

THE
PRINCETON REVIEW.

JULY, 1871.

No. III.

ART. I.—*Studies in the Gospels: Mark, the Gospel for the Roman.*

SOME of the critics—chiefly of the class equally eminent for profundity and simpleness—would have us believe that the Gospel according to Mark is only a very awkward rehash of that according to Matthew, with the occasional addition, no less awkward, of some statements of Luke. The hasty and sometimes shabby treatment of the Second Gospel by many of the commentators, has done not a little to foster in the minds of common readers a view too closely allied to that of these critics. A careful study of the Gospel itself, with a wise reference to its origin, will reveal the fact that it has a distinct aim and independent unity of its own, and will scarcely fail to convince the candid mind that Matthew is quite as likely to be a rehash of Mark as Mark is of Matthew. Much more accordant with a due reverence for the Four Gospels, as produced by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and forming together one part of a great plan of that God who never really wastes material, is the theory that each one of the Evangelists, in writing what he wrote, was directed to perform an essential and distinct service for the world.

ART. V.—*Der Prophet Daniel, theologisch-homiletisch bearbeitet.* Von Dr. O. ZOECKLER, Professor der Theologie zu Greifswald. [J. P. Lange's Theologisch-homiletisch Bibelwerk, 17^{er} Theil des Alten Testaments.] 8vo. pp. 245. 1870.

Biblischer Commentar ueber den Propheten Daniel. Von CARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, Dr. u. Professor der Theologie. [Biblischer Commentar ueber das Alte Testament, herausgegeben von C. F. Keil und F. Delitzsch.] 8vo. pp. 419. 1869.

The Times of Daniel: an Argument. By HENRY W. TAYLOR, LL. D., late a Justice of the Supreme Court, and Judge of the Court of Appeals of New York. New York. 1871. 12mo. pp. 208.

THE book of Daniel has been the battle-ground of ages, and the strifes which it has occasioned are not terminated yet. Like the Pentateuch, Isaiah, and the Gospels, it has been a favorite field for critical disputation. The battle here has from the days of Celsus and Porphyry been substantially a conflict between supernaturalism and unbelief; and it may now be regarded as so far decided as to leave little ground for the latter to stand upon besides the assertion and reassertion of its own cardinal principles, that miracles and predictions are incredible and impossible. Zöckler, who was at one time disposed to refer the composition of the book of Daniel to the Maccabean period, confesses that that position was rendered quite untenable for him by the "thorough investigations of v. Niebuhr, Pusey, Zündel, Kranichfeld, Volck, Fuller, and others," though he still adheres to his former doubts in respect to the larger part of the eleventh chapter, particularly vs. 5-39. The grounds of his hesitation are, as he admits, entirely of an internal character. The remarkable specialty and minuteness of that detailed prediction leads him to suspect or rather to affirm that it cannot have been produced by the prophet Daniel as we now possess it; but that it has been wrought over and recast by "some pious seer of the Maccabean age," with the view of "establishing the most exact relation possible between its predictions and their historical fulfilment;" and that this is one reason why the book was

included in the hagiographa of the Hebrew Bible rather than among the prophets. To this view he is led not by "the pre-conceived opinion that the spirit of prophecy was incapable of producing predictions so specific," but by "the analogy of prophecy" itself. And this he finds not merely in the fact that other prophetic books of the Old Testament give no such detailed representations of the future as this chapter would exhibit, but that the Revelation of John, which is most nearly related in character and scope with the book of Daniel, exhibits "only ideal pictures" of what was yet to come to pass.

If it were, however, to be admitted that the chapter in question stood as entirely alone and without a parallel in the whole round of prophecy, as Zöckler imagines, it would surely be more becoming reverently to inquire for what reason this single exception is made than to allege that no such exception is possible. It is as arrogant to prescribe a method for Divine revelation in one instance as to do so universally. And the analogy of prophecy is to be ascertained not by a partial but by a complete survey of all that holy seers have been inspired to foretell or to record. No assumed "analogy" derived from a portion of the prophecies can be normative for the rest in form and method, so long as God spake not only at sundry times but "in divers manners" unto our fathers by the prophets.

Every one else must see, if Zöckler does not, that his hypothesis is tantamount to the assumption of a pious fraud, and is itself more untenable than the extremes between which he proposes to mediate. The book of Daniel is a unit, and its eleventh chapter must share the fate of all the rest. If they are genuine, it is. If it is interpolated, there is no security that the others are not interpolated too.

