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THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST IN THE APOCALYPSE.

By M. Stuart, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

The first question to be asked is: To which of the two beasts described in Rev. c. 13, does the number 666 in v. 18 refer? One beast John sees ascending from the sea, having seven heads and ten horns, and upon these horns ten diadems or crowns, and upon the heads names of blasphemy. To this beast Satan or the dragon gives his power and his throne, that is, employs him as it were his vicegerent. Divine honours and worship are challenged by this beast, and fierce and bloody persecution is carried on by him against Christians who refuse to pay the homage that he demands, Rev. 13, 2—9. A second beast, moreover, is seen by the author of the Apocalypse, rising out of the land, differing from the first in many important respects, yet animated with the like bitter hostility against the church. The nature of this second beast is graphically described by the appellation "false prophet," which is given him in Rev. 16, 13. 19, 20. 20, 10. Instead of seven horns, he is furnished with only two; and even these are said to be like the horns of a lamb. In other words, this symbol indicates, that the second beast is not possessed of the civil and military, or compulsive, power of empire; but only of a subordinate influence which is exerted in another way than that of force. The horns of a lamb present rather the show, than the reality, of weapons adapted for contest by force. But still, there are other influences not less mischievous than assault by violence. The second beast is represented as "speaking like a dragon," Rev. 13, 11. The meaning of this simile is not obscure. A dragon, according to the idiom of the New Testament, means a huge old serpent. The sly cunning and deceitfulness of the serpent have been proverbial, from the time when Satan, under the guise of a serpent, misled our first parents in paradise. The second beast, then, speaks as the dragon did on that occasion; that is, he speaks craftily, deceitfully, in a manner adapted to allure and ruin those whom he addresses.
CHARACTER OF THE TWO BEASTS.

The writer of the Apocalypse goes on to exhibit the various ways in which he deceives men, and leads them to do homage to the first beast. As it is not my object at present to pursue any inquiry respecting these, I shall advert merely to what immediately precedes the text, which is the particular subject of our present attention. It is worthy of remark, what skilful jugglery is practised by the second beast, or false prophet, and how graphically John describes it. "It was given to him [the second beast] to communicate breath (πνεύμα) to the image of the first beast, so that this image might even speak, and might cause that those who did not worship the image of the beast, should be slain," Rev. 13, 15. Trickery of this sort has long been well known, and often practised. The statute of Memnon, on the banks of the Nile, as Strabo tells us, was accustomed to utter a melodious sound when the sun rose, and a moaning one when it went down. Memnon, king of Ethiopia and Upper Egypt, was the fabled son of Aurora and Tithonus, and grandson of a Trojan monarch. Becoming an auxiliary to the Trojans during the siege of Troy, he was, as the story goes, slain by Achilles in single combat, and his death was very significantly commemorated by his subjects, by erecting the statue in question. Of the fact that such a statue apparently uttered sounds as above described, there is no good reason to doubt; but the cause of this has been discovered only in recent times. It was apparently occasioned by the striking of a stone in the lap of the colossal image, which gave forth a ringing sound.*

How easily the like might be done in regard to other statues, and how often it has been done, it were useless to particularize here, inasmuch as no one is any longer ignorant of such devices. Even the lips of a statue may easily be made to move by machinery nicely adapted to this purpose. Easier still is it to give the statue the appearance of breathing or expiration. A tube connected with the mouth or nostrils, and managed by an adroit person behind the scenes, would make the delusion complete.

That John speaks of these things as being actually done by the image, namely the beast breathing and speaking, is in accordance with the usual idiom of the Scriptures on such occasions. Thus is

* Wilkinson's Thebes, etc. p. 35 sq.
it in respect to the magicians of Egypt, Ex. 7, 11, 12, 22. Thus also, as most suppose, respecting the witch of Endor, 1 Sam. 18, 11 sq. although in fact the raising of Samuel is not there attributed to the witch. It is thus that the Saviour speaks of the sons of the Pharisees as casting out demons, Matt. 12, 27. So John describes many Jews as believing on Christ, John 2, 23; although the context shows clearly that they only professed to believe on him; and the same thing occurs again in John 8, 31 sq. and also in respect to Simon Magus, Acts 8, 13, comp. vs. 22. 23. It were easy to accumulate examples of the like character, which would serve to show, that when the sacred writers narrate things of such a nature as those which are now before us, they often speak in the language of common parlance, or in conformity with external appearances. This may suffice to exonerate John from the charge of believing and affirming, that the false prophet could really give breath to statues, and cause them to speak. There can be no doubt, as it seems to me, in the mind of any candid and intelligent reader, that the writer of the Apocalypse sets forth the whole doings of the second beast as matters of fraud, guile, and trickery; I mean every thing by which the false prophet contrives to make his idol resemble the true God, either in its appearance or in its achievements.

. The manner in which the death of those who refuse to worship the image of the beast is brought about, may be explained in a few words. By causing the statue of the first beast to breathe, the most palpable evidence is seemingly given of a living and active spirit within. The populace, naturally convinced by such an apparently unequivocal sign of the living power and true divinity of the statue, readily obey its commands, and fall upon those who refuse to worship it with all the violence which superstition can inspire.

Nor is this all which the false prophet achieves. By his devices he occasions a decree, that all shall receive the mark of the beast, that is, of the first beast, upon their foreheads or their hands. The mark in question would openly proclaim, that all who should receive it were the worshippers of the beast, inasmuch as it was to be impressed on some part of the person which always remained uncovered. This mark was usually, among idolaters, some device or symbol expressive of something belonging to the idol-god or
his rites. When a mere symbol was employed, which was usually the case, there was something of mystery about it, which served to increase religious awe, and to show, at the same time, that the person who bore this symbol on any part of his body, was one who had been initiated into the secrets of the divinity whom he worshipped.

The second beast is as cruel as cunning. He brings it about by his artifices, that none should either buy or sell, who did not bear the mark of the first beast. In other words, those who decline to worship the first beast, are prohibited from all business-intercourse with their fellow men, and consequently from all the means of obtaining a livelihood, and are thus exposed to the miseries of starvation.

So much for the craftiness and cruelty of superstition and idolatry. But now to our main point: What is the mark or symbol, which is borne by the worshippers of the beast?

It seems to be of two kinds; two rather in appearance than in reality. No person could buy or sell unless he had the \( \chi\alpha\nu\gamma\mu\alpha \), i.e. the impression or stamp of the beast, either upon his forehead or his hand. But what is this \( \chi\alpha\nu\gamma\mu\alpha \) or stamp? According to John (v. 17) it is either the name of the beast or the number of his name. The first of these seems to be the name of the beast or of his idol, written probably in letters somewhat peculiar or curious, but still readable in the common way of reading. But the second is altogether of a mysterious and symbolic character. The number of the name seems to mean, that certain letters, which are or may be expressive of some particular number, are at the same time expressive of such a name as would indicate the beast which is to be worshipped. Thus far, however, we are told only of the general nature of the second species of mark which the worshippers of the beast bore. It is quite probable, from the circumstances of the case, from the usual mysteriousness of the second kind of symbol, and from the manner in which John speaks of it, that the great mass of idol-worshippers received this second mark rather than the other. As both, however, come in the end to the same thing, both might be, and both seem to have been, allowed. But the number-symbol, it is easy to see, would naturally obtain a general preference, on account of the general mysteriousness of its character.
Having mentioned the number of his name, the writer pauses for explanation; for surely no conjecture could be formed as to what the name must be, unless some particular number should be specified. John therefore proceeds to say: 'Ωδε ἡ σοφία ἐστιν· ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου· ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ἀριθμοῦ ποιεῖν ἐστιν, καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ χξε. Here is a matter which demands the exercise of wisdom; let him who possesses understanding reckon the number of the beast, for it is the number of a man, and the number of it is 666.

Several phrases in this verse need some illustration. Here is wisdom conveys an idea somewhat different, according to Hebrew usage, from that which the words in English seem to suggest. The Jews, as appears by the Rabbinical dialect, were accustomed to call anything מָצְצַי wisdom, which was said summarily, obscurely, or in the way of a mere hint. In allusion to this it is said in Prov. 1, 6, that the object of the book of Proverbs among other things is, to give understanding of "the words of the wise and their dark sayings." Proverbial sentences are often dark, from their pithy, sententious, and frequently enigmatical character. So in the case before us; when the writer exclaims: Here is wisdom, he evidently means to say, that here is a matter which is somewhat enigmatical or obscure, for the explanation of which wisdom is needed. The sequel shows plainly that such is the sentiment; for the writer immediately adds: ὁ ἔχων νοῦν ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ θηρίου, that is, 'Let him who has the requisite intelligence, (νοῦν being an equivalent for the preceding σοφία,) reckon the number;' etc. In other words: Not every person can read and understand what follows; but let him who is skilled in matters of this nature, compute what name the letters which may designate 666 will make; for this is the name of the beast.

It is worthy of remark, that John employs this mode of expression, viz. here is wisdom, only in cases where he is going to say something which is more or less obscure or enigmatical. Thus in Rev. 17, 9, he exclaims, "Here is a meaning which comprises wisdom!" for so we may translate ὁ ἔχων σοφία. Or if any one hesitates as to such a version, he may render the phrase still more literally thus: "Here the mind which possesses wisdom!" that is, here a wise mind is needed in order to explain
what follows. The sequel of this passage is the dark saying concerning the seven hills, and the seven kings, and the beast which is the eighth, and was one of the seven, etc. vs. 9—11.

Thus it is plain, that when John is about to utter anything which he knows will be enigmatical to some of his readers, and for the explanation of which special care is needed, he gives them warning, by telling them that σοφία, i. e. special sagacity, is needed in order to make a right interpretation.

In the verse before us, Rev. 13, 18, the supposition is made, or it is tacitly implied, that sagacity may unfold the true meaning: "Let him who has understanding, reckon the number of the beast.” Some hints to aid him, however, the author does not neglect to give. First of all he says, that the number of the beast is the number of a man. What is the meaning of this declaration?

One of two things it seems of necessity to mean; either, first, that it is such a number as men usually employ; or, secondly, that it is a number, the letters of which designate or name a man.

Examples of such a nature as would justify (so far as the mere form of expression is concerned) the first meaning, may be found; thus Rev. 21, 17, “And he [the angel] measured the wall thereof 144 cubits, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου man’s measure,” that is, cubits as estimated by human measure, and not by angelic. It is evident that μέτρον ἀνθρώπου is here added by the writer, merely in order to be explicitly understood and to exclude all useless conjecture. In Is. 8, 1, we find a command to the prophet, that he should write certain words with a man’s pen, as our version has it; but the original, ´ἰς μανῆς, seems plainly to indicate the ordinary writing of men, the usual characters which they employ. These were enjoined, in order that they might be legible to all. Corresponding with this in sentiment is Hab. 2, 2, “Write the vision, and engrave it upon tablets, that he who runneth may read.” But if we should explain the phrase in Rev. 13, 18 by these examples, what sense could it make, when taken in connexion with the context? ‘Let the intelligent man reckon the number of the beast, for it is such a number as men employ, and the number is 666.’ But do not men employ other numbers besides 666? And if we understand the phrase in the manner just proposed, what else
would be asserted, even at the most, except that the number of the beast is a number, and nothing more? And what possible meaning could this have, which would accord in any measure with the context? The followers of the beast are marked on the forehead or in the hand. How? Either with the name of the beast written out, or with a symbolic designation of this name, made by letters, usually indicative of certain numbers. But the mode of exegesis now under discussion would exclude such a designation, and limit the mysterious letters to the mere ordinary significance of numbers. What need of 'wisdom' to unravel these? Or to what can 666 pertain, when considered merely in an arithmetical point of view? Does it relate to time, or descent, or possessions, or attributes, or to any of the like things? It is plainly impossible to make out any tolerable significance of the passage in this way.

We must come then, as it seems to me, to the second meaning given above, viz. that the "number of a man" means a number, which, when expressed in letters (as was usual), designates the name of a man; and here, of course, the name of the man who is symbolized by the beast. It is the context which forces us upon such an interpretation; for the other exegesis would make no tolerable sense. The design of the writer plainly is, to give a hint, purposely somewhat obscure and enigmatical, by way of answer to the natural question: Who is meant or symbolized by the first beast? The reasons why he did not speak out plainly and unequivocally, were cogent ones. But of these more will be said in the sequel.

Bengel explains the phrase under examination in a singular way: "It is a number according to which all men are wont to compute, and not angels." But do not men employ other numbers also in their computations? Like to this is Hartwig's interpretation: "A number which a man may write or engrave without any great difficulty." Bengel had his reasons for such an explanation as he has given; and these were, that it was necessary to understand 666 as a mere numeral adjective relating to time or years, in order to make out his periods. It is unnecessary to occupy a moment in refuting the view either of Bengel or Hart-

1 Apol. der Apokalypse, II. p. 215.
MEANING OF THE NUMBER.

Wig. Both are inconsistent with the requisite significance of the text.

What name, then, of a man symbolized by the beast, can be made out of letters which indicate 666, on the supposition that we employ the Greek alphabet in the computation?

It is evident from the nature of the case, that there is a great variety of combinations of numbers, indeed an almost endless variety, which being put together, will amount to 666. It is plain, therefore, that letters which designate numbers, or are the representatives of them, are capable of the like endless variety of combinations, which may amount to the number, or form the name in question. Of course there is room here for boundless play of the imagination and fancy, if any choose to indulge them; and seldom indeed does an opportunity of this nature present itself, which is not embraced by minds that are peculiarly prone to conjecture and fancy.

It is no part of my design to produce and refute at length all the extravagancies, which have been exhibited to the world in commenting on the text before us. But the reader may naturally expect that some account of this matter should be laid before him, and especially an account of the manner in which the early Christian fathers explained the text which is under consideration. My first object then will be, to give a brief historical view of what has been done; my second, to show, if it may be within my power, what our text most probably does mean.

Fortunately we have a passage in Irenæus, which gives us a somewhat graphic view of the state of feeling in his day, with respect to the matter before us, and of the opinion entertained as to the meaning of the number of the beast. Observe the cautious manner in which this good Father approaches the subject. His language is: "It is more sure and less dangerous to maintain the fulfilment of [John's] prophecy, than it is to conjecture and divine certain names; inasmuch as there is a multitude of names which will amount to the aforesaid number. The question now is, Which of all these shall he [the beast] bear, who is to come? We speak thus, not for want of names which would indicate the requisite number, but out of reverence to God, and zeal for the truth."

1 Contr. Hæres. V. 30. 3.
"E
Evanthas has the requisite number; but we affirm nothing in respect to it. [The want of any appropriate signifi-
cancy is good reason for rejecting it. It means nothing, and nobody; unless indeed there is some implied reference to Gessius Florus (ἀρθος i. q. flos, the procurator of Palestine.) Ατανος also designates 666; and this is exceedingly probable, inasmuch as the last empire [the last of the four described in Daniel] has this appellation. For they are Latini who now reign; but in this we will not glory. Tierar, the first syllable with ε and ι, is, of all the names current among us, the most worthy of credit." He then goes on to give some reasons for preferring this; which are, that the name has six letters (corresponding with the other sixes), that each syllable has three letters, that it is old, and unusual. By the last allegation he means to say, that neither the Roman kings nor gods have any of them such an appellation. He then alludes to the ancient Titan in the fable, who was one of the giants that made resistance to the gods, and thinks that this would tally well with the character of the beast. Finally, he says: "We, however, do not mean to run into any danger respecting the name of Antichrist, as pronouncing positively respecting it; for if his name was designed to be openly exhibited at the present time, it would have been manifested long ago, by him who saw the apocalyptic vision."

It is not necessary to examine the reasons of Irenæus for preferring Tierar. They are merely factitious ones; and nothing is more evident, than that Ατανος lay deeper in his convictions, —"valde verisimile est." Still, he dared not to urge it, on account of the hazard which would be incurred, by appearing as the advocate of an opinion so reproachful to the Roman government. To suppose the Hebrew John to be dealing here with the Greek mythological Titan, would be greatly aside from probability; not to mention the change in the proper spelling of the name which Irenæus has made. To Ατανος we shall again advert, in the sequel.

Victorinus (flor. c. 300), in his skeleton Commentary which has come down to us, has a note on the verse before us, which bids defiance to all critics and commentators. It reads thus: "Since he [John] refers to Greek letters, the sequel will complete the requisite number: ΑΙ. Ν. Λ. Τ. CCC. Φ. Μ. Τ. Χ. Λ. Ο. Λ.
DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS.

If the number of the beast is not to be known until this is explained, I apprehend we must wait a long time for the desired knowledge.

Andreas of Caesarea in Cappadocia, near the close of the fourth century, wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which is still extant. Like Irenæus, he supposes that if John meant that the name of the beast should be known, he would have declared it himself. It was unworthy, he says, of being inserted in such a sacred book. Yet he goes on to give, from Hippolytus and others, several conjectural names; which, as they lay claim to no more than conjecture, I shall barely repeat. Thus the Greek name Ἀμνεσης will make the requisite number; so the Latin Benedictus, or the Persian Sarmnaeus. So the appellatives κακὸς δομιγὸς bad leader, ἀληθὴς βλαβερὸς truly noxious, πάλαι βάσικανος envious of old, and ἄμνος ἄδικος wicked lamb.

Arethas, the successor and epitomator of Andreas, has only repeated these in his Commentary. Primasius, bishop of Utica in Africa, a disciple of Augustin, has added, in his Commentary, the two appellatives, αντεμος (for ἀντεμος) dishonourable, and αφνουμε (for αφνουμι) I deny; the form and invention of which show that his knowledge of Greek and of exegesis were on a par. To these Rupert of Dents (ob. 1135) has added Γενσηκικος or Genseric, king of the Vandals.

