

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

APRIL, 1847.

No. II.

ART. I.—*Horae Apocalypticae, or a Commentary on the Apocalypse, critical and historical; including, also, an examination of the chief Prophecies of Daniel, illustrated by an Apocalyptic Chart, and engravings from medals; and other extant monuments of antiquity.* By the Rev. E. B. Elliott, A. M., late vicar of Tuxford, and fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Second edition, with an Appendix, containing a sketch of the history of Apocalyptic Interpretation, &c. London: 1846.

WE have hitherto reviewed no books written in explanation of this mysterious portion of the inspired volume: deterred, chiefly, by the difficulty of the subject; and also by the vast discrepancy in the views of commentators. We feel, however, that this part of scripture ought not to be neglected; especially, as a blessing is pronounced on "him that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein." And of late, more than in former years, the attention of many learned men has been directed to the interpretation of the Apocalypse; and although, the disagreement among expositors continues as great as ever; yet, it is believed,

inthians, in which the Spirit of God, speaking by St. Paul, saw and spoke of a systematic caricature of the church of Christ, then commencing, by false apostles and deceitful workers, transforming themselves, in appearance, into ministers of righteousness and apostles of Christ; and declared it not to be a wonderful thing since Satan himself, the leader of the party, and the head of the mimic church, had succeeded in accomplishing the more difficult transformation of himself into the form of an angel of light—the practicability of the inferior and less difficult work being proven by the actual accomplishment of the superior and more difficult. By the same reasoning there is no ground for incredulity as to the issue of a complete series of coinage from the same mint—a perfect anti-church—a complete ecclesiastical organization, with any necessary multiplicity of ranks and orders of ministry, with a ritual more imposing and more burdensome than the Jewish; a superstition grosser and more impenetrable than the heathen, yet having the name of Christ and the language of religion ever in its mouth. And for the deliverance of the vitals of the world, from this worse than the vulture of the ‘Promethean fable, in unceasing, unresting warfare with every weapon of truth, we have prayerfully to look to the “wise and holy bounding and governing” of that providence of God, which is of a power above that of the evil Prince who wrought this system, and to the going forth of the residue of the Spirit from him, to turn the hearts of the deluded nations to the Lord Jesus.

ART. IV.—*Reading of History.*

EVERY one must be sensible that far less interest, as a general thing, is taken in history, than its importance demands; and that much less advantage is commonly derived from the perusal of historical works, than might reasonably be expected. Both these facts are no doubt in a measure to be attributed, to the entire want of any definite object in the mind of the reader. He reads history as he would a story, for the mere narrative. We wish to urge the importance of every student reading with his eyes open, and his mind awake, examining the causes, rela-

tions, and consequences of the events which the historian details.

It must be admitted, that it is often difficult to discover the causes of the facts of history; because when men are under the influence of corrupt passions, there is a great temptation to conceal their real purposes. The plans of statesmen are often shrouded in mystery. Men shrink back from the open acknowledgment of motives which are considered dishonourable, or which would be disapproved by the wise and virtuous. In all such cases there is a presumption, that there will be a studious concealment of the ultimate end; and unhappily many such examples are found in history. This temptation to cover evil with the guise of goodness and to deck crimes with names of virtue, increases the difficulty of which we have spoken. But still some progress may be made towards a just and rational conclusion, and we may at least approximate the truth. We are not at liberty however, to assume that certain motives exist without proof. We are no more at liberty to slander the dead than the living; and evil motives which are charged on an individual, when there is no evidence to prove their existence, constitute the essence of slander. We are under no obligations to believe, or to assert what we cannot prove, and if the evidence to establish a given fact does not exist, we may safely excuse ourselves from forming any opinion about it.