But more even than schools of criticism, different systems of prophetic interpretation have fought their battles over Daniel. Its apocalyptic character which belongs to it in common with the book of Revelation, the fact that it makes its disclosures upon the broad arena of the world, and that it stretches over such vast tracts of time, has fastened upon it the attention of all who concern themselves with the adaptation of the

chart of prophecy to the region of history. The wide divergences which have prevailed and still exist among interpreters, may be illustrated by the volumes before us. Zöckler finds the fulfilment of almost all that the book contains, in or prior to the Maccabean era. Judge Taylor refers all the predictions of the last six chapters (except perhaps the first seven verses of the seventh chapter, which are necessarily introductory) to the times of the Christian dispensation. While, according to Keil, the development and progress of that dispensation form no part of its disclosures, which spring from events prior to the advent of Christ to the times of the end and the final consummation.

As a specimen of the method of Zöckler and Keil, we propose to present in this article their respective interpretations of the prophecy of the seventy weeks, Daniel ix. 24-27. This shall be followed by a statement of the prophetic scheme propounded by Judge Taylor on the basis of this book.

The prophecy of the seventy weeks has, by the great body of believing interpreters from the earliest times, been regarded as a prediction of the advent and death of Christ, and the consequent destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The naturalistic interpreters of modern times, who deny the genuineness of the entire book, imputing it to an unknown author in or near the Maccabean period, by whom the history of the past or present was set forth in the guise of a prophecy from the mouth of Daniel, mostly refer it to the profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes and his subsequent overthrow. Zöckler has attempted a compromise between these two views. He believes this to be a genuine prophecy communicated to Daniel by the angel Gabriel, and containing internal evidence that it could not have been produced during or after the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes; which, however, together with the fate of that ungodly monarch, he supposes to constitute its primary or immediate theme, while it has a secondary or remoter reference to the coming of Christ and the events which succeeded it.

According to his conception of the matter, Daniel was in doubt as to the true interpretation of Jeremiah's prediction (Jeremiah xxv. 11, xxix. 10), that the captivity should last for

seventy years. He was uncertain whether these were to be reckoned from the fourth year of Jehoiakim, when the prediction was uttered, and the first deportation of exiles took place, or from the complete destruction of Jerusalem, which was nearly twenty years later. He, therefore, set himself by fervent supplication to seek a solution of this difficulty, and at the conclusion of his prayer the angel was sent to him to interpret the prophecy of Jeremiah. This he expounds by a "mystico-prophetic conversion" of the seventy years into as many weeks or periods of seven years, which must elapse before the theocracy is restored in its full meaning and power. The introduction of the Messianic period, with its fulness of blessings, is to be for that time delayed. The angel informs Daniel, ix. 24, that seventy weeks of years have been fixed as the appointed term for the bestowment of all that had been predicted and promised at the coming of the expected Saviour. Then transgression should be completed, *i. e.*, it should reach its climax and consummation, and the full measure of iniquity should be filled up. Then guilt should be adequately atoned for, and a righteousness should be brought in not of a temporary and provisional character like that which attached to the Mosaic covenant and its ancient ceremonial, but possessing everlasting efficacy and validity. Then prophecy should be sealed by the accomplishment of all that had been foretold from the beginning respecting the future salvation. And a most holy should be anointed; that is to say, the holy oil of consecration shall be poured upon a new altar of burnt-offering, the altar of the New Testament church. Comp. Ex. xxix. 37, xxx. 29, xl. 10; Lev. viii. 1. This is the sanctuary that is cleansed, viii. 14, and never to be defiled, and which is destined to replace the profaned and desecrated structure of the old economy.

The particulars here unfolded belong unquestionably to the region of Messianic anticipations. They are such as are by the prophets uniformly connected with the coming Redeemer, and the dispensation which he should introduce. Nevertheless this is not, as our author judges, in its strict and primary intent a prophecy of the advent and work of Christ. It is not directly but only typically Messianic. The 490 years here

announced do not (as Zöckler reckons them) bring us to the opening of the new dispensation, but only to a great crisis in the old, which heralds and foreshadows it, setting forth with marked distinctness some of its leading features and characteristics and forming a fresh stage of advancement toward it and preparation for it, the token and assured pledge of its actual coming hereafter. The blessings here foreshown to Daniel are Messianic, but they are exhibited in connection with events nearer at hand, which would simply constitute their preliminary and partial realization, while paving the way and pointing forward to a higher fulfilment in an ultimate and completed form in a yet more distant future. The period directly contemplated by this prophecy is not that of Christ, but that of the Maccabees, though ideas are brought in and expressions employed, which look beyond the latter and find their full and adequate embodiment only in the former.