It is proper to note, before we quit the ancient exegesis of Rev. 13, 18, that there were some who applied the name suggested by Irenæus, viz. Τεταρων, to the Roman Titus, who commanded the army which sacked Jerusalem and destroyed the temple. They regarded the name Τεταρων, (in their view i. q. Titan or Titas,) as designating a kind of γένος θεομάχων, like Titan of old. So Hesychius thought, in reference to the passage before us: "Τεταρων, το του 'Αντιχρίστου άνωμα." Of course, he supposed the beast in c. 13, to be Antichrist. So the venerable Bede: "This number [666] is said to be found among the Greeks in the name Titan, giant." When the mild character of Titus Vespasian was urged as being utterly at variance with the character of the beast, as here

1 Biblioth. Pat. III. p. 420.
depicted, the advocates of the word Τειταν found a refuge by resorting to Titus Flavius Domitian, the tyrant. Wetstein, however, has laboured to show, that both the father, Titus Flavius Vespasian, and the son, Titus Vespasian, are meant by John in his number 666. But in order to accomplish this, he changes ξες into χς or 616, and the name Τειταν into Τείτα; and to all this he adds, that Titus had the feminine name Τείτα given him by John, on account of his soft and effeminate disposition! I have only to say: Quodcunque mihi narras sic, incredulus odi.

Enough of such guesses in days of yore. More recent times have added something to the number, and but little to the probability, of these surmises, most of which are all but ridiculous. Thus we have had Αποστατής or Julian the Apostate; Μαουμέτις Muhammed; Βενέδικτος Pope Benedict IX; and other names of the like tenor. It would seem that nearly all the combinations of Greek letters, which will designate 666, have been made at one time or another.

Not content, however, with the Greek language, some have resorted to the Latin. They aver as a reason for so doing, that inasmuch as the author had Roman personages in view, it is probable he would reckon after the Roman manner. It should be remembered here, that in the Roman alphabet only C. D. I. L. M. V. X. are used as numeral signs. Only these letters, then, as they occur in proper names, are to be selected as numerically significant.

Bossuet found 666 in DiοCλes aVgVstVs, that is Diocletian. Here, and elsewhere, as in the older books, the V is used for U. The Huguenots, in the time of the persecution by Louis XIV, found the number of the beast in LVDoVICVs; as some of the republicans in France, at a later period, also found it in the name of the last LVDoVICVs. In a work so recent as A. D. 1817, by Opitius or Gehrenken (it is not known which), the writer maintains, that inasmuch as the beast in Rev. c. 13, is to resemble those in Daniel, it is quite probable that the names of Alexander (Dan 8, 5—8), and Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 8, 9—12), are transferred to the beast; and the more so, because aLeXanDer and antIoChVs make out 666.

I will not occupy much more of the reader’s time, nor of my
DIFFERENT EXPLANATIONS.

own, in recounting such unseemly excrescences of the human mind. To show what minds, even very respectable, may excogitate in regard to the 666 of our text, I may mention that Bolten, in his version of the New Testament, (the original of which he held to have been Syriac,) supposes that the name Titus Flavius Vespasian, expressed in the Syriac, contains the number in question, and consequently, that this emperor is meant. Herdec, from whom we might expect better things, makes it out of יְשֵׁנְיעַרְיוּ, that is, Rabbi Simeon or Simon of Giora, one of the atrocious leaders in the Jewish rebellion. Mere sport of imagination, or at least vapid conceit, is Na Βούνοναγαρτέ, that is Napoleon Bonaparte, in Greek or Hebrew, each of which is equal to 666. So נאינתנשתשך, the Corsican. More adroit than these guesses was that of Feuardentius, a Catholic editor of Irenæus. In his notes on that passage of Irenæus, which is quoted above, he suggests, that the name by which Luther was first called, was Martin Lauter, the letters of which, having the Greek significance given to them, amount to just 666. He goes on to say, that as all the attributes of the beast belonged to Luther, there is but little room for doubt that this is the true application.¹

But enough. I pass to the second object before us, viz. to show what the number of a man, which is 666, probably was intended to designate.

We have seen that Irenæus pronounces Αλτεινος to be valde verisimile. Moreover he says: “They are named Latini, who now reign.” The letters are exact as to the numeral amount; viz. λ 30, ι 300, ε 5, ι 10, υ 50, ὀ 70, σ 200; the sum of the whole is 666. Then as to this mode of writing in Greek the Roman word Latinus, examples enough are at hand to vindicate it; e. g. Σωτεινος, Φανετεινος, Παυλεινος, Απολεινος, Ατειλιος, Μετειλιος, Παπεινος, Ουετινος for Vibius, etc. Even the older Latin is full of such orthography; e. g. solitei, Diveis, capteivei, preimus, etc. as is evident from the relics of Ennius. The significance, then, of Αλτεινος is appropriate; and the form of the word is not liable to any valid objection. Heinrichs says, however, in his Ex-

¹ With this may be classed a of the name of Captain Miller, recent jeu d’esprit in some of our the leader of the newest race of periodicals, which makes 666 out prophets.
cursus on Rev. 13, 18, that John would have given Romanus the recent name, and not Latinus the old one, had he designed to mark the Roman empire. It seems to me quite differently. John undoubtedly designed to speak somewhat enigmatically. It was more consistent with this design, to use the old Roman word; which, however, could be understood without any serious difficulty.

But is there anything to show that the Roman or Latin empire is meant to be symbolized by the first beast? I cannot hesitate as to the answer which should be given to this question. John has given us in Rev. c. 17, particularly in vs. 10 and 18, an explanation so definite and graphic, that I cannot persuade myself that there is any room for doubt. Whoever reads chapters 13–17 with scrutinizing criticism, will be led moreover to see, that John employs τὸ θηρίον as a symbol in two senses, differing somewhat from each other. Often he employs it as the representative of the Roman (heathen) empire generically, Rev. 13, 1. 2. al. In other cases it is used to denote the then reigning prince or emperor, e. g. 13, 12. 14. 17, 8. 11, and elsewhere. In the case before us there can hardly be a question, that the name designated, although the 'name of a man,' must be a name that was common to many men. Hence ἀγιθμὸς ἀνθρώπων, without any article, so that the sense would naturally be of a generic character.

In this view of the subject, the majority of recent commentators seem to be united. And if John designed to refer to the Greek alphabet as constituting the signs for the numbers designated, there can be no exegesis so probable, so far as I can see, as that which has now been given. The name is well chosen from the older idiom; it expresses the exact quantity specified by the text; it designates the empire with which in c. 12–19 of the Apocalypse, the writer is altogether concerned. Why should we seek for any better solution? Here is all the significance which the nature of the case demands.

But still, there may be some room for doubt, whether John meant to refer his readers to the Greek or the Hebrew alphabet, in the case under examination. The grounds of that doubt I will briefly lay before the reader.

Irenæus mentions that there were codices of the Apocalypse in
his time, which instead of \( \chi \xi \zeta \) or 666, read \( \chi \varsigma \) or 616. He avows his preference for the former reading; and the principal reason seems to be, that 666 contains six hundreds, six decades, and six units. He does, indeed, aver, that 666 is the reading in all the more correct and ancient codices; but his judgment about the claims of 666 seems to lean upon his cabbalistic reasoning about the triad of sixes, rather than upon the authority of manuscripts.

Are there not some weighty reasons in favour of the old reading \( \chi \varsigma \) or 616? This question may perhaps be best answered, by first making the inquiry: Whether John would most probably refer to the Greek, or to the Hebrew, method of computation? How is this matter in other parts of the Apocalypse, where the use of numbers is concerned?

There can be no doubt as to the answer which must be given to this last question. All the triads, the heptads, the tetrads, etc. numerous as they are in the Apocalypse, and all pervading as the two first classes of these are in the arrangement of the book,—all these are Hebraic and not Greek. All the periods of time, the 1260 days, the forty-two months, the three and a half years, the 1000 years, are all of Hebrew origin. Is it not probable then that the number 666 is to be made out rather from the Hebrew than from the Greek alphabet?

Other considerations are to be associated with these. It is clear that John meant to be somewhat enigmatical here; and for good reasons, as we shall see in the sequel. Such being his design, (for if it had not been, he would have spoken explicitly and plainly,) would it not be more easily accomplished by a reference to the Hebrew, than to the Greek, alphabet? Hebrew was understood by none, or almost none, excepting Jews. If John then originally wrote \( \chi \varsigma \) or 616, nothing intelligible could be made out of it, by reference to the Greek alphabet. A Roman and heathen magistrate, in case the author of the Apocalypse were accused of slandering the emperor, and Rev. c. 13, were appealed to as proof of the fact, could make nothing out of v. 18 which would satisfy his mind. He would be most likely to attribute it to some hallucination of the writer, and to dismiss him. But not so the Hebrew reader; and such there were in all the churches of Asia.

\footnote{Contr. Haer. V. 30. 1.}
The number 616 is made out by the plain and significant words קיסר ירושלמי, Caesar of Rome. Caesar was, we well know, a common name of the first twelve emperors. The number desired is easily made out from the Hebrew name just mentioned; thus, $\pi 100, \pi 60, \pi 200, \pi 200, \pi 6, \pi 40; \text{sum 616.}$

Thus, while mere Greek readers would be unable to make out any crimen laesa majestatis against John, on account of χισ or 616, Hebrew Christian readers of any considerable acuteness might find a better, that is, a more appropriate, name for the dominion or ruler symbolized by the beast, than could be made from 666, or Ααβαλα. The internal probability of the reading 616 seems, therefore, to be great; and to this must be added the fact, that not a few codices still exhibit this very ancient reading. The three continuous sixes in the other reading can be easily accounted for, from the caballism and the mystical form and power of numbers, which the early ages of Christianity so often exhibit.

I will merely add here, that Ewald leans decidedly to the opinion in favour of 616. We cannot, indeed, acting as mere critics on the text, adopt this meaning with much confidence; but it appears to my mind, when all those things are well considered which have been suggested above, that 616 is on the whole a more probable reading, and at all events it is explicable in a more definite way, than 666.

It matters not, however, in regard to the main thing designed by the writer, which of these opinions one adopts. John means to say, but to say in an occult way, that the first beast is a symbol of heathen persecuting Rome. In c. 17 the writer seems to put this conclusion beyond all reasonable doubt.

This appears to be so plain, that I cannot but express my astonishment at a recent explanation, given by Züllig in his late Commentary on Revelation, of the meaning of 666. He says, that the Jews regarded Moses as a type of Christ; and inasmuch as Balaam was an adversary of the first Moses, so the Jews thought he would be of the second, i.e. of the Messiah. Instead therefore of giving credit to the declaration in Num. 31, 8 and Josh. 13, 22, viz. that the Israelites slew Balaam, he intimates that the Rabbins

$^1$ Comm. p. 237.
believed in the recovery of Balaam from his supposed deadly wound, and that he lived and would continue to live until the coming of the Messiah, when he would have seven heads instead of one, i.e. possess seven times the power which he formerly had. This, Züllig tells us, fully explains Rev. 13, 3, which says, that the beast received a deadly wound and recovered from it. "This reference to Balaam which is so plain," he goes on to say, "is reduced to certainty as clear as the sun, by Rev. 13, 18. This riddle, proclaimed throughout the whole world, but never before solved, has given occasion to the most ridiculous misinterpretations." "This riddle, however," says Gfrörer in his review of Züllig, "has at last found its ÒEdipus."

What then, I would ask, is the éclaircissement of this new and wonderful ÒEdipus? It is this; Joshua (c. 13, 22), speaking of things which the children of Israel had done, declares that they had killed Balaam the son of Beor, the soothsayer. The Hebrew of this last clause, Züllig gives as running thus: כַּלְפֵלָם התַּעֲבַרְבִּים מִשָּׁם הַיָּמִים; and these letters do in fact amount, with regard to numerical value, to 666. Thus, ב 2, י 30, כ 70, ה 40, וב 2, י 70, כ 200, י 100, ג 60, י 40; sum of the whole, 666. "Getroffen, er ist's!" exclaims the reviewer, "he has hit the mark!" And in confirmation of this Gfrörer states, that he had long before come to the conclusion, that the Antichrist of the New Testament was Balaam in disguise.

Such then is the solution, pronounced to be "clearer than the noon-day sun," of this second ÒEdipus, who is come, not, like the second Daniel in Shylock, to judgment, but to give the hermeneutical art a new and unheard of éclaircissement. Yet no Sphynx need dash out its brains, as did that of Thebes, because of the solution.

To argue seriously against such an interpretation as this, would be to insult the understanding of my readers. More especially so, inasmuch as the Hebrew quoted from Josh. 13, 22, has been quite transformed by the new soothsayer who has appealed to it. The original stands thus: בְּנֵי עֵבֵרְבִים עד יָמִים. This settles the whole question. Züllig has merely garbled it. If he had not,

1 Studien und Kritiken, 1842, p. 828 sq.
yet to suppose that John believed in and adopted that putid fable about Balaam, which, if indeed it grew at all, (for I know of no evidence that it did,) must have grown up out of the veriest swamps of Rabbinism,—to suppose not only that John introduced it into such a book as the Apocalypse, and took it for granted that his readers would understand the allusion, is really beyond all critical endurance. I can only express my surprise, that the editors of the "Studien und Kritiken" should admit such a critique as that of Gfrörer; at least, that they should do so without apologizing or making any explanation to their readers. The Rabbins have indeed said many strange things respecting Balaam; some of which are, that he learned sorcery from two demons, that he was one of Pharaoh's evil counsellors in Egypt, that he was born circumcised, that he practised bestiality with the ass on which he rode, that he had but one eye, and the like; but instead of making Balaam live down to the time of the Messiah, they speak of him as occasionally being conjured up from Gehenna, in order to render some assistance or information to sorcerers. 1 Something new under the sun, Züllig may perhaps have the credit of doing; but his entire exegesis of the matter before us is nothing short of ridiculous.

The result of our examination is, that if we suppose the text to read χρυσ or 666, as our common editions have it, and the numbers to be counted in accordance with the designations by the Greek alphabet, the only probable word that corresponds is Αταυμος which Irenæus (who follows this reading) pronounces to be valde verisimile. This of course denotes the Roman power, by the use of a word that was in part antiquated when John wrote, but which would for that very reason be probably chosen in such a case as this. On the other hand, if we prefer a reading found in many copies in the days of Irenæus, viz. χιω or 616, and also still found in not a few codices, then we may resort to the Hebrew alphabet for explanation; in which case Καίσαρ Ρώμη Caesar of Rome will be still more definite and graphic. Go which of these two ways we will, (and none other yet proposed is even slightly probable,) the result is the same for substance as to the meaning of Rev. 13, 18. The persecuting, the blood-thirsty, the impious, the

1 See the Indices under Bileam, in Eisenmenger, Entd. Judenthum, I. II.
idolatrous, the blasphemous beast, is the Roman power as wielded by Nero, that incarnate fiend, who laid waste the church of God with unrelenting fury. I do not say that it is confined merely and entirely to Nero; but the description—the imagery of the whole—is drawn from him. He is the original of the picture. As I have before said, I do not see how c. 17 allows any good room to doubt, even if our conjecture be erroneous as to the name or names originally intended, that still the result would be the same from the explanation of any other name which John may have employed.

Having come then to some conclusion in regard to this matter, here is the proper place to assign some reasons, as I have engaged to do, for the mysterious or enigmatical manner of the communication which John here makes.

I must beg the reader here, if the Apocalypse is not fresh in his mind, and he has any doubt respecting what I am about to say, to read it from beginning to end. He will then be prepared to agree with me, that the book was written in the midst of a raging and relentless persecution of Christians by embittered enemies. In such circumstances, those who had professed the religion of Christ needed to be encouraged, comforted, guided, and assured as to the final event. The hearts of many were failing. Apostasy, under such circumstances, was to be feared. Hence the urgent exhortations of the writer of the Apocalypse, that Christians should persevere. To him that overcometh, in the mighty contest which was going on, the glorious rewards of victory are everywhere held out. Patient martyrdom, whenever this becomes necessary, is made an indispensable condition of enjoying the approbation of the great Head of the church; and a condition also, to the fulfilment of which not only a crown and a throne of glory are promised, but likewise a part in the first resurrection, when the Saviour shall make his cause triumphant over all opposition.

Such was the primary and immediate aim of the Apocalypse. That it was written under the bloody reign of Nero, or shortly after, is now a matter agreed upon by nearly all recent critics who have studied the literature of this book. I cannot turn aside here, in order formally to prove this. The exemption of Christian Jews, who are sealed in their foreheads as the servants of God, as related in chap. 7; the measurement of the inner sanctuary of the tem-
ple, to be preserved from impending destruction, c. 11, 1. 2; the express naming of the city to be destroyed, as "the place where our Lord was crucified," c. 11, 8; these and other concurrent circumstances put it beyond a reasonable doubt, that the Apocalypse was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. And if all this were not sufficient, the passage in c. 17, 10, which declares that five kings or emperors of Rome had already fallen, while the sixth is reigning when the writer is composing the book, marks the period of the composition too definitely to be called in question. It might easily be shown, moreover, that the tenor of the book renders it necessary for us to suppose, that the persecution was actually raging when it was written; and consequently, it must have been written during Nero's life, for persecution ceased immediately after his death. Indeed the threat implied in c. 13, 10, seems plainly to be directed against Nero, and to predict the violent death to which he speedily came.

But to return to our immediate object: What could John do, in circumstances such as those in which he wrote? Must he come out and denounce Nero by name, and incur the crimen laesae majestatis? This were certain death. This were to bring open reproach upon himself, and upon all Christians who read and approved of his book. Even still more; all such Christians would be involved in the like charge with himself, and of course a greater show of justice would be the consequence, in respect to persecuting the Christians. John, therefore, had a difficult and hazardous duty to perform. On the one hand, it was incumbent on him to warn, to encourage, and to console the persecuted; on the other, it was a hazardous thing for himself and his readers, to publish abroad that the Roman persecuting power was blaspheming God and murdering the innocent, and moreover that it would ere long be utterly destroyed. Sedition and misprision of treason would seem to be the charge, to which he would be exposed by such a course. What could he do then, in such a strait, except the very thing that he has done? His message must be delivered. It was from God. But as his message was to the suffering Christians, it was enough, in case the hazardous parts of it should be somewhat veiled or enigmatical, that it was still so composed, that men expert in the Scriptures, could easily unravel it. A mere heathen and
Roman reader, methinks, could make little or nothing out of Rev. 13, 18. One might apply to it what Daniel says respecting certain things that were to take place: "None of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand;" Dan. 12, 10. John did not wish to appear seditious, nor in reality to be so; but John must still be faithful to Christians, and open before them the glorious prospect of final and certain triumph. How then could he act otherwise than he has done? He has spoken enigmatically; but the enigma does not need a second Oedipus to explain it. Must we not excuse him, in such circumstances, for speaking thus? Or rather, must we not commend him for his skill, his caution, and his faithfulness? There may be readers, perhaps, who will doubt here; but if there be, I commend to them the reading and due consideration of 1 Sam. 16, 1—13; and trust that John will fairly stand acquitted of all double dealing or affected mystery, or even cabbalism, in respect to the passage before us.