In all successful enterprises, men of course accomplish their purposes. Here then, it would seem, we have a clue to the motives of men. If the end is good the design must also be good. But even here we are embarrassed with difficulty. A good action may proceed from a bad motive, and *vice versa*. The man who establishes civil liberty among his countrymen, may do so from mercenary and selfish motives. Besides due allowance must be made for human plans thwarted, and human hopes disappointed. Men may be the unwilling instruments of doing good, because restrained and governed by influences which they cannot resist. There is a power which often says to the wicked man, Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther. In all cases however, there is a presumption that a good deed proceeds from a pure principle; and an evil deed from an unholy principle. Corrupt passions, like Christian graces, are gregarious. They are not often found alone. The existence of one therefore, may lead us to expect to find others also. Indeed the uncontrolled dominion of one sometimes proves the existence of

another. Envy cannot exist without ambition; for pain at the good of another implies a desire to possess that good ourselves. He who slanders his rival, may safely be regarded as having an inordinate thirst for fame; for he detracts from a rival's influence because it either does, or is supposed to detract from his own. Suspicions and jealousies generally spring from too ardent a desire for popular favour, and too much sensibility to our own reputation; for it is of the nature of disappointed ambition to charge on others the cause of its disappointment. Power acquired may be used for a benevolent or a selfish end; and we may safely draw the conclusion that power and influence, which are used for selfish ends, were acquired that they might be thus used. The poor may be oppressed, and the claims of justice may be disregarded, and human rights wantonly set aside; and he who does it, need not complain, if he be charged with a want of benevolence, of compassion, and of a sense of justice. There are certain results, which men are generally agreed, cannot be brought about by any but unholy passions. We may select as examples which will illustrate this truth, Hildebrand and Leo I., two men to whom the papacy is as much indebted as to any others, for the vast accumulation of power in the head of the Roman Catholic Church. They assumed authority unheard of before their day: they pretended to superiority over men who were their equals in many things, and their superiors in whatever ought to adorn the character of a minister of the meek and lowly Jesus. They discovered such a tenacity of newly gotten power, so much irritability and impatience of all opposition, and even reasonable remonstrance, and withal a disposition so intolerant, and tyrannical, that it is difficult to conceive by what other influence they could have been governed than a selfish ambition. There is also an external exhibition of temper, which proves the existence of the interior passion. Anger can be seen as well as painted; indeed it can be painted because it is seen. The same remark will apply to some other passions. Contemporaries, therefore, have the best opportunities of judging of the characters of men; and when they possess the means of knowing the secret purposes of the men whose actions they describe, and are men of candour, and sound judgment, their testimony is entitled to great weight. These are some of the principles by which we can ascertain the springs of human action. In our

humble judgment, Hume has violated them, in the estimate which he has formed of the character of Cromwell and the Puritans. They are charged with ambition, hypocrisy, and fanaticism; and yet the evidence, as far as it goes, establishes exactly the opposite conclusions. They gave such evidences of sincerity as are generally considered satisfactory, in other cases, and as that holy martyr Charles the first never gave. If a just and clear sense of what true liberty is, and a consistent, self-sacrificing, and persevering pursuit of it is ambition, then were they ambitious. It is doubtful whether in Hume's judgment fanaticism and genuine piety would not have meant the same thing.

A history may be so written, as simply to detail in an entertaining manner what, in the writer's opinion, are the facts in a given case; or it may be so written as to exhibit the evidence on which the facts of history are based; the designs of the actors in the drama of human life; and the relations of the events recorded. The former may be termed popular, the latter philosophical history. Of the former Dowling's history of Romanism may be given as an example; of the latter Ranke's history of the popes. A history written in a philosophical spirit, in which the reader is led step by step from premises to a conclusion, meets the wants of the scholar, and the controvertist.

They do not enjoy all the advantages of history, who can remember facts and dates in the order in which they occurred. That would be a mere effort of memory, which may excite surprise and admiration, and in some cases tempt to an empty pedantry. But if this is all, it must be admitted that little practical wisdom is derived from the knowledge thus laboriously hoarded up. On the contrary, history becomes useful chiefly when its facts are considered in their relations. This relation may be either as cause and effect; or effects may be regarded as produced by the same or similar causes, though taking place at different periods of time, and in different regions of the earth. For example, the crusades and the French revolution are historical facts which can be, in some respects, compared together. These two wonderful and striking events resemble each other, because they were both the result of an excitement, which for depth, and extent, and results, has scarcely a parallel in the history of the race. They were vast associated outbreaks of malignant fanaticism. In the one case, crimes were perpetrated