It may be readily conceded that events widely separated in point of time are frequently blended in prophetic representation. There is no fact more familiar in the inspired disclosures of the future than the existence of what has been appropriately termed a prophetic horizon. The gaze of the holy seer ranges with comparative clearness over a certain tract of the future, which is brought within the scope of his vision, and then passes suddenly and abruptly to what is far more remote without taking note of the interval that lies between. He sees the dense dark clouds of judgment in contact with the objects of the plain as though they had settled down upon it, or his eye catches at one view the distant hills, and the bright rising of the glorious sun which seems to rest upon their glowing summits. †

The unfolding of God's grand scheme of grace or judgment proceeds by successive steps or stages, each of which specially concerns the people of God so long as it is in progress, while those that lie beyond are of little present interest or concern. The two things of most immediate and practical moment to a traveler upon a distant journey are to know how to reach the next point of prominence upon his route and to be assured that this lies upon his way to the ultimate end of his course. When that first point is safely reached he will need to gather

information respecting the next, and so on till the last stage is reached. It is thus that God led his people along, stage by stage, during the entire period of his supernatural revelation, supplying at each point just that measure of instruction which was necessary in existing emergencies and for guidance in present duty, and careful moreover to keep ever before them the final issue to which all was tending. With the emergencies and wants belonging to future stages in the unfolding of the divine plan they had no present concern. These were accordingly reserved until the occasion for them had arisen. Each period was for the most part instructed simply in the two things which were then most necessary to be known, the issue of that particular stage of providential movement which was then transacting, coupled with the final issue of the whole scheme of which it formed an integral part. When that stage is ended, many more stages may yet remain before the universal plan is perfected; and the long interval previously unsuspected between that and the grand consummation will begin to appear. And thus what the prophets of one age have set in juxtaposition, will by the disclosures of subsequent prophets or by the evolutions of history be resolved into their separate constituents and arranged in their actual chronological succession.

In the blessing of the patriarch Jacob, Shiloh's coming is linked with the settlement of the tribes in Canaan, an event which formed the next important stage in the accomplishment of patriarchal hopes. The prophet Isaiah at successive conjunctures of his ministry couples the advent of the Messiah with the deliverance from the Syrian invasion, the Assyrian invasion and the Babylonish captivity, according as one or the other of these was for the time the most prominent object in the experience of the present, or the anticipations of the future. The fall of Babylon and the overthrow of Edom, are by Isaiah combined with the final judgment on an ungodly world, and by Habakkuk and Obadiah with its complement the triumphant establishment of the Lord's kingdom over all the earth. This feature of prophecy is of such constant recurrence that it is a recognized principle of interpretation that every prediction of temporal good contains, either

implicitly or explicitly, a prediction of the ultimate salvation ; as on the other hand every prediction of the downfall of hostile powers either involves or expressly declares the final overthrow of all the enemies of God. Messiah's coming and kingdom form the background, more or less distinctly visible in every prophetic picture.

There is no antecedent presumption from analogy, therefore, prior to the examination of the terms of this particular prophecy, against the view maintained by Zöckler, that it has mingled reference to the times of the Maccabees, and to the times of the Messiah, and while typically predictive of the latter, it is directly predictive of the former. Such a combination would not only be entirely in accordance with prophetic usage in general, but in regard to these epochs in particular. That signal crisis in the affairs of Israel, when the Maccabees were raised up to be their champions and defenders, did form a prophetic horizon, and from the splendor of these foreseen successes, the people were instructed to anticipate the dawn of the brighter day beyond. As the Babylonish exile formed such a limit to the prophets living prior to that event, from which their inspiration taught them to glance forward to the coming Redeemer ; and as the change of dispensations constituted another such horizon, the prophets of the Old Testament not distinguishing the protracted periods of waiting, and of struggle through which the Kingdom of the Messiah was to win its way to final victory, but springing at once from its establishment to its consummation ; so to Daniel as to Zechariah, the next great crisis in Israel's history, and the most important prior to the advent, was that dark period of oppression and persecution by an offshoot of the Greek Empire, and the signal deliverance that was to follow. Zechariah ch. ix. connects God's protection of his people from the great Greek conqueror in the full tide of his early successes with the coming of Zion's king ; and ch. x. the Maccabean triumphs with the regathering of Israel out of all his dispersions. And Daniel ch. xi.-xii. combines the persecutions and wretched end of Antiochus Epiphanes, with the general resurrection. It would not in itself, therefore, be at all surprising to find a

like combination in this passage of the overthrow of this furious oppressor, and the setting-up of the Kingdom of Christ.

