEM. Price 2*d*.

OLD TESTAMENT SAINTS NOT EXCLUDED FROM THE CHURCH OF GOD. Price 1*d*.

THE ANTI-CHRIST FUTURE. Second Edition. Price 2*d*.

THE 1,260 DAYS OF ANTI-CHRIST'S REIGN FUTURE. Price 3*d*.

DUTY OF GIVING HEED TO THE PREDICTIONS OF SCRIPTURE RESPECTING EVENTS THAT ARE TO PRECEDE THE RETURN OF THE LORD. Second Edition. Price 2*d*.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF OUR LORD NOT SECRET, BUT IN MANIFESTED GLORY. Price 2*d*.

NOTES EXPOSITORY OF THE GREEK OF THE FIRST CHAPTER OF THE ROMANS. Price 2*s*. 6*d*.

ON JUSTIFICATION THROUGH THE BLOOD AND RIGHTEOUSNESS OF A SUBSTITUTE. Second Edition. Price 2*d*.

PROPOSITIONS FOR THE SOLEMN CONSIDERATION OF CHRISTIANS. Third Edition. Price 2*d*.

THE WORLD TO COME. Third Edition. Price 1½*d*.

THE MILLENNIUM AND THE EVERLASTING STATE. Price 2*d*.