in the name of religion; in the other, in the name of liberty. The crusades were the offspring of a superstition, which made it a Christian duty to rescue the holy land from the profane touch of the infidel; the French revolution had its origin in visionary views as to the capabilities of man, which had their root in infidelity and atheism. The course of the crusades was marked with crime and atrocity, from the Danube to the massacre of the ten thousand in the mosque of Omar, at the capture of Jerusalem, but the foundation of their cruelty was in the *Deus vult*, so often upon their lips. God's enemies were theirs; and they had a commission from an infallible source to punish them. On the other hand, such were the unheard of atrocities of the French revolution, that it seemed as if the state were attempting to perpetrate a *felo de se* on a vast scale, and as if in France, liberty meant license to do wrong; and all this was done in an age and nation professing the highest civilization, and the greatest intellectual advancement. We have made these remarks, to show that these two events may be compared in some of their aspects, but not in others. The truth is, it is very unsafe to reason by induction from a few isolated facts. General conclusions ought not to be hastily drawn. No habit ought to be more carefully guarded against, by the student of history, than this. The tendency to generalize, to deduce general principles, and even universal propositions from particular facts, is very strong in many minds. Great soberness of judgment, and patience in investigation, and discrimination are therefore necessary to prevent such persons from making the exception, the rule, and from imagining relations where none exist. We may safely infer from the French revolution, and from other portions of history, that atheism, can give no security to public virtue; and that it creates a recklessness of human life. This is not only proved in the manner just stated, but it appears from the nature of atheism itself. It has no rewards to offer to the good, nor punishments to inflict upon the wicked in another life. It cannot decide with certainty, what is either public or private virtue. This conclusion has been logically drawn out, by the late Robert Hall, in his sermon on Modern Infidelity, which is one of the most eloquent and masterly discourses of modern times. The same remarks will to some extent apply also to infidelity. But whether it would be safe to infer from the simple historical fact, without any analysis of

✓

atheism, that such would be the case, is a question which we are not called upon to consider, as we are willing to draw light from any quarter, to illumine a dark subject.

Some maintain a kind of gradual developement of truth in the course of history. We are no believers in this theory. Its abettors speak of toleration for example as a problem, worked out for the benefit of the race, by the Puritans of Old and New England; especially those of them who where independents; at least this is true of some of them. So far is this from being true, that minorities every where naturally claim toleration, though they have been sometimes known to persecute, when they became the majority. But we think Paul teaches the true principle of toleration, as plainly as it can be taught, when he says, "If I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die." In this passage he teaches, that it ought not to be a civil offence to preach the gospel, though it was rejected by a majority of the Jewish nation, and of the Roman empire. To the same effect are all those passages in which he glories in persecution, and charges it as a crime upon civil rulers to persecute. Peter, whose pretended successors have copied his example as little in this, as in other respects, teaches the same doctrine, when he enjoins it on Christians not to suffer as evil doers, or murderers, or thieves, or busybodies in other men's matters. If those, who profess to sit in Peter's chair, had carried out the principles contained in these simple directions, very little Christian blood would have been shed by the Roman Catholics. When the apostles, therefore, spoke of persecution as a crime; and yet admitted that the persecutor was sometimes conscientious; they certainly must be regarded, as holding the doctrine that no set of men have the right to make their conscience on religion a rule for others, or to punish those who differ from them, so long as they demean themselves as good citizens. Gamaliel was also an advocate of toleration.

It is well known that Christians had no opportunity of exhibiting a tolerant spirit before the days of Constantine the great. It is remarkable that one of the first acts of this first Christian emperor was to publish an edict, granting toleration to all forms of religion, including paganism, which had persecuted Christianity for three centuries. Eusebius has preserved a Greek translation of this edict. It is worthy of the perusal of all, who