In regard to this last charge, however, viz. that which respects cabbalism, I must say a few words. Most of the recent commentators, even those who put an estimate somewhat high upon the Apocalypse, have conceded that John here employs the cabbalistic art of managing numbers; or, in other words, that he gives to them a mystical meaning, in conformity with that practice of the cabbalists which has respect to numbers.

I cannot accede to this view of the subject. First of all I have strong doubts, whether any thing more than the mere germ of cabbalism existed in the days of John. Next, I cannot see, in the various kinds of cabbala, any near approach to John's use of 666. These may be comprised under three heads: 1. Notarikon (נְתָרִיקון), in which the single letters of a particular word were each made the representatives of some whole word; e. g. in Gen. 1, 1, the word שִׁם may be considered as designating יִהוּד, יִשְׂרָאֵל, Son, Spirit, Father, and consequently יִהוּד points us to the doctrine of a Trinity. 2. Temura (טֵמִרָה concealment), which indicates an arbitrary transposition of the letters of any word, so as to constitute another and different word; e. g. Gen. 1, 1 הָאָדָם transposed makes אָדָם הַמָּני, i. e. in the month Tisri or September; which shows, say the cabbalists, that the world was created in that month. The only method which has the least resemblance to Rev.
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13, 18 is: 3. Gematria (גמטריה, γεωμετρία?) which means a computation of the numerical value of letters in one or more words, and then deducing the meaning from some other word which is of the same numerical value; e. g. Gen. 49, 10 שילה נביה "Shiloh will come," amounts numerically to 358, which is the exact numerical amount of מESSIAH. Consequently the two Hebrew words in Gen. 49, 10 designate the Messiah!

Not the most distant resemblance can be found to John’s use of 666, anywhere in the cabbala except here; and surely there is something here, which is quite remote from the manner in which he employs his mystical number. In Gematria the signification of a word is deemed equivalent to, or synonymous with, that of another word whose numerical value is the same; that is, the letters both of שילה נביה and of מESSIAH designate numerically 358; ergo, both must have the same meaning, or must refer to the same individual. But how has John shaped his enigma? The number 666, if expressed in appropriate letters, will constitute a name, which will lead the reader to know who is meant by the beast. No other word, designating the same number, comes at all into a comparison here. No conclusion is drawn by conceit or imagination from a mere accidental occurrence as to equivalency in numbers. The appropriate letters of a certain number are merely made the symbol, or rather constitute a name, of the persecuting power. There is room here, it must be acknowledged, for the exercise of skill and judgment, as to what the appropriate letters are. But as the circumstances of the case demanded indirect speech, or something in a measure enigmatical, none can justly complain of this. And even if the cabbala of the Rabbins had flourished at the time when John wrote, what reason is there to suppose him to have been acquainted with it? His Master was contemned by the Pharisees for not having any acquaintance with γράμματα, i. e. as they meant, Rabbinical learning, John 7, 15. Was the disciple who records this, better versed in these matters than his Master? Or if the presbyter John, at Ephesus, who is named by Papias as a disciple of Christ, and to whom some recent critics are inclined to ascribe the Apocalypse, was the author of Rev. 13, 18, is there any proof that he was versed in cabbalism? Had Paul written such a passage, there would have been more
probability of his being able to draw from Rabbinical store-houses; for he was brought up at the foot of Gamaliel, and was doubtless well versed in all the so-called learning of the day. In a word, it remains yet to be made out, that any part of the New Testament exhibits the peculiar features of cabbalism. I am aware that it has often been assumed, of late, by some of the German critics; but I have never met with any satisfactory proof that the assumption is well grounded.

Let me venture, then, to invite my readers to take a view of ground that has not yet been occupied, at least to my knowledge, in order to illustrate the enigmatical mode of expression which the writer of Rev. 13, 18 has adopted. I will be as brief as the nature of the case will permit; merely suggesting, that as the illustration is from sources not hitherto employed for this purpose, I must say so much as will render my meaning plain and easily intelligible.

It seems scarcely necessary here to enter upon any vindication of the obvious position, that every writer conforms more or less to the usus loquendi of his time. This is true not only in respect to the idiom or diction which he employs, but also true in general with respect to the great outlines of his style and manner of representation. For example, and one too which is directly in point, among the later prophets Ezekiel and Daniel stand pre-eminent. No one, however, who has read their works with attention, can call in question for a moment the fact, that they differ exceedingly in their manner of representation from the older prophets. Nor can it be doubted at all, whether the Apocalypse does not more nearly resemble the books of Ezekiel and Daniel, than any other books of the Old Testament or the New.

If the question should be urged, Why John chose these models? the obvious answer is, that he conformed to the taste of the times in which he lived. The numerous apocryphal works of an apocalyptic nature, which were composed nearly at the same time with the Apocalypse, such as the Book of Enoch, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs, many of the Sibylline Oracles, the Fourth Book of Ezra, the Pastor of Hermas, and many others which are lost, all testify to the taste and feelings of the times, when, or near which, the Apocalypse was written. If
this method of writing was more grateful to the times in which John lived, it is a good reason for his preferring it.

As to the general style and manner of the Apocalypse, I may presume so much as I have now stated, will be conceded. But was there any thing in the usages of those times—any thing not connected with cabbalism—which showed a tendency to such a mode of representation as that adopted in Rev. 13, 18?

In reading the Sibylline Oracles, which are a singular compound of different writings in different ages, and by writers of different faith, but some parts of which were composed about the same time with the Apocalypse, I have found several passages, the manner and tenor of which are very nearly the same with those of Rev. 13, 18. I shall advert, first of all, to a passage which appears evidently to have been written about A. D. 120. The reader will call to mind that these Oracles, so named, are written in hexameter verse.

In the passage referred to, the writer undertakes to give a list of the Roman emperors down to Adrian, with now and then a trait of character, and a hint of their respective achievements. He begins with Καίσαρ, meaning Julius Cæsar, whom he thus designates:

"Εστι αυτὸς πρῶτιστος, ὃς τις δέκα δις πορφυρόσει.
Γράμματος ἀριθμόν πολέμων δ' ἐπὶ πολὺ κρατήσει.

"He will be the first king of all, whose [name] begins with a letter which amounts to twice ten; he will greatly prevail in war."

The assumption on the part of the writer is, that what is here uttered was written before Cæsar was born. The K in Καίσαρ represents twice ten. To this the writer adds a second designation, namely for the word Julius (Ἰούλιος), which he expresses thus:

"Εξι δ' ἐκ δεκάδος πρῶτον τίπον, "He shall have the primary form [designation] from the decade, or number ten;" in other and simple words, his first name shall begin with i, which designates ten.

This may serve to give the reader a specimen of the original Greek. For other examples I may confine myself merely to translations. The writer proceeds: "He who next follows is designated by the letter which stands at the head of the alphabet," that

1 Lib. V. v. 11 sq.
is, Αἰγουστος or Augustus. Of Tiberius he says: "He shall have the number 300 upon the first letter" [of his name], viz. τ, 300. Then follows "he who has the mark of the number 3," viz. Γαῖος or Caius Caligula. Then comes "a king whose name is δίς δέκα, twice ten, viz. Κλαύδιος or Claudius, ι for 20. Next follows "the dire serpent whose name has the sign of 50," viz. Νέρων or Nero, ν for 50. The three kings that succeed him, viz. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, are not specified, because of the shortness of their reign. Vespasian, Οὐσπασίανος, "who exhibits the manifest mark of seven times ten" or ω for 70; his son, Titus, "whose first letter shows the sign of 300," viz. τ, 300; then "the fatal empire of him whose sign is four," viz. Domitian, δ for 4; "then the man of 50," Nerva, with ν for 50; next, "the man whose name begins with the sign of 300," Trajan, with τ for 300; and lastly, "the man who has the silvery name of the sea," viz. Adrian, whose name is like that of the Adriatic sea;—all these follow in regular succession.

Thus has the writer gone through with the whole class of the emperors, down to the time in which he lived. The principle which reigns throughout this whole exhibition is, that of comparing the first letter of the leading popular name of each emperor with the number which it designates. No name is actually mentioned, but it is simply referred to by indicating the number which is designated by part of its elements. It is essentially of the same nature, therefore, as the method adopted in Rev. 13, 18. The only difference is, that in the latter case the writer has made the number so large as to take in all the letters of the name intended.

But there are some other instances of a like nature, which follow still more exactly in the steps of John. It must, however, be remarked, that they are of a somewhat uncertain age, but probably belong to a later period, and may possibly have originated from the mere imitation of the Apocalypse, although there is no palpable evidence of this.

The following is a specimen of this later period. The passage in question runs thus: 1

1 Lib. I. v. 141 sq.
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"I have nine letters, and am of four syllables; consider me. [Q. d. reflect well what name corresponds with this.] The first three have each two letters; the remaining one, the rest [of the letters]. Five of them are consonants. Of the whole number, there are twice eight hundreds, and three times three decades, with seven."

The occasion of such a description, as given by the Sibyllist, is, that Jehovah is addressing Noah, and propounding to him a secret or mysterious name by which he is called. As in respect to Rev. 13, 18 a great variety of conjectures have been made, so here. I shall not occupy any time with the discussion of these; but merely observe, that the Greek word ἀνέξιφωρος (unspeakable) answers well to the description. It has nine letters and four syllables; the first three syllables have each two letters, the remaining one, of course, the rest. Five of the letters are consonants. The numeral sum is 1696; which lacks one of the requisite number; but by the aid of a unit, (the restorative and helping number, as the Pythagoreans say,) it amounts to just the required number.

Whatever word, however, may constitute the true solution of this, the whole passage is manifestly of the like tenor with that in Rev. 13, 18. It is the designation of a name, by the use of numbers represented by letters.

Once more; in the same book there is another passage still more exactly like to the one under consideration. It runs thus:

"Τέσσαρα φωνήσατα φέων, τάδ' ἄφωνα ἐν αὐτῷ
Δισδέκατα ἀγγέλλων, ἀριθμὸν δ' ὄλον ἐξονομήσω.
'Οκτὼ γὰρ μονάδας, τόσας δεκάδας ἐπὶ τούτοις,
'Ηδ' ἑκατοντάδας ὅκτω, ἀπιστοκόρου ἀνθρώποις
Οὐνομα δηλώσει.

Lib. I. v. 325 sq."
"Producing four vowels, and announcing doubly the consonants in it, I will recount the whole number. His name shall designate to unbelieving men eight monads [unities], as many decades added to these, and also 800."

There is much variety of reading, and perplexity among interpreters, in respect to the two first lines of this extract. I have given the text by selecting, from different readings, those which seem to make the only tolerable sense. The name to which the passage refers is plainly Ἰησοῦς Jesus; for so the preceding context manifestly declares. The writer is predicting the advent of the Messiah: "Then the son of the great God, clothed in flesh, shall come to men, made like to mortal men on earth;" after which follows the mystical passage above presented. The numbers of the name Ἰησοῦς agree with the numerical quantity expressed in the Greek verses; thus, ι 10, η 8, σ 200, ο 70, ν 400, γ 200; whole sum 888. Moreover, there are four vowels and two consonants. Here then is a kind of exact counterpart of Rev. 13, 18; the name of the personage about to make his appearance is represented by 888, for the letters which make up this composite number, four of them being vowels and two consonants, will constitute the name in question. This last particular, namely, that which respects the vowels and consonants, is a little more minute and specific than any thing in Rev. 13, 18; but in all other respects the parallel is perfect.

What may we conclude, now, from exhibitions of this kind, which we thus meet within other ancient writings besides the Apocalypse? In respect to all the extracts from the Sibylline Oracles made above, I have not been able to discover any particular leaning upon the Apocalypse, or favouritism for it. Indeed, throughout the Sibylline Oracles, various as they are, derived also from many sources and composed at different periods, it is very seldom the case that they exhibit any particular dependence on, or connexion with, the Apocalypse. Of course, examples of the mystical use of numbers (if I may so express it), such as those exhibited above, and conditioned as they are, cast a strong light on the question: Whether John, in writing Rev. 13, 18, may well be supposed to have done nothing more than to conform to a usus loquendi of his day, which was by no means unfrequent? I cannot help thinking that this question should be emphatically answered in the
THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST IN THE APOCALYPSE.

affirmative. A writer who expected to be understood ἵνα τοῖς ἔφοσι τὸν νόμον (as he expresses himself), would not adopt modes of expression which would be regarded as altogether without precedent, and looked upon either as the product of mere caprice, fancy, or mysticism, or as being so dark and unintelligible that no reader could hope to attain to the true meaning. In fact we may well doubt, whether there appeared to John's readers, to be any thing particularly strange or outré in the declarations made by Rev. 13, 18.

It is time to hasten to a close. But I must beg the indulgence of making a few remarks here; for this may not be inapposite on an occasion like the present.

I am aware that illustrations and arguments of such a nature as I have now employed, can be thoroughly understood and appreciated only by the few, who devote themselves in some good measure to the critical study of the Scriptures. The number of these is evidently on the increase, in our country. The particular reason why I have chosen such a subject for discussion, is the present state of our religious community in regard to the book of Revelation. There is, indeed, scarcely any thing new in the opinions relative to this book, which are published and urged upon the community from week to week; but it is somewhat new to find our community so much agitated as they are on this subject, and many of them driven hither and thither by every wind of doctrine. It is time that some metes and bounds were set, if indeed they may be set, to the surging flood that is sweeping so many of the incautious and unwary before it.

I regard it as a principle of interpreting Scripture, from which there can be no appeal, and to which no valid objection can be made, that we must have reference always to the times in which a writer lived; to the usus loquendi of his age and country; to the style and taste of his contemporaries; to the historical circumstances in which his work was composed; and of course, and above all, to the main design which he had in view. Every expositor who neglects these things, or who is ignorant in any considerable degree respecting them, is certain to go wrong in many respects. How can those be trusted, then, to expound the more difficult and abstruse portions of the Scriptures, who are acquainted neither with
the original language, nor with any of the attendant circumstances, of a scriptural composition? Let them be ever so honest and well-meaning; they must of necessity err in many respects.

It is in vain to deny this, or to appeal to the promises of Scripture, that true Christians shall always be guided in all their opinions respecting matters of revelation. The promises of this nature are practical ones; and as such they are fulfilled. The duty of men lies upon the very face of the Bible, and all men may understand it, who can read the Scriptures, and who are possessed of common sense. But how can such promises be applied to all those parts of the Scriptures which refer to things, or persons, or occurrences, in distant countries and ages, of which the reader has little or no knowledge? And if such an application is to be made, how shall we account for it, that sincere Christians may and often do differ in their interpretation of particular texts?

If the Apocalypse is ever to be understood in these latter days, it must either be explained by some inspired interpreter, or else the meaning must be obtained by the same process as that which we employ in the study of all other ancient writings. There are but two things which we can trust here; the one is inspiration, the other is the laws of hermeneutics. If any one can show a valid title to the former, let us hear him; if not, we can give him our ear only when he follows the proper laws of interpretation.

What estimate then is to be put upon mere fancy, imagination, mysticism, or guessing, in respect to the meaning of John in the Apocalypse? And is it not passing strange, that those who launch into these, do not once look upon the rocky shore covered with the wrecks of those who have before set sail in the same direction? Warn them of this, and they will probably stop their ears, and turn away their eyes. The enthusiasm which leads them to take such a course, forbids them to attend to the voice of warning. And the worst feature of all is, that they look with indignation or scorn upon all who doubt or call in question the safety of their course. Ignorance and enthusiasm are always confident. A sober and judicious man, who has well examined, may also attain to confidence; but his ears will always be open to any new voice which instructs, and his eyes open to any new prospects which are disclosed.

Never was any book abused as the Apocalypse has been. En-
thusiasts on the one hand, and skeptics on the other, have, although unwittingly, united their efforts to obscure and degrade it. May some more auspicious light speedily dawn upon the darkness of the churches, in respect to the true design and meaning of this peculiar and sublime composition!

That the conclusion to which I have come, in the preceding pages, respecting the number of the beast, is well grounded, can be thoroughly understood and appreciated only by him, who so reads the whole book as to be able to decide with satisfaction, what are the great aims and ends of its author. To me, I confess it would seem strange, if, after having done this, he should entertain any considerable doubt, whether the first beast, in chap. 13, is the civil, heathen, persecuting power of Rome,—of Rome as engaged in laying waste the church of God. If there be any thing clear in all the prophetic parts of this book, I must believe that this is so. Indeed, such are my views of this matter, that I should utterly despair of ever attaining to the true interpretation of any prophecy in the Old Testament or the New, if this conclusion be not well founded; for in coming to it, I am conscious that it has been my only aim, to follow out the simple principles of exegesis, let them lead me where they might. But still, I claim no exemption from error. I may have made a wrong application of these principles; or possibly I may have even mistaken the right principles themselves. I am still open to conviction. But until I see reason to believe, that one or the other of these misfortunes has happened to me, my present convictions must remain.

In the meantime, if any reader can make known "a more excellent way," let him speak. Discussion is, or should be, for the sake of eliciting truth; and I am very willing that my opinions should be canvassed. But let us not have conjecture instead of argument, nor fanciful guesses in the place of illustrations from analogy and from ancient history.
pilgrim, who visited the Holy City in A. D. 333, writes that in going from Neapolis to Jerusalem, on the left hand, at the distance of twelve Roman miles from the latter city, there is a "villa" called by this name.¹

Taking all these circumstances together, although they certainly do not amount to any positive demonstration, yet they seem to me to afford a much higher degree of probability in respect to the site of Bether, than is presented by any previous hypothesis.