Two insuperable objections to the application of this view to the present prophecy are, however, supplied by its opening verse. The first is that a definite period is here fixed for the ushering in of the blessings consequent upon Messiah's advent. Zöckler concedes that the particulars described in this verse are according to the uniform representation of prophecy Messianic. He further not only allows but urges that the weeks here spoken of are determinate measures of time, that they are weeks of years, and that the seventy weeks are, therefore, four hundred and ninety years. From these premises the conclusion is inevitable, that the lapse of this period must bring about the dawn of the Messianic era. The definite chronological statement here made clearly distinguishes this prophecy from those in which the future is merely spoken of in general terms, with nothing to indicate whether the fulfilment is to take place in the nearer or remoter future, or whether there are to be successive accomplishments at distinct and even widely sundered points of time. The time is exactly determined, and the thing to be looked for is precisely stated.

Of the six clauses of this verse (ver. 24), it is not intimated that the first five have any other than their proper Messianic application. Only the last, "anointing a most holy," it is suggested, was to have first an external literal fulfilment in the restoration of the temple service with its animal sacrifices after its temporary interruption by Antiochus Epiphanes; and subsequently to this it was to have a second, of which the former was a type, in the erection of the more perfect sanctuary and service of the New Testament, whose altar was the cross, anointed and consecrated by the blood of Christ, himself the victim and the priest. Reconciliation for iniquity and everlasting righteousness, are acknowledged to be the very center of the gracious benefits purchased for us by Christ. The sealing of vision and prophecy is understood, as it must be, of the accomplishment of that which has been the constant theme of all the prophets from the beginning.

It is true that the meaning put upon the first two clauses by Zöckler, might admit of their being applied in a lower sense to the criminality which culminated in the desecration of God's temple by Antiochus, as well as to that which found its acme in that more awful crime at which the earth quaked, and the sun was darkened. But the correct interpretation of those clauses makes them substantially equivalent to the third, and refers them in like manner to the putting away of sin by the only effectual offering, thus precluding the possibility of any other than a Messianic sense.

It is vain, therefore, to plead as parallel the language of our Lord appended to a prediction which had blended reference to the destruction of Jerusalem and to the end of the world: "This generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled;" or that other declaration, which rings through the Old Testament: "The day of the Lord is at hand," and is echoed in the New: "The coming of the Lord draweth nigh." Where, as in these cases, a predicted event finds its fulfilment in successive stadia or cycles, it may be said to come to pass on the completion of the first stadium, of which those that follow will be but the substantial reproduction in higher potency. But Daniel's seventy weeks were to effect a result which admits of no double or doubtful interpretation. The atonement for sin, which was to find place within this limit, allows of no degrees and no inferior application. It can be nothing less than the sacrificial death of the incarnate Son of God.

But a second objection equally fatal to the view under consideration is, that the seventy weeks, upon Zöckler's own showing, extend not to the overthrow of Antiochus and the Maccabean deliverance, but many years beyond it. This he does not affect to conceal or cover up, but plainly avows. He claims, p. 179, that the seventy weeks, or 490 years, should be reckoned from the same point of time with the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah, of which he conceives it to be an expansion or modification. Jeremiah's prophecy furnished the occasion of that of Daniel, suggested its form, supplied it with its number seventy, and, he contends, determines the date from which it was to be computed. About this date there

was, he thinks, a measure of uncertainty. It might be the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B. C. 605, when Jeremiah, ch. xxv., first announced that the subjection to Babylon should last for seventy years; or it might be B. C. 598, or thereabouts, when Jeremiah repeated this prediction in a letter to the captives in Babylon, ch. xxix.; or, which Zöckler for a reason that will appear hereafter, finds it convenient to make the basis of his estimate, B. C. 588, when Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. The appointed term will come to an end, therefore, as he makes it out, p. 194, about one hundred years before Christ, and seventy years or more after the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 175. One would think that this would be accepted by himself as the demonstration of the falsity of his own conclusion. The prophecy fixes the time of its fulfilment; and this is by his estimate seventy years distant from the events in which he fancies that it found its accomplishment. It is plain that he has either miscalculated the time or misapplied the prediction. We believe that he has done both.

Zöckler seeks to extricate himself from the dilemma, in which his calculations have placed him, by alleging the limitations of prophecy. A prophecy is not exactly the same as history written beforehand. There is a distinction between them in the mode in which they respectively represent the same objects, which is never confused and should not be lost sight of. Every prophecy is written out of and for the time to which it belongs. This is reflected in its shape and coloring, in the turn of its expressions, the relative prominence it accords to different events, and the aspect under which it presents them. In many instances their prophetic character and the circumstances of their origin are so visibly impressed upon the productions of the prophets as to amount to a complete vindication of their genuineness. They could not have been written as they are at any later period; least of all after the events predicted had taken place.