in their superabounding vanity. ascribe everything good to a particular age or class of men. It assigns as a reason for toleration the fact, that the persons tolerated were conscientious in their belief. Jam dudum quidem, cum animadvertimus non esse cohibendam religionis libertatem, sed unius cujusque arbitrio ac voluntati permittendum, ut ex animi sui sententia rebus divinis operam daret, sanximus tum caeteri omnes tum christiani, sectae religionis suae fidem atque observantiam retinrent. Eusebii Hist. Lib. 10, C. 5. It is true Licinius united in the publication of this edict; but none who know his character will hesitate to ascribe it to the influence of Constantine. We shall not enter into the question, whether Constantine was at this time, or indeed ever was a true Christian; nor will we justify every expression found in this remarkable production, especially as it bears on its face evidence of being the joint production of two men, one of whom was a pagan. It was certainly a full and fair acknowledgment of the received doctrine on the subject of toleration; and in the mystery, which shrouds the Christian character of Constantine, we are willing to put the most charitable construction on it. In the middle of the sixteenth century, the victorious Protestants, in the treaty of Passau, granted free toleration to the Roman Catholics of Germany, which they have enjoyed to this day; while protestants, who live in the catholic portions of Germany, have been persecuted. We are free to confess, that we consider the Puritans a noble race of men; the world owes them a debt of gratitude for their manly and long continued struggle, and many sufferings in the cause of religious and civil liberty. But the extravagant praise in which some have indulged is an act of injustice to others, at least by imputation, and confers no real favour on those for whose benefit glorifying harangues are made.

But before we can exhibit this subject to the readers notice, in the point of view we desire, it is necessary that we should consider the union of church and state, which is closely connected with it. Persecution in a well regulated state, without the concurrence of the ruling powers, is impossible. The state persecutes, because it regards the church as entitled to protection, under the laws and constitution. The enemies of the church thus become those of the state. Whatever detracts from the influence, or lessens the prosperity of the church established by

law, injures the state of which, in a civil sense, it is regarded as a component part. Hence laws are made, restraining the rights of others, and inflicting penalties on them for the benefit of the church, which it is deemed the interest of the state to cherish and patronize. Hence we have intolerance.

The lessons which history teaches on this subject, are most instructive; and they have been delivered in tones of startling emphasis. We look back through the church's history, for fifteen centuries; and we find, during all that period, the church and state united. Whithersoever we turn our eyes, the same state of things is discovered. In Protestant and Catholic communities, and in the Greek church every where, this has been the favourite doctrine. Persons of every variety of creed, and form of government, have adopted it, from the high calvinist, down to the lowest of the rationalistic school; and from the high churchman to the lowest Erastean. It prevails alike in enlightened, and in unenlightened communities. Our own country presents the only exception, worthy of notice, in which this alliance has been deliberately repudiated. A quasi union of church and state existed for many years after our revolution, in New England: and even in Virginia, where so much had been endured from intolerance, a bill for a general assessment, for the support of religion, was, in 1784, passed to its third reading in the lower house; but was finally abandoned, on the remonstrance of the presbyterians and baptists. These remarks are made to show how deeply rooted in human nature, is that principle which leads to this unhallowed union. The causes which have produced this result may, therefore, be regarded as amongst the most powerful which operate on man. If, as is the general conviction in this country, such a connexion with the state would be one of the most deplorable calamities, which could befall our common Christianity; then it becomes American Christians to study this subject with the greatest diligence. What are the lessons which history teaches us in relation to this matter, and what is their value?

The first act of Constantine was to restore to the church all the confiscated property, of which it had been deprived during the previous persecutions. This was simply giving to the church corporate powers. His next step was to bestow money out of the royal treasury, for the support of the clergy. This

consummated the union between the church and the state, and made every clergyman a salaried dependant on the state. So far as the reasons of these acts of the emperor appear from his edicts, which are still in existence, they seem to have been a misjudged zeal for the good of the church. It is well known that Constantine and his successors often became the active partizans of a particular creed. They assembled councils, in whose deliberations they took deep interest. This fact renders it probable, that the same feeling led to the calamitous union of which we are now speaking; and that it tended to perpetuate it is certain. In their edicts also, fears are expressed lest the unity of the church should be destroyed. Indeed they seem to have been fascinated and charmed with the idea of an external unity of the church; and to bring it about, they used civil pains and penalties without scruple. This idea of unity has dazzled more minds than those of the emperors of the East and West. It has been one of the reasons for repressing inquiry, and encouraging ignorance. In the days of which we are speaking, except those incident to the election of an emperor, no internal agitations were more violent, than those which related to religion. They threatened the peace of the empire; and sometimes ended in bloodshed. The emperors considered it their duty by means of general councils, and civil coercion, to repress these dangerous commotions; and not to trust to the church alone a task so difficult and delicate. Accordingly, when the council decided what was heresy, the civil authority punished the heretics. If such an unity as they contemplated could have been procured, it would have implied an end to all religious disputes; and it might have been worldly wisdom to seek it. This consideration, therefore, would draw the cords which bound together church and state, closer and tighter, and of its influence there is the most abundant proof. We have no doubt that designing politicians have been earnest advocates of this union, because the church by its influence has assisted to accomplish the purposes of the state or of a party in it. Manly independence is hardly to be expected of those, who are fed from the public treasury. Religious teachers have always wielded a great influence in every Christian country; and as a consequence, the state has used the best means in her power to direct that influence into such a channel, as she believed would best subserve