II.

THE WHITE STONE OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Exegesis of Rev. II. 17.

By M. Stuart, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary, Andover.

"Ο ἔχων οὖς, ἀκονσάτω τι τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, τῷ νικῶντι, δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν μάννα τοῦ κεκρυμμένου, καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ ψήφον λευκόν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ψῆφον ὄνομα καὶνόν γεγραμμένον, ὁ οὐδές οἴδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμπάνων.

"He who hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches: To him that overcometh will I give of the hidden manna; I will also give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name inscribed, which no one understandeth save he who receiveth."

Some attention may be regarded as due to the grammatical construction of this passage. The phrase, τῷ νικῶντι δώσω αὐτῷ, apparently contains a pleonastic or redundant pronoun. The like to this may be found elsewhere in the Apocalypse; e. g. Rev. 7, 2 οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικήσαι, and Rev. 20, 8 οὖν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς η'

¹ Itin. Hieros. ed. Wesseling, p. euntibus Hierusalem, in parte sin-
588, "Inde [a Neapole] millia xxviii, istra est villa, quæ dicitur, Bethar."
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ἄμμος. So in 3, 8, 6, 4, 8, 7, 9, 17, 9. Even adverbs are sometimes repeated in a similar way; as ὁπον τρέφεται ἐκεῖ Rev. 12, 14, and the like in 12, 6, and in some other cases. Indeed the instances in which the demonstrative pronoun is inserted after the noun to which it refers, (as in the phrase above which gives occasion to these remarks,) are by no means unfrequent in the Apocalypse. It is matter of particular interest, moreover, to the inquisitive reader, to know that this idiom has not only been charged upon the writer of the Apocalypse as a peculiarity, but also as a barbarism, or even a solecism. Yet the New Testament is full of the same idiom. And not only so, the Septuagint exhibits it even still more frequently; yea, the Greek Classics themselves—I mean such writers as Xenophon, Plato, Sophocles, Ἀλιαν, Diodorus Siculus, and others—exhibit it, especially when a participle precedes the demonstrative pronoun, as in the case before us. We need not resort to the Hebrew, therefore, as most have done, for the sake of explaining and defending the idiom of John; for it is no unusual thing even in the best Greek. But the frequency of it in John, I suppose, may be Hebraistic. The ᾧ ... ἡμῖν and the ὧν ... ἡμῖν (to whom, where) of the Hebrew must be very familiar, even to a mere beginner in the study of it. The apparently pleonastic pronoun, in such a case as ἐμεῖς ἠδον ἡμῖν, she saw him—the child Ex. 2, 6, is so common, not only in Hebrew, but in all its sisterdialects, that there can scarcely be a doubt, that the New Testament writers were influenced by this, as to the frequency with which they have resorted to the idiom in question.

The reader, who may have any special interest in inquiries that respect the particular idiom of the New Testament, may find abundant evidence in regard to the subject now presented, in Wi- ner's New Testament Grammar, § 22. 4. § 23. 3; to which he may add Gesenius's Lehrgeb. § 192. 2 sq. The simple truth in regard to this idiom seems to be, that either emphatic intensity, or else designed and peculiar specification, is in all cases the object of it. If now John had simply said in Rev. 2, 17, τῷ νικῶντι δῶσω τῷ μᾶννα κ. τ. ι. the Greek would have been perfectly classic, and the meaning altogether plain. But when John says: τῷ νικῶντι, δῶσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μᾶννα, i. e. 'to the conqueror—to the very same, will I give of the manna,' he makes his expression specifically
emphatic. We may well illustrate this by our own English idiom. Should I say: ‘To Andrew M. to that very man, or to this same individual, will I make application, or give reward,’ every one would understand me as increasing the intensity of my promise, and minutely and certainly designating the particular individual to whom the promise was made. So too when we say: ‘That very man,’ ‘That man there,’ etc. In common parlance, the latter mode of expression is frequent to a degree that can hardly be estimated. For substance, it illustrates at once, to the considerate reader, what is achieved in Greek when the pronoun demonstrative is inserted after the noun to which it belongs, and in cases where, strictly speaking, it might be dispensed with. It is not grammar, but rhetoric, which demands the employment of it in any case.

I should not have dwelt thus on so minute a particular as the idiom in question, had it not been the fact, that every thing which could be brought to bear upon the Apocalypse, either as to idiom, style, object, or design, has of late been adduced, in order to overthrow the credit of the book, or at least, among one class of writers, to show that John the Apostle and Evangelist could not have been the writer of it. It turns out in this case, however, as it does in respect to nearly all other anomalies which have been charged on the Apocalypse, that John had exemplars, as we have seen above, among the classic Greek writers; and although he might have read, and probably had read, but little of the heathen Greek when he wrote the Apocalypse, he had still so learned it as rarely indeed to make a misstep in the use of it. He has, we may readily concede, written it as a Hebrew would and must write it, viz. he has often exhibited Hebrew modes of thought and expression. Often, and indeed almost everywhere, in the pictures which he presents, the person is Hebrew while the costume is Greek. It has been a charge against the Apocalypse, made so long ago as the days of Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, (fl. A. D. 250,) that the Apocalypse is full of barbarisms and solecisms, and therefore cannot belong to John the Evangelist. Among these anomalies were doubtless reckoned the modes of expression which we have just now examined. It turns out, however, after these charges have been hundreds of times repeated, and all the changes rung upon them that were possible, that there is very little, if any, substantial ground
on which one can rest them. Winer was the first, I believe, in recent times, who has, with any good degree of success, vindicated the character of the Apocalypse in regard to its grammatical style, and especially in regard to its alleged anomalies and barbarisms. This he has done in his Programm, De Solecismis, qui in Apocalys i Joannea inesse dicuntur, Exeget. Studien, Heft I. S. 144 sq. The writer of these remarks has had occasion still more minutely to examine this subject. He has found, (and to his great surprise after all that has been said about the anomalous Greek of the Apocalypse,) that there are not more than two or three expressions in the whole book, which have not their exemplars in the Greek classics, so far as the principles of grammar are concerned. Such a Greek syntax as Kühner has exhibited, although it was composed without any reference to the New Testament, will enable any man of diligence and accurate observation to verify all which I have now said. It is easy to see, therefore, how much of mere empty and groundless declamation there has been among a certain class of critics, respecting the style of the New Testament writers, and particularly of the writer of the Apocalypse. Indeed, the time seems to be near, in which the alleged rudeness and unskilfulness of the New Testament writers in Greek, will cease to be descanted upon; for such writers as Kühner and Winer must speedily put questions of this kind to their final rest.

I must beg the reader to indulge me in one more remark, kindred to what has already been said. Another allegation against the Apocalypse has been, that the writer does not appear to have understood the nice and more exquisite use of the oblique cases (Genitive and Dative) in Greek, and consequently that he very rarely, or almost never, employs them. Yet a minute examination of the Apocalypse will go far towards rebutting the force of this allegation. For example, in the case before us, we have δῶσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα, i. e. I will give him of the manna. Here is one of the very nicest of the Greek idioms. If a Greek writer or speaker meant to convey the idea that the whole of any thing was given or imparted to any one, he would put the noun designating that thing in the Accusative case, and the person to whom it was given in the Dative. But if he meant (as in the present case) to speak partitively, i. e. to designate the idea that a person was merely made partaker
of a part or portion of any thing, then he would put that thing in the Genitive case, and the person in the Dative. This belongs to Attic writers of the nicest idiom. Yet here in the verse before us, we find this very idiom, and find it most properly and appropriately employed. It is only a portion of the heavenly manna, that any one conqueror receives. There are other conquerors, and very many of them too, who are also to have their portion. We may easily express the like idea in English by saying, 'I will give him of the manna,' or 'I will give him some of the manna.' The first phraseology is quite good English, and perfectly intelligible; and it corresponds, moreover, very exactly in all respects to the Greek of the Apocalypse.

The reader, who feels an interest in refuting such allegations as those just mentioned against the style of the Apocalypse, may easily find material for refutation in the book itself. Thus, in respect to that use of the Genitive which is nicer and more idiomatic, we find the Genitive of price or value twice in Rev. 6, 6, the Genitive of time when, in 7, 15, 12, 10, 14, 14, 20, 10. Even where length of time is designated by the Genitive, as in Rev. 2, 10, we may vindicate this on classical ground; for which I would refer to examples in my New Testament Grammar §107. 7; comp. §106. 4. Other examples of a nice classical use of the Genitive, may be seen in c. 4, 6. 8. 5, 8. 15, 7. 8. 17, 4. 21, 9; the Genitive even after the verb áxoúw is frequent, notwithstanding Ewald and others have asserted that this idiom is not employed in the Apocalypse, e. g. 6, 1. 3. 5. 14, 13. 16, 1. 5. 7. 21, 3. And the like of the Dative case. 'John,' it has been said, 'was not acquainted with the proper and idiomatic use of the Dative, viz. to designate manner, means, material, time, etc. without prefixing any preposition before it.' Yet it is easy to refute this, by a reference to c. 5, 1. 12. 6, 10. 7, 2. 10. 8, 3. 4. 8. 13. 10, 3. 14, 18. 15, 2. 8. 17, 4. 18, 10. 16 (bis). 19. 21. 19, 17. 21, 8. 16. 19. 22, 14. So after all verbs signifying to show, tell, declare, impart, give, belong to, etc. i. e. all verbs which require an indirect complement as well as a direct one, the Dative is employed in the Apocalypse times almost without number. No one in carefully reading it feels, in respect to this idiom, that he is in a different element from that of common Greek. So too we find the Dative, after such verbs as on other grounds require, or rather very commonly admit, the Dative; e. g.
προσκυνεῖν, 4, 10. 5, 14. 7, 11. 11, 16. 13, 4 (bis). 16, 2. 19, 4. 10 (bis). 20. 22, 9; ἀκολουθέω 14, 4. 9. 19, 14; λατρεύω 7, 15; συγκουράσεω 18, 4. Generally speaking, the oblique cases are employed as often in the Apocalypse, as elsewhere in the New Testament. That the later Greek made more frequent use than the earlier of prepositions before the oblique cases, is conceded by all well-read Greek scholars; and why may not the New Testament writers be supposed to follow the idiom of the later Greek, since they lived and wrote in the midst of its most blooming period?

The subjects thus introduced by the modes of expression in our text, evidently possess more interest than what belongs to a simple grammatical inquiry. The discussion of matters like those before us, takes deep hold on the higher criticism of the Apocalypse, and may help to remove some of the obstructions that have industriously been thrown in the way, against the fair and proper claims of this deeply interesting book.

But I must not delay for a moment longer upon mere topics of style, lest I should lose sight of my main object, or weary the patience of the reader, before I come to that part of my exegesis where I must make the strongest appeal to it.

The verse before us consists of two clauses, which exhibit two promises that are in some respects quite distinct, while at the same time there is a general bond of connexion between them. The first promise runs thus:

To the conqueror, to him will I give of the manna which is laid up.

The word conqueror (νικῶντι), in this case, has a relative meaning. From the commencement of the Apocalypse down to the passage before us, the writer everywhere exhibits manifest tokens, that a violent persecution or war against Christians was going on at that period. Hence the idea of a struggle, a combat, and in the sequel, that of a victory. The great object of the writer of the Revelation, is to confirm and encourage the professors of Christianity to continue steadfast in their profession, although it might be at the sacrifice of liberty, property, and even life. He who should persevere in the course of fidelity to his Lord and Master, come what might or could, is the one whom John calls νικῶν conqueror. He has fought against the world, the flesh, and the devil, "against the rulers of the darkness of this world and spiritual wickedness in
high places," and has overcome them all. This is the conqueror—this the very man—to whom is made the promise of the manna which is laid up.

But what is this? The literal sense of the words in question, we may presume, no one will contend for; but what is the source of the imagery or symbol which the writer here employs? It may doubtless be found in Ex. 16, 32–34. The children of Israel had murmured against Moses and Aaron, because they lacked bread in the wilderness, and the Lord had promised to Moses that he would "rain bread from heaven" for them. This promise was accomplished by sending down the manna; which fell upon the ground like the dew of evening. On this the people fed; and in commemoration of this signal event, the Lord directed Moses to "fill an omer of it to be kept for their generations, that they might see the bread wherewith they had been fed in the wilderness," v. 32. Moses then directed Aaron to "take a pot, and put an omer full of manna therein, and lay it up before the Lord, to be kept for their generations," v. 33. Accordingly Aaron "laid it up before the Testimony, to be kept." In accordance with what was done on this occasion, we find the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews expressing himself in 9, 4; where he says, when speaking of the inner sanctuary, or most holy place, that it contained "the ark of the covenant overlaid with gold, wherein was the golden pot that had manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant."

Whether the apostle speaks, in this passage, of the condition of the ark as it was known to be while in the second temple, and during the time in which he lived, or merely of its condition in the original first tabernacle, has been thought a matter of difficulty to decide. In 1 K. 8, 9 it is said, when the ark was deposited in the temple built by Solomon, that "there was nothing in it save the two tables of stone which Moses put there at Horeb;" and the very same words are repeated in 2 Chron. 5, 10. Paul then, as it would seem, is rather speaking of what belonged originally to the ark of the covenant, than of what was actually in it at the time when he wrote. Yet the Rabbins seem to have held, that the ark of the covenant was with all its contents transferred to the first temple, and even the tabernacle also along with it; for they tell us
that Jeremiah, being divinely warned, commanded the tabernacle and the ark and the altar of incense to follow him to Mount Sinai, when the army of Nebuchadnezzar were about to destroy the temple. Thither, according to the same authority, they did follow him, and there he found a subterranean depository for them, and hid them, so that no man knows the place of them, even unto this day. There too, as they go on to teach us, they will remain, until the days of the Messiah, when Jeremiah, who will re-appear with him, will bring them out and deposite them in the new Messianic temple at Jerusalem. This story, moreover, is not of recent invention. It may be found for substance in 2 Macc. 2, 4–7.¹

But, dismissing the conceits of the Rabbins, let us return to our interpretation. In Ps. 78, 24. 25, manna is called the corn of heaven, and the bread of the mighty or of the mighty ones, שָׁבוּץ, or, as our English Bible has it, angels' food. Obviously these appellations are given to the manna, in order to show forth or enhance the excellence of the gift, or of the nourishment. And we are now brought near to the final illustration of the matter before us. The happiness of a future world, or the joys of the blessed, are often represented in Scripture under the imagery of a feast. Thus Lazarus, in a world of blessedness, is exhibited as reclining in Abraham’s bosom, i. e. reclining at the table of heavenly repast, Luke 16, 23; and our Lord represents his followers as coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south, and sitting down (reclining ἀναυλιθόσονται) at the divine feast in the kingdom of God, Luke 13, 29. So in Revelation 3, 20, the Saviour represents himself as supping with the true and faithful believer; and in Revelation 19, 9, we are told of those “who are invited to the marriage-supper (δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου) of the Lamb.”

All these modes of speech were familiar to the minds of John's readers. Hence the idea suggested in our text, of manna in reserve for the feast of the blessed. At that feast, the bread is not to be like that which sustains us here on earth, but to be like the corn of heaven, the bread of the mighty ones, or angels' food. In fact, our

Lord has said, that "in the resurrection we shall be made like to the angels." Of course angels' food, so to speak, will be appropriate for all true believers. And so the declaration of John is, that he who overcometh shall sit at the table of heavenly refection, and there eat the bread of the mighty ones. In other words, he shall have full admittance to the joys of paradise, and partake of its splendid and precious entertainments; he shall eat the bread of heaven, and eating live forever. The manna rained down from heaven upon the Israelites, was but a type and shadow of the true and heavenly manna reserved for believers.

But this last word, reserved or hidden, (κεκρυμμένον in our text,) needs a passing notice. We have seen how the manna of the desert was laid up (κεκρυμμένον) in the inner sanctuary. This was an image of that which was in reserve, in the eternal sanctuary of the heavens, in reserve for all who are permitted to enter there. As to the earthly tabernacle, none was permitted to enter the most holy place, except the high priest once in a year, in order to make atonement for the people. Under the new dispensation, on the contrary, all are to be made kings and priests; yea, as we shall soon see, to have the dignity of high-priests bestowed upon them. This of course will entitle them to enter the inner sanctuary. In fact, the death of Jesus rent the vail which concealed the inner sanctuary on the earth, and Jesus showed to the world, that all men who will accept them, are without distinction to be admitted to the privileges and honours which the gospel proffers. The white stone and the new name designate them as of a rank equal to the high-priest of old, and as possessing a right to enter the innermost sanctuary of the heavenly world, and feed on the manna which is laid up for all who overcome, in the great contest between Christ's kingdom and the powers of darkness.

In a word, the true heavenly bread, kept in reserve for the faithful, and sustaining life without end, shall be given to them, when the contest and the sorrows of life are past, and they enter upon their final reward.

This brings us to the second promise, differing, as has been said, specifically from the first, but still connected with it by the bonds of a general relation:

I will also give him a white stone, and on the stone a new name
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inscribed, which no one understandeth excepting him who receiveth.

This passage has long been a crux interpretum, and a great variety of solutions have been proposed. It is not my intention to examine them in detail, for this would occupy much time, and be little to my present purpose, or to that of my readers. The principal ones, however, which have been proposed by interpreters of note, ought to receive our respectful, although brief attention. Greek and Roman sources of explanation have been sought out here, and a solution of the difficulty by means of them often attempted. It is somewhat improbable, however, that John, who almost never appeals to Grecian objects and modes of representation, should have made such an appeal in the present instance. The more respectable attempts of this nature may be divided into two classes.