But that which distinguishes prophecy from history is not the inaccuracy of the former and its want of correspondence with the facts as they really occur. We cannot accept Zöckler's defence of the genuineness of this prophecy of the seventy

weeks based on its alleged non-fulfilment, except as a valid *argumentum ad hominem* directed against the criticism of modern unbelief. "It is not a *vaticinium ex eventu* concocted in the Maccabean period," he says, p. 195, "for the points in which its statements do not agree with the events of the time are more numerous than those in which they do." And we consider it but a doubtful compliment to the prophet when his perspicacity is lauded, p. 194, at the expense of the truth of the revelation made to him. "While there could scarcely have been one of his contemporaries in the exile, who would have postponed the dawn of Messiah's days much beyond the close of the Babylonish captivity, it evidences a marvellous breadth of vision" in Daniel that he sees the great crisis by which it is typified and with which it is identified in his mind at a distance of 490 years; though this does not correspond in point of fact with the interval that separated him either from the type or the antitype.

The limitations which really belong to prophecy, are not imposed upon it by the narrow bounds of human vision, whether unassisted or but partially aided from on high. It is neither by an inborn nor an acquired faculty, neither by their native sagacity nor their spiritual penetration, that the prophets forecast the future, the result of which would be that, however they may surpass other men in prescience, the necessary weakness of the human understanding must unavoidably restrict it in its range, and render it liable to error. The limitation of prophecy arises solely out of the Divine intention. The prophet foresees just what God chooses to communicate and as he communicates it. And the Divine intention in the case is governed by the need to be supplied. All is not made known which God's omniscience might reveal. But just so much of the future is exhibited, and under just such aspects as are adapted to furnish the stimulus, or warning, or consolation, which is required.

In the present instance Daniel was stirred up to pray that God would revisit the desolations of Jerusalem, by the speedily approaching close of the predicted term of exile. It was not because he was unable to compute the seventy years of Jeremiah, but because he could compute and had computed

them, and he knew their end was at hand. The fulfilment had in fact already begun. Babylon had fallen—the signal and pledge of Israel's release. His prayer intimates no obscurity in the prophecy which he would have resolved, and implies no doubt of its accomplishment. The burden of the whole is confession of his own and his people's sins and supplication for God's forgiveness and the restoration of his favor. Israel might return to Jerusalem, but how could her desolations be rebuilt and she become the praise of the whole earth, unless God's anger and his fury should be turned away, and he made his face to shine upon his people and upon his sanctuary? Hereupon the angel Gabriel informs the prophet that seventy weeks shall suffice to provide a perfect expiation for sin, and seal the blessings which all former seers have promised. The mercy, for which he entreats, can only then be granted in its highest measure, and the covenant shall be confirmed with many; but the rejection of Messiah by the blinded mass shall cause the rebuilt city to be again fearfully and utterly destroyed.

The prediction takes its form from the supplication of Daniel, to which it is an answer, and the prophecy of Jeremiah which had encouraged him to make it. There is no full recital of the events consequent upon Messiah's advent or of those by which it was to be preceded. The prediction is restricted to just those events and aspects of the future, which gave the proper response to Daniel, and to the pious in Israel whom he represented. There is a limitation both in the amount communicated and in its enigmatical brevity, which clearly distinguishes it from historical statement. But there is no error and no room for any, unless this be charged upon the angel, or upon Him whose message he bore. If the distance in time were to be left in doubt, the chronological interval would not have been stated. Since this is announced, it must be held to be accurate; or at least no more latitude allowed than is always involved in the use of round numbers. But that this must here be restricted within very narrow limits, is shown by its exact division in what follows into three component parts, and the note taken, of not only a single week, but of half a week.

We must, however, proceed to examine the interpretation given of the subsequent verses, upon which it is chiefly that Zöckler bases his view of the entire passage. He reads ver. 25, "From the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem unto an anointed, a prince, are seven weeks; and during two and sixty weeks it shall be restored and built with street and moat (*i. e.* the process of its restoration and upbuilding shall be continued at intervals through these 434 years), but in troublous times." The anointed prince he takes to be Cyrus, whom God calls his anointed, Isa. xlv. ; and who made his appearance 49 years after Jerusalem was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, B. C. 588. But would any man not sorely pressed by the exigencies of a theory ever dream of fixing upon the destruction of Jerusalem as the time of "the going forth of the word to restore and to build" it? If the 49 years intervening between Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus are to be identified with the seven weeks of this prophecy, there would seem to be more reason in the preposterous method adopted by Eichhorn, who reckons them backward instead of forward, and starting with the decree of Cyrus permitting the Jews to return to their own land, finds the anointed prince in the king of Babylon!