her interests. Thus have we given what we believe to be the chief causes which led the state to seek and continue this union. We have not given all the evidence in our possession for the statement just made: because we have deemed it unnecessary.

We now proceed to give the reasons which induced the church to consent to a union, which, in our judgment, has been disastrous to her best interests. There is no principle of the human mind stronger, than that which leads men to desire a sure and certain income for life.* To be above the common vicissitudes of fortune, to enjoy affluence or competence, secure from the fear of want, is the goal which multitudes are striving to reach. It is this that produces, in part at least, the inordinate desire of wealth, so common in our country. Now that the state gives both a more ample and a more certain support to the clergy, than is ordinarily enjoyed on the voluntary principle, we think cannot be denied. Both of these remarks can be proved by the history of established churches. Hundreds have been found in every age, who have been content to profess to receive a creed, which they did not believe, and to preach a gospel, which they have denied and renounced, that they might enjoy the revenues of a parish. Ministers of the gospel have, in large numbers, subscribed, in the course of a short period, two opposite and contradictory creeds, that they might not lose place. Facts like these are found on almost every page of history. That nothing like this state of things is found in any other circumstances, than those just referred to, we are far from affirming; but that these evils exist in a more aggravated form in religious establishments, we are ready to affirm, and to prove. Now we maintain, that this is an unnatural state of things. Some powerful principles must be at work in men's minds, before they can consent to become deliberate hypocrites for life. Such persons must know that their course is as dishonourable as it is sinful; and we must, therefore, seek for the governing principle in this case, in the charms of a wealthy church establishment to a worldly man. We do not affirm, that all these evils are to be found in every religious establishment. So far from this we are ready to admit

* Of course we shall not be understood as intimating that there is not a far deeper and nobler principle than this, at work in the minds of many who advocate this connexion. Their convictions arise from a high, but as we conceive erroneous, idea of the state, and consequently of its prerogatives and duties.

that a tithing of the evils in question does not appear in some cases. Where there is a parity among the clergy, and non-residence, and pluralities are not allowed, the same evils do not exist, which are found, when grades are multiplied, from the poor curate, to the princely archbishop; each requiring additional revenue to support his dignity. But to return: in proof of the fact that there are in human nature certain principles which tend to the union of church and state, we may mention, that to bask in the sunshine of court favour, is grateful to aspiring and ambitious men. There must be some powerful principle at work in the human breast, to induce the church and its ministers to endure the wrongs done by the state to both. How often have the rights of conscience been disregarded; and conscientious men made the reluctant instruments of executing the tyrannical and unrighteous laws of the state. If as already intimated persecution results, in part at least, from an attempt by the state to patronize and protect a particular form of religion; then this view of the matter opens a chapter of wrongs, not soon read, and not easily equalled; yet those who compose the church favoured by the public authorities, are expected to justify, and in point of fact, have generally justified the enormities thus committed. Even when the Free Church of Scotland separated from the establishment, it was with a decided protest against the voluntary principle. In the early history of the church the same ministers, when assembled in councils, have been known within a short period of time, to subscribe opposite and contradictory creeds; and to shout vociferously, first for the creed of Arius, then for that of Athanasius; first for Eutyches, who confounded the natures of Christ, and then for Nestorius, who divided them. Those therefore who regard the union of church and state as an evil, ought to watch with sleepless vigilance on this subject, lest that which seems now to be so improbable, should take place. We have made these remarks to show that deductions may be made from the facts of history which are not found in the books ordinarily studied. If nothing else is gained, a more vivid impression is made on the mind, and a conviction, previously entertained, is confirmed, by these deductions.