I. Vitringa, Lange, and many others, have referred here to the usage among the Greeks of absolving those who were tried on the ground of any accusation, by the use of white balls or stones, and condemning them by black ones. The balls, which symbolized the sentence of acquittal or condemnation, were thrown together into one common urn, whence they were drawn and counted. A majority of the white balls acquitted the party accused. There was no inscription on them. The mere colour indicated the nature of the sentence. But in the case before us, there are no corresponding resemblances. The white stone, whatever it is, is given to the party himself who is conqueror. It is the new name inscribed upon it, which imparts to it its principal value and influence. The individual who receives it, is not represented here as being under trial, or as having any accusation preferred against him. And indeed we may ask, with Paul, "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?" It is not the object of John to present the victor, in this case, as tried and absolved merely, but as crowned with a diadem of glory. The illustration from this source, then, is altogether inapposite and unsatisfactory.

II. Grotius, Eichhorn, and others refer to a different usage among the Greeks and Romans as a source of illustration. The victor in the Olympic games was presented with a tessera, on which was inscribed the reward to which his victory gave him a title, and
which was to be bestowed upon him usually by his native city. This reward might be a sum of money, public support, presents of value, special honours, and the like. Similar to this was a custom at Rome. The emperors there, on certain festive occasions, scattered *tesserae* among the mass of the people who were assembled, on which were inscribed pledges to bestow certain favours on those who obtained them. But in both these cases the white stone of our text is wanting. The inscription, moreover, contained nothing which any one was unable to read. No mention is made of *mystical* characters. It is not a name which is inscribed, but some honorary stipend is designated. And in the latter case, it was the mere successful scramble of an individual to obtain a tesser in spite of his competitors, which entitled him to receive his reward. How can we suppose John to have referred, in our text, to things so dissimilar as these? Still less can we suppose, with Vitringa, that John had in view both of the customs which have been mentioned above, and amalgamated both in his representation.

Greek and Roman sources of illustration, then, do not promise much. Let us see whether Hebrew sources will not afford us better satisfaction.

We have already seen, that the first promise contained in our text exhibits an indication that the conqueror will be admitted into the most holy place, to eat of the manna which is laid up there. It follows, of course, that there is here an indication of a dignity and privilege which is equivalent to *high-priesthood*. We must further remark, also, that there is frequent intimation in the Old Testament and in the New, that the people of God will eventually be made *kings* and *priests*. Let the reader compare, among other passages, in respect to their *kingly* dignity, Ps. 49, 14. Dan. 7, 22. 27. Matt. 19, 28. Luke 22, 29. 30. 1 Cor. 6, 2. 3. 2 Tim. 2, 12. Rev. 2, 26. 27. 3, 21. In regard to their *priestly* dignity, he may consult Is. 61, 6. 1 Pet. 2, 5. Rev. 5, 10. 20, 6; comp. Ex. 19, 5. 6. Literally, indeed, these texts are not to be interpreted; for if *all* are to be literally kings, who are to be the subjects? And if *all* are to be literally priests, who are to be those for whom they are to officiate? It is the honour, the dignity, the privileges of the saints, which are represented by such language figuratively employed. And when they are called *priests*, there is an intimation of something
more than what the word *kings* designates, viz. the idea of consecration to God, of devotedness to his service, as well as of personal holiness. Indeed the whole compass of language discloses to us no words of greater and more intense significance, than those now in question.

Our text may be regarded as indicating still more than the simple declaration, that the redeemed shall become *priests* unto God. It conveys the idea that they shall be *high-priests*; than which no situation can be more elevated as to dignity and honour, especially as it was regarded by the mind of a Hebrew.

Let us see how this can be made out. In Ex. 28, 36 sq. the mitre of the high-priest is described, and it is enjoined among other things, that a plate of pure gold shall be put upon the front of this mitre, and on this shall be engraven HOLINESS TO THE LORD. In Hebrew, it is נֶדֶנֶס וּפוֹתָה, i.e. holiness to Jehovah; which means, that he who wears the mitre is consecrated to the service of Jehovah, and is to be regarded and honoured as his consecrated or holy one. The mitre, made of sumptuous materials, decked with blue lace, and having the frontlet already described, was truly a magnificent piece of attire, and must have been regarded by every devoted Jew with feelings which it would be difficult adequately to describe.

What resemblance, now, is there between our text and this description of the most striking part of the high priest's attire? Both, I answer, are substantially of the same nature; with the exception, however, that when the passage in Exodus was written, the future construction of the high-priest's mitre was circumstantially prescribed. But in our text, all that pertains to the mere fashion of the mitre is regarded as being already familiar to the readers. Already had John declared, in Rev. 1, 6, that Christ would make his devoted followers *kings* and *priests* to God. In the first part of the verse under examination, a promise is made that the same followers should have access to the most holy place, and partake of the manna laid up there; which of course implies, that they should enjoy such a privilege of access to the holy of holies as belonged only to *high-priests*. And now, in the clause at present before us, the speaker adds a brief description of the splendid attire in which the faithful disciples of Christ shall enter the
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inner sanctuary. Instead of a mitre, with a gold frontispiece on which is the inscription HOLINESS TO THE LORD, he shall wear a mitre with a \textit{pellucid precious stone}, on which shall be engraved the \textit{new name} which belongs to the new Lord of the new kingdom; a name equivalent in value to that of \textit{Jehovah} under the Old Testament, which no one but the high-priest knew how to utter.

It will be conceded, that if I am in the right, this is a splendid description. But it needs to be more fully illustrated and confirmed by the explanation of a few particulars.

The epithet \textit{levxi\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{t}}}, which is rendered \textit{white}, means much more than our simple word 'white.' Hesychius has hit nearly the exact sense which it usually has in the New Testament, when he defines it as equivalent to \textit{laumpr\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{o}}\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{s}}}, i. e. \textit{splendid, shining} or \textit{glistening}. Thus, it is said of Jesus' raiment at his transfiguration, that it was \textit{levxi\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{t}} \lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{t}} \lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{o}} \lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{t}} \lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{t}}}, i. e. splendid as the sun-light, Matt. 17, 2; or, as Luke has it, his garment was \textit{levxi\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{o}}}, \textit{ξεαστράπτων}, i. e. splendid, glittering or shooting forth lightnings. So says Virgil, of a glittering polished sword: \textit{enis candens}, \AE n. XII. 91; and Pliny speaks of a comet as adorned \textit{argenteo crine}, Hist. Nat. II. 25. In Daniel 7, 9 the Ancient of Days is said to be clothed in a vesture \textit{white as snow}, i. e. of a perfectly pure brightness. In the book of Revelation the epithet \textit{levxi\lower.5ex\hbox{\textgreek{o}}} is frequently employed to denote the pure splendour of vestments worn by saints in glory, or by angels; once or twice it is spoken of \textit{pure} vestments as the emblem of innocence and purity of character; see Rev. 3, 4. 5. 18. 6, 11. 7, 9. 13. 19, 14. Once it is spoken of a radiant cloud, Rev. 14, 14. In all such cases, I think we may trace the original conception to the \textit{white heat} of metallic substances, when subjected to a glowing furnace, or to the appearance of the sun when not discoloured by the atmosphere. There is a perfect union of splendour or effulgence and purity of colour, which we name \textit{dazzling white}. And like to this, is the reflection of many of the pellucid or diaphanous gems. The splendour of some of them, it would be difficult indeed to describe in an adequate manner. The word \textit{ψιφος} means, when generically considered, any small smooth polished pebble or stone, and may well be employed to designate any of the precious stones.

Such a gem, then, constitutes the frontispiece to the mitre or diadem, given to the new order of priests under the new dispensa-
tion. Gold is not rich or splendid enough for the frontispiece. A precious stone is put in its place. And on this stone, as the case requires, is graven a new name, significant of a new order of things and of new relations.

Two particulars in respect to this engraved name deserve to be considered. The first is, that it is new. The name anciently graven on the high-priest's mitre was that of Jehovah. The great Mediator between God and man had not then made his appearance. The temple-services and all the Jewish ritual foreshadowed him, or were in some way emblematic of him, or of some part of his work. But the fulness of time for his manifestation had not yet arrived. The Jews, therefore, were placed under a law-dispensation; and to God as their immediate law-giver and judge they owed their homage and allegiance. Consequently his name was inscribed on the mitre of their high-priest. But when a new covenant was introduced, "established upon better promises than the old;" in a word, when "all things were created anew;" then came in person a Mediator between God and man, who was placed at the head of this new order of things. God no longer communed or treated with his people directly and without any medium of access, but chose to be henceforth approached only through and by this new Director and Disposer of all things. Henceforth there was a Vice-gerent, wielding the concerns of all creatures and worlds by the word of his power—a new Head over all things for the sake of the church—an Heir of his Father's throne and dominion—a newly constituted Lord of all. In his name, by his authority, by his power, and at his word, all the concerns of the universe are managed and directed. The elders around the throne of God fall at his feet and reverently worship; before him angels and archangels bow; and at his presence devils tremble.

This new and delegated dominion is to continue, so long as the work of redemption goes on. When it is completed, "then cometh the end." Then will his delegated power—delegated to the God-Man for the sake of completing the work of redeeming grace—be given up to God the Father, and God will again resume his immediate and universal dominion. So says the apostle, in 1 Cor. 15, 24–28; and the nature of the case would seem to indicate that it must be so.
Here then is a new power, a new office, a new personage, and of course a new name. That the Logos is specifically meant or supposed by John, as the name in question, I would not positively affirm. His writings, however, seem to favour the supposition. His Gospel introduces us, in its first sentence, to the Logos, as becoming the incarnate Redeemer; and when, in holy vision, he sees him at the head of his great army, he tells us that his name was called the Word of God, Rev. 19, 13.

Perfectly natural and congruous is it, therefore, that this new name should be inscribed on the mitre of his followers, when they are advanced to the dignity of the high-priesthood. Indeed, what less could be expected, than that the subjects of the Prince of Peace should wear his livery, and have his name upon their frontlets? Yet this is a new name. It is not holiness to Jehovah, but ἡγεμόν, or ἔγνω τῷ Ἀγγελῷ! Such will be the frontispiece of their mitres, so long as the mediatorial dominion shall continue.

One circumstance more, and I have done. What means the clause, ὅ ὁδότης ὕπερ εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμπάνων, which no one understandeth excepting him who receiveth? This can be explained only by a reference to a Jewish custom in regard to the word Ἰ Jehovah, i.e. as we pronounce it, Jehovah. But every Hebrew scholar well knows that the Jews have never pretended to give the true sound of this word. The vowel points attached to it belong to the word מ; and so the Jews have read it always, excepting that in some cases of duplicate appellations they read it as בָּרָס, and pointed it accordingly. Hence, among the more than fifteen hundred times in which the word Jehovah occurs in the Old Testament, we find no example of any attempt on the part of the Seventy ever to make out the sound of the word יהוה. Always do they translate it by κυριος, when it is read as בָּרָס, or by θεός when it is read בָּרָס. Hence we know, that the custom of never attempting to sound the word יהוה in common parlance, preceded the date of the Christian era; how much older than this date it is, it would be difficult to say. But be this as it may, when the Apocalypse was written, the word יהוה was regarded by the Hebrews as something too sacred and awful to be uttered. None but the high-priest knew how it should be uttered, and he could utter it only in the most holy place. So says Philo, in his book De Vita Mosis, when speaking of the high-
priest's mitre: "A golden plate was made like a crown, having four engraved characters of a name [i.e. יהוה], which it was lawful only for those whose ears and tongue were purified by wisdom to hear and to utter in the sanctuary, but for no one at all in any other place." To the same purpose Josephus speaks in Antiq. II. 12. 4. Thus run his words: "And God made known to him [Moses] his own name [יהוה], which before had not been disclosed to men; respecting which it is not lawful for me to speak." Josephus, being himself a priest, might possibly have heard the name in the temple; and therefore he does not say that he had no knowledge of it, but only that he cannot lawfully utter any thing respecting it. Besides this, Theodoret, in his Greek commentary upon Exodus, Quest. XV, says: "This name [יהוה] is not uttered by the Hebrews, nor do they attempt to pronounce it with the tongue." He speaks, of course, respecting common usage among them. And to the like purpose Eusebius speaks, in Præp. Evang. XI, when he says: "It [this name] is something which cannot be spoken or uttered by the multitude." That he means the name Jehovah, is plain; because he says, that it was "an appellation which the Hebrews designated by four letters." In the same chapter he says again: "The proper name of God is unutterable and not to be spoken, nor is it even to be ideally conceived by the mind."

From all this it is very apparent, that none but the high-priest, or those on whom his functions might devolve, had knowledge respecting the true pronunciation of the word יהוה on his mitre. But he was himself an exception. In the sanctuary he might and did utter it. The privilege, therefore, was high and exclusive.

Twice does the writer of the Apocalypse refer to this distinctive privilege and peculiarity; once in the text under examination, and again in chap. 18, 12, where he represents the Logos as wearing a diadem, "on which was inscribed a name that none understood but himself," viz. the wearer. We cannot doubt therefore to what source we are to apply, for an explanation of the phraseology before us.

The sum of the meaning is, that the conqueror in the Christian warfare will not only be admitted to partake of the manna in the most holy place, but that he will wear a diadem on which the unknown and unutterable name is inscribed. In other words: The conqueror shall be advanced to the dignity, honour, and privilege
of the high-priest of the sanctuary—not on earth, but in heaven. The *new name* which he shall bear in his mitre, shall designate him as the consecrated servant of the *new Regent* of the universe, the Lord of all; and be the token of admission to all the privileges and honours conferred upon those who held such a rank.

One thought more must not be omitted. The awful, adorable, unutterable name of the ancient נָפָר should be commuted for one under the new dispensation, which was an *equivalent*. In other words, this new name should be equally significant, equally honourable, equally adorable. This is the substance. The idea, that it was not to be known or ever uttered, is not the necessary essence of the matter. Awful silence is only a token of the profoundest reverence. The new dispensation is one of revelation and light, rather than one of concealment and mystical secrecy. But all which belonged to the unuttered and unutterable name of ancient days, is to belong to the new name in the latter day—the times of the Messiah.

Here, in an indirect way, but still in a very striking one, and which does not easily admit of a refutation, the claims of the Messiah to the full honours and dignity of the Godhead are plainly conceded and declared. The Apocalypse abounds in similar intimations with regard to this most important subject. This book deserves a fuller investigation, with respect to this matter, than it has yet received. Few readers are well acquainted with the variety of ways in which it recurs to the transcendent glory and excellency of the Redeemer; fewer still, with the overpowering arguments which it supplies, to prove that he is God over all and blessed for ever.
IV.

THE LORD’S SUPPER IN THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH.

REMARKS ON 1 CORINTHIANS, XI. 17–34.

By M. STUART, Professor of Sacred Literature in the Theological Seminary at Andover

TRANSLATION.

17 Moreover, while I give these directions, I praise you not that you come together not for the better but for the worse.
18 For, first, when you come together in public assembly, I hear
19 that schisms exist among you, and in part I believe it; for there must needs be even heresies among you, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you.
20 Moreover, when ye come together in the same place, it is
21 not to eat the Lord's Supper; for each one takes beforehand his own supper at the time of eating, and one is hungry, but
22 another drinks freely. For have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? Or do you think lightly of the church of God, and put to shame those who have not? What shall I say to you? In this matter I do not praise you. For I received of the Lord that which I also communicated to you; that the
23 Lord Jesus, in the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks he brake it and said: [Take, eat,] this is my body which is broken for you; this do
24 in remembrance of me. In like manner also [he took] the cup, after supping, and said: This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do, so often as ye shall drink it, in remem-
25 brance of me. For so often as ye shall eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death until he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty in respect to the
26 body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself,
27 and so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup; for he
who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh con-
demnation to himself, making no distinction in respect to the
body of the Lord.

30 On account of this, many are weak and sickly among you,
31 and some have fallen asleep. For if we would pass judgment
32 upon ourselves, then we should not be judged; but being judged
of the Lord, we are chastened in order that we might not be
33 condemned with the world. Wherefore, my brethren, when
34 ye come together in order to eat, wait for each other. If any
one is hungry, let him eat at home, so that ye may not come
together unto condemnation. As to other matters, I will set
them in order when I come.

My object is not to write a minute commentary on this passage
throughout. I have translated it anew, because I thought, in some
instances, that the sense might be made more perspicuous, and
somewhat more true to the original Greek, than it is in our common
English version; and thus the necessity of a more particular com-
mentary, for my purposes, might be superseded. Very few remarks
are necessary in the way of vindicating and explaining my version;
and those few I shall immediately subjoin, in order that the strain
of remark in the sequel may not be interrupted by any thing of this
nature.

I have followed the text of Hahn's edition of the New Testament,
recently reprinted in New-York. This of itself occasions some
slight variations from the English Version. In v. 24, the words,
take, eat, it will be perceived, are included in brackets; and the
reason of this is, that the authority of the text in relation to these
two words is not clear. The probability is, that they ought to be
omitted. The sense is not materially changed by the omission.

In respect to v. 17, the words τοῦτο παραγγέλλων while I give
these directions, seem to me plainly to refer to what the apostle had
been saying in the context which precedes; and not, as even seve-
reral recent critics interpret it, as referring to the sequel. Schisms
among you, v. 18, refers to divisions of a party nature, which
developed themselves in the public assemblies of the Corinthian
church; which we can readily assent to as a fact, after reading
what the apostle has said in chap. 1–4. The heresies mentioned in
v. 19, seem to be something different from these, and of a more ag-
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gravated nature; although, as the sacred writer suggests, δει εἰλοῦ, i. e. they must take place, on account of the corruption of the human heart, and in order that the truly faithful may be distinguished. They seem to involve some error in doctrine or practice, or perhaps in both, more serious than what is designated by schisms.

It may not be unworthy of remark, that the word πρόστωμ first, in v. 18, is nowhere followed by a δεύτερον secondly, in the context. In the room of this I suppose the οὖν to be employed in v. 20, which, in its original meaning, designated some kind of separation or exclusion; but by later usage it seems at the same time to denote also a connexion in some sense with what precedes. What belongs to one genus, but differs as to species, so to speak, may be connected by οὖν, as in the present case. The first thing which the apostle blames, is the schisms among the Corinthians; the second is the irregularity and undue behaviour which were exhibited on sacramental occasions. The first he merely glances at here; the second is the subject of the whole remainder of the passage which we have quoted above.