The allegation that the 70 weeks of Daniel begin at the same time with the 70 years of Jeremiah, if it were well founded, would not lead us to fix upon the destruction of Jerusalem as their common point of departure. On the contrary, it is plain that the term of subjection to Babylon predicted Jer. xxv. 12, xxix. 10, begins from the fourth year of Jehoiakim (B. C. 606). For, 1, this is the year that the prediction was first uttered, Jer. xxv. 1. 2. In that year Jerusalem was captured by Nebuchadnezzar and the exile properly commenced; the first deportation of exiles then occurred, the king became a vassal of Nebuchadnezzar and Judea tributary to him, only the shadow of a kingdom remaining for a few years in Jerusalem, 2 Kgs. xxiv. 1, 2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, 7, Dan. i. 2. 3. The seventy years were completed in the first year of Cyrus (B. C. 536), 2 Chron. xxvi. 21, 22, Ezra i. 1, with which Zech. i. 12, is entirely consistent. 4. Daniel must have so reckoned them, for he was himself carried away by Nebuchadnezzar in that expedition which

began in the third and ended in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, Dan. i. 1, 6. And as he was taken to Babylon at the beginning of the exile, so he continued there until its close, Dan. i. 21. That the first year of Cyrus is particularly spoken of in the passage last cited, because it marked the end of the exile, appears from the fact that it was neither the limit of Daniel's life nor of the revelations made to him, Dan. x. 1. And the supplication in ch. ix. implies that the predicted term of captivity had almost reached its termination; and when it was offered, 69 years had elapsed since the fourth year of Jehoiakim.

If Cyrus were the anointed prince here referred to, and the commencement of Jeremiah's seventy years were the intended point of beginning, Daniel would have fixed the interval at ten weeks instead of seven. For even if it were to be allowed, that he might err in assigning the time of events yet future, he could not have been mistaken in his computation of what was already past, and particularly of a period so intimately associated with his own life and experience.

But the notion that the seventy weeks are to be reckoned from the same starting point with the seventy years of Jeremiah has no foundation in the text of the passage, nor in the nature of the case, and is just the offspring of the hypothesis that the book of Daniel is a spurious production, dating from the Maccabean age; a hypothesis which Zöckler no longer accepts, though he has only partially emancipated himself from its trammels. The representation made by those who adopt it is, that as the ancient prosperity of Jerusalem had not even yet returned, the prophecy of Jeremiah seemed to have failed. And the unknown author of this book undertook to save its credit by lengthening out the period and substituting for the seventy years, seven times seventy. No such wretched shift, however, was needed to bolster up the prophetic character of Jeremiah. His prophecy was fulfilled to the letter. Its fulfilment was recognized at the time, as is shown by the allusions to it in the books written at or after the close of the exile, and as is implied in the book of Daniel itself. Its truth and accuracy have been confessed ever since. And no such motive appears in this passage.

On the contrary it is expressly stated that these weeks are to be reckoned from "the going forth of the word to restore and to build Jerusalem." Jeremiah's prophecy of the exile and its duration cannot with any propriety be so regarded. The earliest period that could be imagined to answer to this description is the first year of Cyrus, when leave was granted to the exiles to return to their own land and "build the house of God which is in Jerusalem," Ezra i. 1-4. But no *restoration* of the city in any just sense of the term followed upon this edict; nor upon the renewed permission to prosecute the work upon the temple in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, Ezra, ch. vi.; nor upon the mission of Ezra in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, which was chiefly concerned with the service of the sanctuary, Ezra ch. vii. The city was still in ruins and its walls unbuilt, and nothing effectual had been done towards its restoration until in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, when Nehemiah was authorized and empowered to rebuild "the city of his fathers' sepulchres," Neh. i. 3, ch. ii. According to the terms of the prophecy, therefore, this is the date from which its weeks are to be counted.