The general principle, to which we adverted in the beginning of these remarks, may be further illustrated, by a comparison

of Mohammedanism and Popery. We shall not discuss the question, as to the rise of the papacy. We shall assume, that it was contemporaneous or nearly so with the appearance of the false prophet in the east. We do not mean to say, that it burst upon the world as suddenly, as did the Arabian impostor; but simply that it was consummated about the same time. Yet it is not essential to our argument that we should maintain this. It is simply a coincidence somewhat striking, as the one pervaded the east, and the other the west. It is true, that Islamism is a total apostacy from Christianity, though it borrows some of its precepts and doctrines from the bible: but popery cannot be so regarded. Still these two systems may be compared together. They both owe their rise to a fallen and corrupt Christianity; the larger portion of the converts to Mohammedanism were of course nominal Christians. These two systems agree in this, that they both appeal to the senses and imagination; and are both idolatrous; and of course the services which they require are to a great extent external.

There is in the temple at Mecca, a holy stone, which the Mussulman devoutly kisses. If the Roman Catholic has holy water, the orthodox follower of Mohammed can show his well of holy water near the same temple, which he believes has an equal efficacy in healing the diseases of body and soul. The tapestry, which covers the walls of this temple, is annually divided into small pieces, and sold to pilgrims, who doubtless value them as highly, as the good catholic does the bones of a martyr, or a piece of the true cross. If pilgrimages to see the holy coat of Treves, and to other places, are considered meritorious; the Koran considers pilgrimages to Mecca no less so. If the catholic prays with his face to the altar, the followers of the false prophet pray with theirs turned towards Mecca. If a senseless and formal repetition of the same prayer, is thought by the votary of Rome to have merit; prayers many times repeated possess no less merit in the estimation of a Mussulman. If penance for sin is enjoined at Roman Catholic confessionals: every pilgrim to Mecca, on his approach to the city, does a penance, which deprives many of their lives. If the Romanist has his lent during which he professes to fast, the religion of Islam requires the fast, Ramadan, to be kept during a whole month. If a cross surmounts a Christian church, a crescent is seen on the domes

and minarets of Mohammedan mosques. Both systems have been intolerant and persecuting; both have adopted the most rigorous measures to check all adverse influences from without; and both have swayed an immense influence over an ignorant and bigoted population. The inference from all this would seem to be fair, that these two systems appeal to some common principle of our nature; and that they are adapted to human nature as it is. Of course this principle is modified by the different circumstances and influences which exist in the two cases. What this is we may not be able fully to develop. The two systems have this in common, that they appeal to the imagination and senses. What men see, and hear, and feel, makes a strong and palpable impression on them; and the senses furnish the material which the imagination works up into various forms. The imagination and the senses are therefore, closely connected; and anything which appeals to these two principles is sure to make a deep impression on the masses of men. Children have always discovered a passion for pictures; and in the dark ages, an attempt was made to teach scripture truth to those who could not read by means of pictures; and the book thus made was called the poor man's bible. But when men are taught a religion, which requires an exercise of the affections and of the understanding, it is a very different affair. The attention, the judgment, the conscience, the heart must all be exercised; and this is very different from the system which purifies by plunging in water; or pardons by eating a piece of bread; or whose devotions are acceptably performed by a heartless and formal repetition of prayers, with the proper genuflexions, and signs of the cross. The tactual succession of the Christian graces, for it amounts to this, certainly places the attainment of them within the reach of all, and upon the easiest terms possible. If seeing and hearing, tasting and touching, certainly procure blessings, and have in them an inherent efficacy as an *opus operatum*; then surely religion is an easy thing. We do not affirm, that it is in fact a part of the creed of the classes of persons, on whom we are remarking, to exclude altogether internal and spiritual emotion. We are merely speaking of that which is, in multitudes of cases, the practical result, and to which there is, in frail human nature, a very strong tendency.