We come now to consider some of the leading topics in this latter and principal part of the passage.

Paul first complains, that they do not come together to eat the Lord's Supper. The meaning plainly is, that they do not come together to eat it in a becoming manner, viz. as the principal or leading object of assembling together. What then hinders this? The sequel tells us: “Each takes beforehand his own supper, at the time of eating,” i. e. when supper-time arrives. But what was his own supper? Unquestionably it was a supper which was eaten antecedently to the proper Lord's Supper, and which was so familiarly known to all the ancient churches under the name of ἄγάπη, or more usually ἄγάπαι, love-feast. This was furnished by each member of the church according to his ability. The natural consequence was, that the rich furnished themselves with a sumptuous meal, while the poor were destitute. Of course, this naturally gave rise to irregularities of several kinds. First, a great inequality between the members of the church was manifested in this way; some feeding sumptuously and drinking freely, while others were hungry and destitute. Feelings of pride and contempt on one hand, and
of envy and repining on the other, would be the inevitable consequence. Secondly, both parties, in consequence of this, were placed in a very unfit condition to celebrate the memorials of a Saviour's dying love. The full and perhaps surfeiting meal of the rich, and the scanty portion of the poor, or in many cases their entire destitution, while they looked on and saw others feasting, was very unpromising preparatory discipline for one of the most solemn of all ordinances, one which above all others ought to be celebrated with the spirit of humility and brotherly love.

Beyond these natural consequences of such a state of things, it appears that there was much incivility among the more wealthy members of the church. Paul complains, that one προλάβας takes beforehand (i.e., before the proper time) his own supper, v. 21; and again, in v. 33, he directs them to wait for each other, i.e., to wait until all can sit down and take the supper in question together and at the same time; as it became Christian brethren to do. In other words, if this fore-meal must be allowed and practised, he insists that it shall be so regulated as not to give rise to the evils of which he complains.

But does Paul in fact approve of this fore-meal at all? It strikes me quite in the opposite way. What says he? "One is hungry, but another drinks freely. Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" In other words: What has all the manifestation of this difference of condition and treatment, this hunger of one and full-feeding of another, to do with such an occasion? If ye must feast, why not at your own houses? The church is not the place for common meals. Refection to gratify the senses is utterly foreign to the nature of the occasion, and even alien from it.

That the eating or drinking to excess on this occasion, was not the immediate result, or did not form any part of the celebration of the Lord's Supper, strictly and properly so named, is quite plain from the question which the apostle puts: "Have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" He did not intend to say, that it was a matter of propriety that they should celebrate the Lord's Supper respectively and separately, in their private houses; but he means that they ought to take their meals of refectio in their private dwellings. The Lord's Supper is, from the very nature and design
of the original institution, a public and common ordinance; common, I mean, to the society of believers or disciples. It is not only emblematical of the sufferings and death of Christ, but also of the union of believers in him, and of their communion with each other in and through that union in their common head. In order to attain the full measure of its significance, it is necessary that it should be celebrated socially and communicatively. And although I do not hold this idea in such a shape as would interdict, on all occasions and in all circumstances, what might be called private communion by particular individuals or families, yet the ordinary celebration of it should be by "meeting together to break bread," as was the case with the disciples of old.

To most Christians of the present day it seems somewhat strange, that the ancient churches should have ever introduced a usage so replete with dangers, as that of taking any thing like a festive meal on an occasion like that of celebrating the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Indeed, the origin of such a custom has never yet been satisfactorily explained, and is not fully known. To me, however, it has always seemed and still appears most likely, that the Agape were in imitation of the passover meal, which followed indeed the eating of the passover proper, but preceded the institution of the Lord’s Supper at its first celebration by Christ and his disciples. But let this be as it may, one thing is quite plain, which is, that a festive meal, taken on a religious occasion like this, must naturally give rise to many indulgencies, or at all events must present many temptations, which would be dangerous in their tendencies.

Facts early showed the state of the case to be as now supposed. Even in Paul’s day, the most gifted, perhaps, of all the churches planted by his hand, had begun to degenerate and to become prone to sensual indulgence, by means of such a custom. The love of superiority, the pride of riches, the attractions of luxury, were all fostered by display at the festive meal in question. Perhaps we might say even more. Some, it has been usually thought, were accustomed to intoxicate themselves on the occasion, by excessive use of the wine which was exhibited. Yet this is not quite certain, even from the literal interpretation of the words which Paul employs. The verb μεθύω does not necessarily and of course mean
to become intoxicated. It means also to drink freely or largely. The natural or usual consequence of this, indeed, would be intoxication in a greater or less degree. The noun, ἐσθημόνω, means wine, and μεθυόω naturally has a like sense; so that, if it were lawful to coin a new English word, we might render the Greek phrase, ὑπὲρ μεθυόων, in the following manner: “Another bewines himself.” Less than some kind of unlawful excitement arising from wine cannot be meant by Paul; but that intoxication in its higher stages and grosser developments, was intended, can hardly be credited. It is scarcely possible to suppose, with any good degree of probability, that a church, gathered by Paul, so long instructed by him, and furnished with such distinguished gifts of the Spirit, could have come together in connexion with making deliberate provision for a real drinking-bout or a season of beastly intoxication. I acknowledge that the word μεθυόω might be employed to designate intoxication in any degree; but the circumstances of the present case naturally forbid us so to interpret it in the passage before us, unless we are actually obliged so to explain it. But inasmuch as we are not, let us, for the honour of human nature and of the church at Corinth, take it in the most moderate sense which it will fairly bear. It is evident that Paul’s indignant feelings give a strong impetus to his mode of expression. He has employed μεθυόω in the present case, because it places the indecorum of that which he blames in the strongest light. Foundation for his expression, in point of fact, was not wholly wanting. Free drinking of wine at the antecedent festive meal must of course have given rise to a state of feeling, which at least must have bordered on intoxication. The holy indignation of the apostle could scarcely call this by a softer name than he has given it.

It is easy to perceive from what has been said, that by the clause now before us Paul does not characterize the manner in which the Corinthians celebrated the Lord’s Supper itself, when he speaks of drinking freely; but the state in which they approached the Lord’s table, in consequence of the antecedent festive meal, or the Agapae. It was the sensual indulgence of the communicants beforehand, and the improper condition that followed this, which Paul severely reprehends. How could any person approach the table of the Lord in such a state, and there eat and drink, “discerning the Lord’s body
aright;" or, rather, how could he be said "properly to distinguish the Lord’s body?" It could not be done. Sobriety of mind, humility, gratitude, devoted piety, are the requisites of a worthy communicant. The festive meal and much wine are no right preparatives for such a state, and the exercise of such graces.

Most readers, perhaps, are liable to some mistake in putting a proper estimate on the passage under examination, because Paul has not definitely separated the fore-meal from the Lord’s Supper itself. He had no need of so doing, for the sake of those whom he originally addressed. All was plain to them. Paul has spoken of both suppers, if I may so express myself, in such a way as if they were but one, merely because the celebration of both was in continued and uninterrupted succession; just as the passover-meal was followed by the Holy Supper, when this last was instituted by Christ. But still, when Paul asks whether the Corinthians have not houses to eat and to drink in, he furnishes us at once with the means of deciding, that the excess complained of was at a festive meal, or at least a meal for refection, and not properly during the appropriate celebration of the Lord’s Supper. A knowledge of the customs of the ancient churches enables us fully to dissipate any obscurity, that may at first seem to rest upon the apostle’s language.

It may be proper to add a few words more, in relation to the Agapæ. The inconveniences and indecencies of which Paul complains, were soon felt by the churches. At an early period, they began to postpone the Agapæ to the Lord’s Supper, so that the communicants might approach the table of the Lord in a fasting and sober state. Even this was insufficient to forestall the mischiefs that might so easily arise. Clement of Alexandria complains much of the irregularities occasioned by them. In like manner, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Gregory Nazianzen speak. No wonder then that we find the pious Ambrose very intent upon abolishing the custom of holding the meal in question. The Council of Carthage (A. D. 397) forbade it. So did the Council at Laodicea, about 364; and in the same manner decided the Council Aurel. and the Council of Trulla at a later period. Mostly,
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however, these Councils merely expelled the feast from the churches. But of course, by such a measure, it soon lost its good reputation, and went into desuetude. In modern times, the Moravians, the Methodists, and some others, have revived the custom; yet it is partial only, and with strenuous caution against the ancient abuses.

Another question has been agitated in respect to this excess of the Corinthian church. *What kind of wine was employed, on the occasion of celebrating their sacrament?*

At first, it seems as if no question could be made about the answer that must be given. All would naturally be prone to say: Intoxicating wine. Yet the words of themselves will hardly render this quite certain. It is clear that μέθυ means wine of all sorts; for it embraces every kind of liquor, at least every kind in a drinkable state, which is made from grapes. Its predominant sense is that of strong wine. If, however, a liquor had been made from grapes but a short time; if it had been made from dried grapes; in a word, if it were in this state or that, of this quality or that, in case it had any intoxicating quality, it might be called by the generic appellation of μέθυ. In fact, even mead, or any other intoxicating liquor, might be called μέθυ. The verb which Paul employs, and which has already been the subject of remark, merely shows that the persons concerned drank freely of μέθυ. On the strength of this, and on the state or condition of respective individuals, depended of course the greater or less degree of excitement that was consequent.

Still, the impression from the whole account of Paul is, that the Corinthians rendered themselves unfit to approach the table of the Lord by their indulgence in μέθυ; and the conclusion from all this must of course be, that it was more or less an intoxicating liquor.

It is not absolutely certain, indeed, that the same kind of wine which was drunk at the Agapæ or fore-meal, was also drunk at the proper Lord's Supper. Yet I think no one can well doubt this. Had there been any distinction made by the Corinthians in this respect between the two suppers, one can hardly see how some kind of reference to it could be avoided. Certainly, if any thing important depended on a particular sort of wine at the communion
proper, some precept must have been given in some part of the New Testament, if not in the passage before us. But as there is none, so it would seem that nothing important was regarded as being dependent on the sort of wine employed. In this respect, therefore, the churches seem to be left to such liberty as circumstances may render necessary or desirable.

Still the question is not without some interest: What sort of wine was probably used by Jesus, when he instituted the Last Supper?

It is not my main object, at present, to discuss this question. I will therefore only make a few suggestions here, of results to which my examination of this matter has brought me.

The well known custom of the Jews, from the first institution of the Passover, of excluding every kind of leaven or fermented bread from their dwellings, when the season for this festival arrived, needs nothing more, in this place, than a bare mention. It was strictly a matter of divine command to do this. But when the days of "tithing mint, anise, and cummin," came, an over scrupulous attention to this command, like that to all others which had regard to external rites, was naturally to be expected. Not only leavened bread (ןָּסֶף), i.e. bread fermented, but other things which had undergone fermentation, were, as we know, excluded from the passover-meal. Perhaps, however, the usage which was carried so far by the Jews, arose mainly from strict regard to the supposed real meaning of the command in Ex. 12, 15. 13, 3. 7. al. which is not expressed by declaring that the Hebrews should not eat fermented bread (ןָּסֶף), but by declaring that they should not eat נָּסֶף i.e. any thing fermented. Now as the word eating is, in cases without number, employed to include a partaking of all refreshments at a meal, that is, of the drinks, as well as the food, the Rabbins, it would seem, interpreted the command just cited as extending to the wine, as well as the bread, of the passover. Wine is not only capable of fermentation, but in fact is not properly wine, in the usual and strict sense of the word, until it has been fermented. The Rabbins, therefore, in order to exclude every kind of fermentation from the passover, taught the Jews to make a wine from raisins, or dried grapes, expressly for that occasion; and this was to be drunk before it had time to ferment.

Superstition, some may call this; and perhaps it is. I am dis-
posed to believe that the original precept of Moses had reference only to the bread of the passover, and not to any drink that might be used. In fact, not one word is said about any drink on that occasion, when it was first instituted. We know not whether wine was drunk at all; although it is not improbable that it might be, at least by many families. But there is no prescription respecting it.

When the Jewish custom began of excluding fermented wine from the passover-feast, is not known. That the custom is very ancient; that it is even now almost universal; and that it has been so for time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, I take to be facts that cannot be fairly controverted. I am aware that Professor Maclean, in his sharp-sighted criticism on some productions of our English brethren respecting temperance, has avowed different convictions on this subject, and vouched for the contrary of these propositions. But I am fully persuaded, that he has, on this point, been misled by partial testimonies, and that only loose and half-Jewish synagogues or societies of Jews, are accustomed to use fermented wine at the passover. I take this to have been as rare among strict and conscientious Jews, for time past indefinite and unknown, as the use of water only at the sacramental table among churches. I do not say this in order to disparage his criticisms; which are evidently the fruit of much labour and great acuteness. I say it merely to correct what I must believe to be a mistake, in this part of his critical essay. For the rest, he has shown that not a few errors in both classical and sacred exegesis, have been committed by the English writers in question. Pity that so good a cause had not been more guardedly and skilfully and philologically defended, than it has been by those writers!

I cannot doubt that קֶם, in its widest sense, was excluded from, the Jewish passover, when the Lord's Supper was first instituted; for I am not able to find evidence to make me doubt, that the custom among the Jews of excluding fermented wine, as well as bread, is older than the Christian era. I am aware that the Rabbins themselves have had dispute at times in respect to this point. But as the case stands before my mind, it seems quite certain that Jewish orthodoxy demands exclusion of fermented wine.

What then is the natural deduction from this? It must be, that at the institution of the Lord's Supper newly made wine was em-
WHAT WINE WAS USED?

ployed. We cannot well suppose, that Christ himself would have deemed this important. But when he bade his disciples prepare for the feast of the passover, he gave them no special directions. Of course they would make the usual and common preparations. It follows then, unless I am wholly in error with regard to the Jewish usage, that new wine was used at the original institution of the Lord’s Supper. There is no probability that two different kinds of wine were provided for the occasion; for the disciples, who had made the requisite preparation, knew nothing as yet of the Lord’s Supper.

There is a passage in Matt. 26, 29 and Mark 14, 25, which seems to me to allude to the kind of wine employed on this occasion; which passage, because this has been overlooked, has long been a crux interpretum. After distributing the cup, the Saviour says to his disciples, that he shall “no more drink with them of the fruit of the vine, until he shall drink it έκ καινού, new, with them in the kingdom of his Father.” Whether it means to drink new wine in the kingdom of God, is the question before us. Let us hear Kuinoel: “Many interpreters explain it by vinum praestantius, excellentius,” i.e. wine of the better sort. But, as he well adds: “Vix probari poterit,” this cannot well be proved. Indeed there is no foundation at all for such an exegesis. But how shall we expound, if not in this way? “I am more pleased,” says he, “with Theophylact’s exposition, καινός τρόπως, i.e. in another way, under different circumstances; so that καινός is put for κατὰ καινόν, and καινόν means the same as ἐστεροῦ, i.e. different.” Sic! But the difficulty here is, that καινόν does not stand adverbially, and so cannot stand for κατὰ καινόν; but, in Matt. 26, 29, it agrees with αὐτῷ which refers to γέννημα ἀμπέλου; that is, new refers to the fruit of the vine, and to nothing else. The question then remains in statu quo: What is new wine in the kingdom of God?

De Wette solves the difficulty, by saying that ‘it is called new here in reference to the future renovation of all things at Christ’s coming. It refers to an ideal celebration of the Supper in a glorified state.’ This is hitting the point with more dexterity; but still, even this does not quite satisfy the curious inquirer. Why is the wine to be new, on the future occasion suggested, any more than the bread, and all things else which belonged to the apparatus for
the occasion? There seems, then, to be no special point in this exegesis? Such an explanation leaves, after all, the main and distinctive difficulty still untouched.

What now if the wine was made new, on occasion of the passover, and the epithet new refers to this? It is no objection to this view, that the Saviour has said, in Luke 5, 39, that 'the old wine is better than the new;' for this has reference merely to the gratification of the taste. It was no object, at the passover-meal, to gratify the taste. Unleavened bread and bitter herbs were the appropriate viands, on that occasion. The sort of wine, therefore, which would least gratify the taste, would seem to be much better in keeping with these. Why may we not understand Jesus then, as saying, that he should no more celebrate a passover or supper with his disciples, until he should sit down with them at the feast which divine love will prepare, in his Father's house which has many mansions? There he is, according to other passages of Scripture (Rev. 3, 20), to sup with his followers. It is not the excellence of the viands to which we ought to suppose a reference here to be made. On another occasion, that might be very appropriate. But here something in the heavenly world is referred to, which bears an analogy to the passover and the supper on earth. And what did these celebrate? The first celebrated the deliverance of God's people from the destroying angel who smote the Egyptians, and their deliverance too from the yoke of bondage; the second the deliverance from eternal death and from the bondage of sin, through the death of Christ. How natural now to refer to the renewal of such a celebration in the world of glory! To speak of the wine exhibited at that feast as new, was as much according to the usages and views of the time when this was uttered, as to characterize the nature and object of the feast to be renewed in the world of light and love. The circumstance that the wine was more or less grateful to the taste, is here left out of the question. It is a renewal of the glorious jubilee of freedom—of eternal deliverance, which constitutes the main point in the discourse. And the simple fact of saying that the wine was to be new, at once pointed out to the disciples the nature and object of the future feast.

All literal eating or drinking I understand, of course, is to be
excluded by the nature of the case. But the diction assumes its particular hue, because it is borrowed from literal usages. The whole becomes, when thus understood and interpreted, fraught with significant and beautiful sentiment. Construed in the usual way, it either violates the common principles of philology, or else has but an imperfect and one-sided meaning, which is incapable of any satisfactory explanation.¹

So much for the new wine, most probably drunk at the first Lord's Supper. Is it obligatory on Christians to employ it now?