Zöckler's division of the 25th verse may at first sight appear to be the most natural distribution of the clauses. In so enigmatical a passage, however, this consideration is not of itself decisive; especially as the terms of the prophecy plainly point to, if they do not compel a different division. Seventy weeks (490 years) were to introduce Messianic blessings; after the sixty-two weeks, which followed the first seven in the partition of the seventy (*i. e.* after 483 years), Messiah was to be cut off; it is far more likely, therefore, that the prophet intends to say that 483 years extend to the time of his appearance than 49 years; unless his life on earth was to be out of all proportion to other human lives. Accordingly, although the Masoretic accents, which are often rhythmical rather than logical, assign the sixty-two weeks to the second clause of the verse, several of the ancient versions combine the "seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," and connect both with the first clause as is done by our English translators. And that this is the correct rendering is put beyond question by its correspondence with the fulfilment, which in any case of obscu-

urity or ambiguity is certainly entitled to guide our interpretation. There is some variance among chronologers as to the precise time when Artaxerxes succeeded to the throne of Persia. But upon any hypothesis that has ever been proposed, the interval between his twentieth year and the baptism of Christ, when his public ministry began and from which we are to date his appearance as the Messiah, is in the neighborhood of 483 years. Hengstenberg, in his *Christology*, enters into a detailed examination of all the data with the view of showing that the coincidence is exact.

The anointed one cut off after the sixty-two weeks Zöckler takes to be the high-priest Onias III., with regard to which identification he makes the following frank confession, p. 181: "Only in a chronological point of view this event does not harmonize with the statements of our prophecy. For whilst the sixty-two weeks of years, after the lapse of which the anointed is cut off, reckoned from the end of the first seven weeks, or from B. C. 539, extend to B. C. 105, that is to say, into the reign of the Hasmonean Aristobulus I., or his successor, Alexander Jannæus, the murder of Onias took place as early as 141 or 142 of the era of the Seleucidæ, *i. e.*, B. C. 172 or 171, which belongs to the fifty-third week after 539. It must be confessed, therefore, on the hypothesis of the correctness of all our other assumptions, that the prophecy is not in accord with itself in the matter of chronology, or that the prophet beheld together what belonged to different times; in other words, that he conceived of a very important catastrophe in the history of the future, as occurring quite a number of weeks later (about ten weeks, or almost seventy years) than it actually took place." To which it might be added, that this particular murder scarcely deserved to be thus singled out by specific prediction in those disorderly times, when the sacerdotal succession was so disturbed, and intrigue, riot, and bloodshed so abounded in Jerusalem; that the destruction of the city and the sanctuary consequent upon the cutting-off of the anointed, shows his transcendent pre-eminence, and that the fortunes of the chosen people were bound up in their treatment of him as cannot be conceded to have been the ease in regard to Onias; that the "anointed" of this verse, in the absence of decisive

reasons to the contrary, must be held to be the same with the "anointed" of the preceding verse, and both are interpreted by the anointing, verse 24, which is coupled with unquestionably Messianic blessings; and that the crucifixion of Christ at the time here indicated, and the subsequent destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, so signally corresponds with the language of the prediction, that even rationalistic interpreters confess the remarkable coincidence, and admit that this application of it was almost unavoidable on the part of the early Christians. The most that can be said of the application to Onias is, that it is less outrageous than the wild conjecture of Bertholdt, that the sudden death of Alexander the Great is referred to, or that of Bleek, Ewald, and others, who find the "anointed" in Seleucus IV. Philopator.

The prince that shall come and destroy the city and the sanctuary is assumed to be Antiochus Epiphanes, who, though he desecrated the latter, did not destroy either; and it is his end that shall be with a flood, which either denotes the overflow of Divine wrath, or, as Zöckler prefers, is a figure for hostile invasion, in which case the prophecy would fail again, for Antiochus did not perish in battle. His confirming the covenant with many for one week, means his gaining over a recreant party among the Jews, whom he succeeded in rendering subservient to his ends. His ceasing the sacrifice and the oblation to cease for half of the week, with which Zöckler compares viii. 11, and vii. 25, denotes the suppression of the temple-worship in Jerusalem for three years and a half; which is the only really plausible point in the interpretation of the entire passage. In the next clause Zöckler alters the words of the text, and reads, "On the temple" (a figurative designation of the roof being applied to the entire structure) "are the abominations of desolation," or the abominations that make desolate, viz., the symbols and appliances of idolatry, heathen statues, altars, etc., "until destruction and judgment shall be poured on the desolater" (where a transitive sense is given to an intransitive form), *i. e.*, on the impious tyrant and his host.