I think not. I am fully persuaded, that the use of it at first was merely accidental, that is, merely because on that occasion no other was at hand. Any other would have been equally significant, and is so now. Enough, that an element which may fairly and appropriately symbolize the blood of Christ, is used. This is the essence of the celebration by this element. Where the essence is well provided for and fairly exhibited, the Lord's Supper is duly celebrated, so far as its material symbols are concerned. The ordinance of the supper is designed to show, that what the bread and wine are to the body for refection and the imparting of strength, the like is the body and blood of Christ to the soul for its spiritual nourishment and growth. This is the sum. It is a great truth which is to instruct, to edify, to exhort, to rebuke, to comfort. It is this, applied by the Holy Spirit, and blessed by him, which makes the sacrament profitable, in a spiritual way, to the worthy partakers.

If any one is still scrupulous about the kind of wine, and thinks that we must copy exactly the original model, because the Saviour has said, "This do in remembrance of me;" then why does he not reason in the same way with respect to the bread? It is clear that unleavened bread only was used in the first celebration. No other could be had. And why does he not extend this to the kind

¹ Perhaps, after all, the curious inquirer might ask, Whether the future new wine here spoken of, may not rather imply distinction and antithesis in respect to that which was then present? Or, he might ask, If the epithet new is to be urged as in the text, and cannot be understood in some such way as that which De Wette above suggests (p. 509), how are we then to understand the new song of Rev. 14, 3? or the new name of Rev. 2, 17? See above on p. 475. —Ed.
of room in which the Supper is to be celebrated, viz. in an upper loft? Why not to the form of the table or triclinium; to the position, lying down on the left arm; to the dress of the guests; to the kind of furniture; to the season of the celebration, at evening? The scrupulous man, who perplexes himself so much about the wine, holds himself quite free and easy in regard to all these things; and yet they belong as much to the This do, as the wine which is to be employed on the occasion.

Of one thing we are certain. Neither Jesus nor his apostles have once made mention of ὀλυρόν, wine, still less of any particular ὀλυρόν, in any prescriptions concerning this ordinance. It is the fruit of the vine and the cup, of which they have spoken. They have therefore left the churches at liberty to choose the 'fruit of the vine' in what way they judge best. There is only this implication throughout, viz. that the significance of the symbol should not be sacrificed nor obscured, and that all should be done decently and in order. More than this cannot be shown. It is out of question about establishing any certainty, that Jesus and his disciples made use of wine that had been fermented. The probability, at least, is strongly against this. And on the other hand, it is equally out of question about enforcing a strict and literal use of new wine on this occasion; because the use of it, if it was employed at the first institution of the Lord's Supper, was evidently the mere result of their present circumstances, and not of any choice on the ground that one particular species of wine was deemed specially important.

One other question, moreover, intimately connected with this subject, here presents itself. In case the Saviour and his disciples did employ the common fermented wine of Palestine, did they drink it pure, or diluted with water?

As to any decision of this from the New Testament, by any express prescription, or any certain implication, from what is said, it is in vain to look for it. Nothing is said respecting it. Inference from circumstances is all which is left us as a ground of argument. What then is the probability, as gathered in this way?

It will be conceded by all reasonable interpreters, that it is probable the usual method of drinking wine among the Jews was practised. And what was this? Among sober men in Roman and
Grecian countries, we know from abundant testimony, as Athenæus has shown us in his Deipnosophist, that wine was always drunk by mingling it with water. Among the Hebrews we cannot well suppose less of prudent caution to exist; certainly not among men of piety and virtue. Accordingly, when eternal Wisdom prepares her feast, "she mingles her wine" (Prov. 9, 2), that is, she dilutes it with water, that it may be fitted to drink. "Wine and milk," the thirsty are invited to come and take, Is. 50, 1. There is a mingling of wine with intoxicating drugs, sometimes spoken of in Scripture, which is the opposite of this; and such a mingling is designed to make it stronger. But there is no room to suppose any thing of this nature here. The customs of the day make it nearly certain, that if wine was drunk at the passover, which was fermented and therefore intoxicating, it must have been drunk with water. We cannot indeed absolutely prove that this was done, when the Supper was instituted; but the facts stated above render it altogether probable.

There is another way, however, in which light may be cast on this part of our subject. This is by reference to the usages of the early churches, during the first four or five centuries of the Christian era. What then were these usages? How did those churches suppose the ordinance was to be celebrated, so far as it concerns the state in which the wine was to be received?

Happily our answer to this question is plain and certain. So far back as the time of Justin Martyr (fl. A. D. 140), the testimony begins respecting this subject, and there is a continued series of it which puts the matter past all reasonable doubt.

It would seem that the ancient church thought little or nothing of the question, as to what particular sort of wine was drunk at the original institution of the Lord's Supper. It was the current and general belief, that red wine, such as Palestine more usually affords, was exhibited; but the colour was generally regarded as a thing of little or no consequence, and therefore placed among the ἄδιάφορα.¹ Not so, however, in regard to the mingling of the wine with water. The fact that this custom was universal, shows, it must be conceded, that the churches in general regarded it as probable, that the

¹ See Augusti, Denkwürd. VIII. p. 290 sq.
Saviour had employed fermented wine. But however this may be, the object of mingling wine with water was twofold: first, and more specially, to avoid all approach to intoxication; secondly, to render it as a table-drink more palatable to the taste, and more adapted to quench thirst. In general the Gentile churches cannot be supposed to have known the peculiar scruples of the Jews about the wine at their passover, much less the grounds of them. The custom of drinking common wine at the sacramental ordinance, (which was certainly a very early one, for it must have been practised by the church at Corinth, as appears from the passage of Scripture under examination,) was adopted independently of Jewish scruples. There was no particular reason why churches should shun the use of γυμν, certainly no such reason as influenced a Jew. Whatever then was the wine drunk by Christ and his disciples, it would not, since no precept is given in respect to the kind, be regarded as a model which must be obligatory. It was not so. The fact that the early churches made use of common wine stands unquestioned and unquestionable. Thence the custom that we now inquire after, viz. that of mingling their wine with water at the sacramental table.

The Greek and Latin Fathers are full of references to this usage. The Greeks had two names for the wine when duly prepared for the Lord’s Supper: viz. καλλά, mixture, (from the verb καλλάνειμα,) and καλλάως, which properly signifies the act of mingling, but was also employed in a passive sense for mixture. In exact correspondence with this, the Latin fathers use mixtum and temperatum, i. e. mixed, tempered. Wherever we find these appropriate names, in reference to the liquid element at the table of the Lord, there we find the idea definitely conveyed, that the wine had been mingled with water.

Let us begin our testimony with Justin Martyr, who speaks of the Lord’s Supper, and in designating the elements of it, he says: “τὸν ἑκαριστήθηντος ἄρτον, καὶ ὁμον καὶ ὑδάτως, i. e. the bread blessed, and wine and water.” ¹ Irenæus speaks of the temperamentum calicis, employed in the eucharist;² and again he says: “Quando mistus calix et fractus panis, percipit verbum Dei, fit Eucharistia sanguinis et corporis Christi,”³ that is, “when the mingled cup and

¹ In Apolog. II. ² Hær. IV. 57. ³ Ibid. V. 11.
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the broken bread perceives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ." Cyprian of Carthage, in the beginning of the third century, has a passage too long to transcribe, but which I must translate: "You know we are admonished, that the tradition of the Lord should be regarded in offering the cup; nor should any thing be done by us different from that which the Lord formerly did for us; so that the cup, which is offered in commemoration, should be offered mingled with wine. For when Christ says, I am the true vine, the blood of Christ is not water but wine." With this view he goes on to refute some who employed only water in the cup. In the sequel he comes to show, that water symbolizes the baptism of Christ, and wine his blood. Both therefore, as he avers, must be united. This he confirms in the following manner: "If wine only is offered, the blood of Christ begins to be without us. If water only is offered, the people begin to be without Christ. But when both are mingled and joined together in one entire amalgamation, then is completed the spiritual and heavenly sacrament. Thus the cup of the Lord is not water alone, nor wine alone, but both commingled." He then goes on to show, that in like manner water is mingled with the other element, viz. the bread. In the sequel, he speaks of neglecting this custom, and says that the neglect may be venial, where it proceeds from ignorance, and then adds: "But for us, who are admonished and instructed of the Lord, that we should offer the cup mixed with wine, in accordance with what Christ did, we cannot be pardoned," in case we neglect to do this.

The third Council of Carthage (A.D. 253) declare themselves in the same way: "In the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, nothing should be offered more than what the Lord himself has taught us, namely, panis et vinum aquae mixtum, i.e. bread and wine mingled with water."*

In the same way speak Basil, in his Liturgy; Gregory of Nyssa, Orat. Catechet. cap. 37; Ambrose, Lib. V. c. 1, De Sacramentis; Chrysostom, in Liturgia; Augustine, De Doct. Christ. IV. c. 21; Proclus, de Tradit. Liturg.; Theodoret, Dial. I. 9 So also Beda, Damascenus, Rabanus Maurus, Paschasius, Nicephorus

Callistus, Lombardus, Thomas Aquinas, and innumerable others. Finally, the Council of Trent have fixed on using the κραμα or mixtum, as the universal rule for celebrating the Lord's Supper.

That at some periods there were those who called in question this usage, or at least regarded it as a matter of indifference, is clear from what the Council of Trulla (A.D. 692) deemed it necessary to decide, when they denounce Encratiles, viz. those who use nothing but water, and also the Armenians who used pure wine. Theophylact, Nicephorus, and many others, have spoken in the same way.

But although now and then a solitary voice was raised in favour of wine only, or water only, yet the opinion that the mixture of both was the proper element, seems to have been held with more general and longer continued unanimity, than almost any other matter of antiquity which pertained to rites or forms. One might almost literally say of it: Quod unum, quod semper, quod ubique.

The facts of later usage, then, are clear; I mean, simply, later than the apostolic age; for our testimony reaches to the very confines of this. What remains, then, to be said or thought, in relation to this part of our subject?

One thing, at least, is very obvious; and this is, that those persons whom we often find manifesting great zeal about the use of pure wine, at the sacrament, and expressing what they deem to be a holy horror and indignation at the thought of tempering the wine, can have informed themselves but very little about the usages of the churches in primitive days. Indeed this matter is so very plain, that one is astonished to see persons, of a grave cast and sedate character, willing to expose themselves to the charge of ignorance so profound as their zeal implies, in a matter that lies so upon the very surface of ancient ecclesiastical history. Their motives I do not attempt to impeach. But their zeal might surely be directed in a more intelligent and enlightened way.

On the other hand, all attempts to enforce the renewal of the practice in question, by urging obligation, seem to be equally unfounded. Even the Council of Trent dared not to vouch for it, that the Scriptures have enjoined any such thing. They merely place it on this ground: 'The tradition of the churches demands it.' As to the fact of tradition, they are unquestionably in the right; but
as to the obligation, Protestant churches believe, or ought to believe, that the Scriptures are the sufficient and only rule of faith and practice.

Enough of this topic. What is not matter of command in the Bible, certainly of express advice, is matter of discretion with the church. She is free to do as circumstances may demand.

It is to be hoped that such matters as these may soon cease to agitate our churches. There is, or ought to be, too much light abroad among us to render it tolerable, that churches and ministers of the Gospel should be disputing about matters such as these. When men shall have done with making commands by their own authority for the churches, these disputes will of course be terminated. And why should not every church be left to follow its own judgment as to expediency in such things? If the significancy of the symbol is preserved, then the ordinance is safe and sound. The ancient fathers said, that because blood and water issued from the wounded side of Christ, therefore wine (the representative of blood) and water ought to be used at the sacramental table. We may pay reverence to the feeling which prompted this sentiment; but we are not bound to assent to its logic. Above all, we are not bound to cleave to brandied wines, and these undiluted, as the only fit representative or symbol of a Saviour's dying blood. Yet so little is needed even of these, for the due celebration of the sacrament, that it would seem to be little less than a kind of superstition to declaim vehemently against them. If particular communicants are injured by them, or old and sinful appetites are revived in strength by the mere taste of them, then, in the name of all that is edifying, and charitable, and generous, let persons who suffer in this way have the ancient mixed cup—mixed to such a degree as shall guard against the danger! It must be something worse than even superstition, which would seriously object to this.

The substance of the ordinance, as to its externals, is significant symbolization of the broken body and blood that was shed of Christ. Let it be remembered, then, that the action of breaking the bread is one of the significancies; and this will exclude wafers, already made to hand. The pouring out is a part of the symbolic significancy of the blood poured out; and so the fruit of the vine must be in the liquid shape, in order that it may be poured out. I
do not say that either of these is so necessary as to render null the
ordinance, when it is neglected. I only say, that the appropriate
significancy of the ordinance cannot be fully attained without these
circumstances. I would not insist on any one kind of bread; nor
on any one kind of wine; and where neither could be attained, I
would not hesitate to use any other similar elements which go to
support animal life and health. But when the elements are attain-
able, that compare well with those originally employed, I would
always prefer them.

It is time to pass on to the consideration of some other parts of
the passage of Scripture before us.

This is my body which is broken for you . . . This cup is the

With the interminable controversies about the meaning of these
words, and the like ones in the Gospels, every reader is somewhat
acquainted. The history of them is no part of my present object.
The simple and necessary meaning of the words, as decided by the
laws of exegesis, is what I aim at.

My first remark is, that of no two substances, or real concrete
existences, differing of course in their attributes and accidents from
each other, can it possibly be said with truth, that the one is the
other. When I say, God is a rock, I cannot say he is one in a
literal sense, unless indeed I am a stupid heathen and believe a rock
in verity to be essentially divine. Of course, in the latter case, I do
not believe that God is a Spirit. But so long as I do believe that he
is a Spirit, it is impossible for me, as a rational man, to say that God
is a rock, and mean any thing more than that he is one in a figura-
tive sense, that is, that he is an immovable and safe bulwark and
defence, or rather an adequate protector and defender. I may well
and truly say, 'John is king, is a nobleman, is a husbandman, is a
mechanic, is a lawyer, a physician, a pastor,' and the like; because
all these are mere offices which he holds, or qualifications which he
possesses. But I cannot say that John is James, unless indeed I
mean that he has merely two names instead of one. And so in
every possible case. One substance or person cannot be another
substance or person, for the plain and simple reason, that two
substances or persons are not one person or substance. In all
this I assume merely that it is impossible for a thing to be and not
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to be, at one and the same time. This is so self-evident, that it is even incapable of any demonstration. It needs but to be stated, in order to be recognised and believed in the fullest possible manner, even without the consent of the will, if such a case were possible.

But if the sacramental bread is the actual body of Christ, then is it two different substances at one and the same time—a thing absolutely impossible. Even the Romanists see and endeavour to avoid the absurdity of this; for they aver, that after the consecration it changes its nature, and becomes what it was not before, namely, the body of Christ. But what is the evidence of this? All our senses decide against it, and how can they deceive us in such a matter? They may deceive us in some things, for a little while, and repeated trial may be necessary for full confirmation. But here the conclusion remains the same, after trials repeated ever so often. We cannot force any of our senses to recognise flesh and blood in the bread and wine of the sacrament; and how can we bring ourselves, then, to discredit what they do testify?

The Lutheran idea of con-substantiation, that is, that the body and blood of Christ are on, in, and under the bread and wine, does not much help the matter. Do our senses recognise the presence of body and blood? They do not. What is the evidence, then, that such is the fact? It is, say its advocates, the assurance of Christ, that his body and blood are on, in, and under the bread and wine. But where has Christ so said? I can find no passage like this in all the Scriptures. The Romanists are, in fact, nearer to his words here than the strenuous Lutherans. This is my body; this is my blood; such, it must be confessed, are the words of Christ in the Gospels. If a literal interpretation now must be given, the Romanists come the nearest to it. But how can they make this out? If the elements be veritably a human body and human blood, the breaking with the hands and the pouring out from the cup are neither of them possibilities. For a body to be broken and blood to be poured out, in such a case, it would be necessary that instruments of violence and of death should be employed. The fact of the breaking and the pouring out shows of itself, that the elements are in reality bread and wine still, even after the consecration. And to show that Christ's body and blood are on, in, and under the elements, one must give a sense to the words which is
neither literal nor figurative. But what meaning is that which belongs to neither of these classes?

This, however, is not all. When Christ and his apostles first celebrated the ordinance, he was not yet crucified. His body therefore was not yet broken, nor his blood poured out. But it is the broken body of Christ, and his blood poured out, which the bread and wine are said to be. If then we construe this literally, we make out a direct contradiction to facts. We make a thing to be and not to be, at the same time; we make out a broken body before it was broken, and blood poured out before it was poured out. All this, now, is plainly and absolutely impossible. We are forced, then, to consider the bread and wine as symbols merely, or else to give up the fundamental principles of human reason.

Nor is even this all. We may well ask, and we are bound to ask, What is the moral use or fitness of a literal eating of human flesh and blood? The Jewish legislator had the greatest horror of human sacrifices. The Bible everywhere exhibits a horror of it. And is the most sacred and sanctifying of all rites, then, to consist, under the mild and godlike dispensation of the gospel, of eating real human flesh and drinking human blood? Is this act of cannibalism, (forgive me, for what else can I name it?) then, the way of nearest approach to an all-perfect and glorious Redeemer? The literal act of eating human flesh and drinking human blood—is this to be our highest and noblest act of acceptable devotion, and to sanctify our souls? It is inconceivable; it is incredible; it is quite impossible, unless the very nature of God and man and all religion be changed.

Once more; when the sacrament is celebrated in all parts of the earth at one and the same time, (as it may be,) or in Europe and Asia, how is Christ's human body and blood to be present, and to be literally eaten and drunk at the same time? What kind of dimensions must this body have? And how can a human body be ubiquitous? Or, if the glorified body of the Saviour be meant, why should this be resembled to some Typhoeus of old in fable and song? I speak, however, only of his human body and blood; for these are the very things which are asserted to be eaten and drunk, but which, however, cannot be eaten and drunk unless they actually exist.
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This leads us to another consideration; which is, that the body and blood of Christ, as merely human, as proper flesh and blood, no longer exist anywhere. The apostle has told us in so many perfectly plain words, that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God;" and we know from the same authority, that the saints' bodies, after their resurrection, are to be "made like to Christ's glorious body." Now if flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, then Christ is no longer flesh and blood. How then can we eat and drink that which does not anywhere? It is not what Christ once was, that we are to partake of, according to the views in question, but what he now is. It is the now living bread, not that which lived eighteen hundred years ago. But this living and proper flesh and blood is not—is nowhere to be found. In heaven it cannot be, if Paul is in the right; on earth it has not been for these eighteen centuries. How then are we to feed on what does not exist anywhere, neither in heaven nor on earth?

I may be told, however, that 'it is Christ's glorified body which we are to feed upon.' But what does this mean? A glorified body, which the apostle says, in 1 Cor. c. 15, is a spiritual body—how is this to be eaten and drunk in a literal sense? What possible meaning or reason is there in such a suggestion? A spiritual substance literally eaten and drunk! The only thing to be said, is the same thing which a more reasonable enthusiast than the Romanists said long ago, in reference to another matter: Credo, quia impossible est. Even this, however, will not save the case. It is really neither more nor less than a downright absurdity.

Besides all that has been suggested, I may add, that the form of the text lying at present before us, offers an inexplicable difficulty to the advocates of transubstantiation or of consubstantiation. What says it? This cup is the New Testament in my blood. We are told that faith believes, and must believe, the exact words of Scripture true just as they present themselves to us respecting the sacrament of the Supper; the exact words, that is, taken in their literal sense. Let us put to the test this principle so often and so highly lauded by some. How stands the present matter? This cup—not the wine, but the cup—is what? Is the New Testament in my blood. A cup, then, is a New Testament; yea, a New Testament in the
blood of Christ! And what meaning, pray, has this declaration, when literally taken? No possible meaning, the Romanists themselves and all the mystics being judges. But is not Paul's authority as good as that of either of the Evangelists? Are his words less sacred, less intangible, than theirs? If not, why then must Paul's words be tropically or figuratively interpreted, and those of the Evangelists literally construed? The downright and inexpressible absurdity of Paul's words, if we literally interpret them, deter all men even from the attempt to do so. But in the case of This is my body and this is my blood, there is a little more room for mysticism to exert itself, and a little less of glaring and revolting absurdity. Yet, when searched to the bottom, the literal exposition of these words is not a whit less absurd than the like exposition would be of Paul's words.

I must appeal to what has already been said above, for illustrating and confirming this; and go on to make a few more suggestions in relation to the proper exegesis that ought to be given to the passage under consideration.

It is an idiom which pervades the Old and New Testament Scriptures, that when one thing is compared to another, or one thing symbolizes or represents another, by far the more usual method of expressing this, is to say that one thing 'is another. Now and then we have the assertion in plain words, that one thing is like another; but the declaration that it symbolizes or represents another, it would be difficult to find. Here the universal idiom is: One thing is another!

It would be easy to exhibit proofs that this statement is correct, beginning with the book of Genesis and ending with the Apocalypse. I must content myself with a moderate number of examples. When Joseph interprets Pharaoh's dream, he says, "The seven kine are seven years; and the seven good ears are seven years—and the seven thin and ill-favoured kine are seven years, and the seven empty ears blasted with the east wind shall be seven years of famine." So Isaiah, in his parable respecting the vineyard: "The vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the house of Israel, and the men of Judah his pleasant plant." So with Daniel: "The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom—and the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise," 7, 23. 24. Again:
"The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia; the rough goat is the king of Grecia; the great horn between his eyes is the first king," 8, 20, 21. So in Zechariah; this prophet sees seven lamps, and two olive-trees supplying them with oil; and he inquires of the angel, what these are; the angel's answer is: "This is the word of the Lord to Zerubbabel, and the two olive-trees are the two anointed ones, that stand by the Lord of the whole earth," Zech. c. 4. So in the discourses of our Saviour: 'The seed sown by the way-side, is he that heareth the word and speedily hath it taken from him by the wicked one; the seed sown in stony places is he that heareth the word, and speedily loseth it by reason of offence; the seed among thorns, is he that heareth the word, and in whom it is speedily choked by riches; good seed in good ground, is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it, and bringeth forth much fruit.' So in the parable of the tares: 'The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; the tares are the children of the wicked one; the enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels;' Matt. 12, 13. So in the Apocalypse: "The seven stars are the angels of the seven churches; and the seven candlesticks are the seven churches;" 1, 20. We find the like, moreover, in a multitude of other cases.

Nor is such language at all confined to prophecy and parable. To bring the matter as near home as possible, let us see what is said of Christ himself. 'He is the true light; he is the true vine; he is the way; he is the truth; he is the life; he is the resurrection; he is the good shepherd; he is the door;' and so of a multitude of other declarations of a similar tenor, in respect to all or any of which one might act the mystic, with as much consistency as the literal expounders of the sacramental words are wont to do. Food never can be wanting to gratify such an appetite. Every page of the Bible will supply it, if it may be treated in this manner.

But here I shall be met with loud remonstrances from the literal interpreters, and asked with an aspect full of rebuke, 'What! Are we then to set aside the Saviour's own words—This is my body—this is my blood? Is he not to be believed, on his own express declaration? Dare you do away the force of his words, and mar
all their excellence and beauty, by putting your own *figurative* interpretation upon them? What is this but to sacrifice the very life of Scripture to the vain reasonings of a skeptical mind?

It requires no great force of intellect, is my answer, to utter such rebuke, or invent such an apology as this. It is merely marching upon an old and hackneyed road, travelled, time out of mind, by all mystics and literal interpreters. Whenever such a man is resolved to carry through his own peculiar scheme of religion, so often as he cannot meet the objections which are brought against its extravagance and incongruity, he finds an easier way than appeal to argument and reason. He insists vehemently upon the simple declaration of the Scripture *literally* taken; and if any one will not receive it in that very shape, he stands convicted in his view of skepticism and opposition to the word of God.

I have, however, in despite of all this, been uniformly in the habit of supposing, that it is an established and immutable law of interpretation, that wherever we meet with a text of Scripture which, if literally construed, would make an absurd, an impossible, an inept, or a frigid sense, we are not only authorized but required to interpret it as having a *tropical* meaning. On any other ground, the Bible would most palpably be a book fraught with absurdities; and so would any other book.

But let us put to the test the mystic's principle, in a plain and easy way. *God is a rock; God is our sun; God is our shield.* Here then for the moment, I must, in order fully to illustrate what I mean to say, insist on a *literal* sense. But the mystic starts up with horror and indignation, and asks me, with a frowning and contemptuous aspect, whether I will presume to degrade the Almighty by asserting that he is literally a rock, or the sun, or a shield. Very well; and what is my reply? Merely what his own was, a moment since. 'How dare you now dispute the express declarations of the Bible? How dare you, by your glosses made out from your own scheme of theology, put an interpretation on the sacred and immutable words of the Holy Ghost—an interpretation, too, which does away all the force of the Scriptural declarations, and removes all the mystery which necessarily belongs to them?'

What has he now to answer? He will tell me, that my inter-
pretation is unreasonable; that it represents God as being something contrary to what he is represented elsewhere in the Bible; that it makes him material, finite, mutable, and the like. But how easily can I reply, (if his former ground is well chosen,) and say, ‘It is only your vain and carnal reasoning which so concludes. All this is only appealing to reason—to your own reason—as a standard, and then judging the whole matter by that. Reason has surely nothing to do with such a matter; faith—faith is the all in all. Your reason, forsooth, finds inconsistencies; your reason concludes that such an interpretation would be degrading to God; your reason undertakes, therefore, to mould the words of Scripture and give them a new shape. Presumptuous and daring man! How can you set up your darkened and erring and carnal reason against the plain and express declarations of eternal truth? Your business is to believe, and not to reason. You ought to fall down and adore what you cannot comprehend. Why should you presumptuously undertake to examine and to scan it?"

What now has this mystic to say for himself? He may say, perhaps, that the two cases are not alike; but this will not avail him. It is in his system, and for his purposes only, that they are not alike. Nothing can be plainer, than that it is in every way quite as consonant with the first principles of our rational nature, to say that God is a rock, is the sun, is a shield, as to say, that Christ, living now in heaven, is still flesh and blood, is eaten and drunk in a literal sense, and that he remains the same complete identical person, undivided and unmangled, while his flesh is in every part of the earth divided and masticated, and his blood distributed and swallowed down into the stomachs of countless human beings. I appeal to all that is sober reason on earth, whether the latter is not even a more revolting absurdity than the former.

One word on this so much lauded, and so often undefined, faith. What is true faith? It is believing what God has revealed. It does not consist in believing what he has not revealed. The belief of science, moreover, is not faith, and the belief of superstition is not faith. Faith is believing in things unseen, on the credit of revelation, or of God's word. This is plain. But what next? The next is, that we must first know what his word
says, or means, in order to believe with a true faith. It is the real meaning of Scripture which we are to believe. And how is this to be attained? I know of only two ways; the one by the laws of interpretation; the other by a new revelation. Those who make claim to the latter, are bound to establish their claim by working miracles; and when they do, we will begin to examine their claims de novo. Those who admit only the former method of finding the meaning of Scripture, are bound to abide by the laws of interpretation. We have no other standard of appeal.

These laws now decide, that an impossible, an absurd, a frigid, an inept meaning, can be no true meaning. A different supposition would virtually deny the common sense and intelligence of the sacred writers.

What is it then which determines and settles the laws of interpretation? If it be not reason, what is it? Are the laws of interpretation which are made without reason, laws to be followed and obeyed? If not, then reason has something to do in preparing for the work of faith. It has to settle, by some proper laws of interpretation, what is to be believed. Faith then performs her office, and believes.

Of what use, then, to insist on renouncing reason, in matters of religion? Why do you believe there is a God? Not because the Scriptures prove it; for they do not. You believe it, then, because reason proves it. But if the Scriptures did prove it, by what faculty would you judge of the weight of the argument presented? By this same slandered reason. What is it that judges of the sufficiency of evidence, that the Bible is the word of God? Is it not reason? Or is this matter to be settled and acquiesced in without reason?

I might go further still. We will even suppose that the church is to decide for all Christians, what they are to believe. How then is the church herself to make the decisions? With reason, or without it? If without it, whence her authority to bind us? Even if the Pope is the sovereign arbiter of faith, how is he to make his decisions as to the meaning of Scripture? With reason, or without it? And when Christians are called on to put implicit faith in their spiritual guides as interpreters of the Scriptures for
them; are they to be persuaded to do this by good sound reason, or without it?

Who does not see, now, that it is the very essence of absurdity, to pretend to decry and thrust out reason in matters of religion? It is all a farce. What mystics mean, then, is neither more nor less, than that their word is reason, their decisions law, their interpretations orthodoxy, and that all church power is therefore to be intrusted to their hands, and the faith of the world to be moulded by their views of reason. This is the simple state and ultimatum of the matter, when it is examined to the bottom.

But what binds all Christians to such a submission? What binds me to follow an interpretation of the Bible which I see to be absurd? I am bound to interpret the Bible for myself, so far as I can; and so is every other Christian, as well as I. Who has been made an authoritative interpreter, by Christ, or by his apostles? Where is he designated?

A man must show me, then, some good reason for believing that I eat and drink the body and blood of Christ in the literal sense, before I can possibly believe that such is the meaning of the sacramental language of Scripture. My faith is in the true meaning of the Bible; not in the mere form of its words. No meaning that is absurd, contradictory, degrading, inept, frigid, can be true. And all these in combination, belong to the interpretation of the mystics put upon the Saviour's words at the first institution of the sacrament.

And why such demands upon us, in this matter of eating and drinking Christ's body and blood? In what way can it ever be shown, or rendered at all probable, that such material participation of him is either essential to our salvation or advances our sanctification? "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost." Verily it is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that the Saviour speaks, "they are spirit, and they are life," John 6, 63. In other phraseology: It is divine truth which quickens, which converts, which sanctifies the soul; not indeed without the influence of the Spirit of God, but it is the chosen instrument by which that Spirit operates. "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation." "It is the truth whereby Christ makes his followers free."
"It is of God's own will, that he begets or regenerates us by the word of his truth." "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimonies of the Lord are sure, making wise the simple." Moral change is brought about only by means of moral truth. It is not rites and forms which can possibly change the soul or sanctify it; it is only the instruction that they are adapted to convey, which performs this work.

What other advantage, then, can we expect to reap from sacramental ordinances, than that which results from the truths which they teach? These ordinances, properly administered, convey in a most lively manner an impression of the love, the sufferings, and the death of Christ;—great truths, which must be salutary in their influence, unless the good that they may do is hindered by a perverse state of mind. Symbol is a lively and interesting mode of instruction. It has always been resorted to; and it ever may be, with great advantage, when properly managed. And it is in this way, that good may be reasonably expected from the symbols of Christ's broken body, and of his blood that was shed.

On the other hand, to expect holiness from the simple act of eating and drinking—of eating human flesh and drinking human blood—what is this but an airy, mystical, superstitious expectation? The mere agere actum of a matter, sanctifying of itself the soul by a mysterious and inexplicable operation! I appeal to the moral nature of man, and to all that is known of the means of grace, whether such a position is not altogether irrational and visionary.

"But you do away all the mystery of the Gospel, by such positions." Not at all. "God manifest in the flesh" is still the same mystery. A thousand things in the work of redemption are still mysteries. But let us not make puerilities into mysteries. Gospel-mysteries are not improbabilities, incongruities, impossibilities; they are something to excite our wonder and to command our veneration, but not to offend the first principles of our reason, and to annihilate the evidence of our senses. Every true mystery must, I readily concede, have something about it which is incapable of explanation; but every thing inexplicable because it is absurd and contradictory is not a mystery; above all, it is not one of the gospel-mysteries.
From the words before us, then, in 1 Cor. 11, 24, we may gather that the bread and the cup are symbols, bringing to mind the death of Christ, and setting it forth in a lively and impressive manner. In a word, they are memorials of his dying love.

So says the apostle himself. "This is my body, broken for you. This do"—for what purpose? to what end? "This do in remembrance of me." So with the cup. "This do in remembrance of me." The original Greek is more plain and certain than our English mode of expression. "This do εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, for the sake of, for the purpose of calling me to mind." This shows the object or end in view, by sacramental eating and drinking. The apostle claims no mystical design in this case; no inexplicable operations or end of the rite. It is simple, intelligible, altogether obvious to every reflecting mind.

If we are asked, now, whether the sacrament is not a sanctifying ordinance, our answer would be, that so far as it brings truth to mind and impresses it upon us, it is so. It has a common influence with other ministrations of the truth. Its peculiar solemnity entitles it to a high place among the means of impressing divine truth upon us—that truth which is of high and holy import.

One other circumstance should be noted here. The apostle has told us what is achieved by the sacramental rite; and of course he has told us what its leading object is. Let us hear him: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." He does not say, that so often as this is done, all are made actual partakers of the flesh and blood of Christ; but that his death is showed forth, declared, symbolized, by the due performance of this rite. Plainly this would be accomplished; and it is equally plain, that this must be the direct object in view when the rite is performed.

The Romanists, who deny the cup to the laity, will find it difficult to dispose, in a satisfactory way, of the text just cited. The eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup are joined together by the apostle, and made severally and jointly necessary to showing forth the Lord's death. On what authority, then, can one of these be omitted? Or how do they show forth the Lord's
death in a becoming manner, who reject the symbol of his blood that was shed?

I have only a few remarks to make on the close of the passage which I have undertaken to examine. What is the eating and drinking unworthily? And what is eating and drinking κρίμα, condemnation, to one's self?

In the passage before us, the ἄναξίως, unworthily, beyond all doubt, refers to the party spirit and the pampered state in which the Corinthians approached the table of the Lord. Μὴ διαχρίνω τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου, says Paul, that is, not being able to distinguish the proper showing forth of the Lord's death, by the elements of the Supper. They were in any state rather than in a devout and humble one, when they came to the table in such circumstances. Hence the duty was not performed in an appropriate manner. And hence the κρίμα, condemnation, of their demeanour. Hence some of them had been chastised by infirmities and sickness; yea, some had even been chastised unto death; καὶ κομῶνται ἱκανοὶ. If they would avoid these consequences, Paul admonishes them that they must avoid the sins which occasioned them. He tells them to come to the Lord's Supper with self-examination, with becoming trial of their state. They should pass judgment on themselves, and then it would be unnecessary that they should be brought under condemnation by the divine tribunal.

That it was a sin to approach the Lord's table in such a state of mind as the Corinthians indulged, is quite clear. That it was an unpardonable sin, can be made out on no proper ground. The fact that some were chastened even unto natural death, does not prove that their sin might not be forgiven, nor that they were absolutely impenitent to the last. It might be a very proper arrangement by a wise and holy Providence, that gross offenders should meet with condign chastisement, in order to deter others from the commission of the like sin. Still, pardon might be extended to all true believers, notwithstanding their error. Doubtless he who loved his own, loved them to the end; although it might at the same time be true, that he rebuked and chastened them.

All light or irreverent behaviour, then, or any state of mind which gives rise to it, at the Lord's table, is a sin, and exposes us to the divine displeasure and to God's righteous rebuke. Nothing
can ever be drawn from the passage before us, to show that a light and ordinary state of mind at the Lord's Supper does not deserve, and may not be followed by, severe chastisement from the great Head of the Church. I doubt not, that in the primitive age of Christianity there were some special developments of this nature, and for important purposes; but the same God and Saviour still reigns, and he does not love holiness, nor hate sin, less now than he did then. A profanation of the sacramental ordinance, in any respect whatever, now and evermore, must be peculiarly offensive in his sight.

V.

THE COMING OF CHRIST:


BY THE EDITOR.

Our Lord had taken his final leave of the temple and its courts; and in departing had uttered over it the dread prediction, soon to be so fearfully accomplished: "Verily, I say unto you, there shall not be left here one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." Retiring with his disciples to the Mount of Olives, he seated himself upon the heights over against the temple, where its courts and edifices, as well as the whole city, were spread out as on a map before him. Here, four of the disciples, Peter and James, and John and Andrew, propose to him privately the following inquiry:

2 Mark 13, 3.