Keil rejects the application of this prophecy to Antiochus Epiphanes, his persecutions and overthrow. At the same

time he does not accept the current interpretation of it which has prevailed among believing expositors from the beginning, and which finds here predicted the advent of Christ, his crucifixion, and the consequent destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans. The chief difficulty which he alleges, in fact the only one of any moment, concerns the chronological exactness of the fulfilment. He impugns this, but without good reason, as appears from the following estimate quoted by himself from Hengstenberg. The twentieth year of Artaxerxes, when the first effectual measures were taken for the rebuilding and restoration of Jerusalem, corresponds with 455 B. C., or the year of Rome 299. Christ's entrance upon his public ministry and his anointing by the Holy Ghost took place, according to Luke iii. 1, in the year of Rome 782. The interval is precisely 483 years, or in the language of the prophecy "seven weeks and threescore and two weeks," each week representing a period of seven years. In the midst of the following week, or three years and a half after his baptism, our Lord suffered death on Calvary, thus making an all-sufficient atonement for the sins of men, and causing the typical sacrifices and oblations of the old economy to cease.

To this demonstration of the precise accuracy of the prophetic announcement, Keil first mentions an objection, p. 317, upon which, however, he very properly does not insist. "We shall not urge," he says, "against the exactness of the fulfilment arrived at by this calculation that the *terminus a quo* adopted by Hengstenberg, viz. : the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, coincides with 455 B. C., only upon the assumption that Xerxes reigned but eleven years, and Artaxerxes came to the throne ten years earlier than in the common chronology, according to which Xerxes reigned twenty-one years; because the arguments for and against this view are *evenly balanced*. In the uncertainty which attaches to many points of ancient chronology, we shall attach no weight to the figuring out to a year, but shall regard the approximate coincidence of the predicted time with that which has actually elapsed as a sufficient proof that there may possibly have been an exact correspondence in the number of years, and that no one can at any rate prove the contrary."

That which to his mind renders the common view of this prophecy untenable, is that the destruction of the city by the Romans, supposed to be predicted at the close of verse 26, and again at the close of verse 27, did not take place till A. D. 70, which would be 525 years, or seventy-five prophetic weeks from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, allowing that to be the proper starting-point. But "the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," points rather, as he claims, to the first year of Cyrus, B. C. 536, which will extend the time to 606 years, or upwards of eighty-six septenaries.

But however plausible this latter suggestion may appear on its first presentation, and though the edict of Cyrus permitting the Jews to return from captivity and rebuild their temple, marked an epoch in the fortunes of the chosen race, and was the limit of the seventy years of exile predicted by Jeremiah, a moment's reflection will suffice to show that this is not necessarily the starting-point of the period here revealed to Daniel. No mention is made of rebuilding or restoring the city in the edict of Cyrus, Ezra i. 1-4.; and at any rate the city was not in point of fact restored under its operation. It is beyond question that no effectual measures were taken to that end until the mission of Nehemiah in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes. And it is also indisputable that from this first effectual going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem, to the appearance of Messiah in the exercise of his public ministry, is exactly the predicted term according to a chronology, which Keil himself confesses to be equal in its claims to any other, and varies but slightly from it according to any chronology which has ever been adopted.

And the allegation that the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans does not fall within the seventy weeks, is nothing to the purpose. The terms of the prediction do not require that it should. The destruction of the city and the sanctuary follows upon the cutting-off of the Messiah as its righteous retribution; but whether immediately or after an interval, the prophecy does not declare. It is not intimated in any way that this was to occur before the seventy weeks had expired. The prophecy is throughout vindicated to the letter, and the

interpretation in which the church has rested for ages, finds the amplest verification in the facts of history.

Abandoning this ancient and well-established view, Keil finds in this passage the Antichrist of the future and the end of the world. There are some faint traces of such an interpretation in Hippolytus and Apollinaris of Laodicea. And a few of those who have referred it in the first instance to the times of Antiochus Epiphaneus, or to the advent of Christ, have likewise supposed a further typical application to the last times, and the personal Antichrist. Keil follows Kliefoth in supposing this to be its immediate and proper intent.

According to this conception of the prophecy, the seventy weeks extend to the termination of the present order of things. "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city"—not, as Keil understands it, upon Israel after the flesh or the geographical Jerusalem, but embracing likewise the New Testament church and the whole of God's earthly kingdom. This is the period fixed for the complete working out of God's grand scheme on earth. Within this term it is his purpose "to shut up transgression" (comp. Eng. Vers., margin), to confine it as in a prison (comp. Rev. xx. 3), to suffer it no longer to have free range and exert itself at will, but put it under a constraint from which it cannot emancipate itself. This shall be accomplished so far as the ungodly and finally impenitent are concerned, by "sealing up sins," not bringing them to an end as a letter is sealed when it is finished, nor simply removing them from sight as things are sealed up to put them out of reach, but in connection with incarceration, making fast and securing under lock and seal, so that there can be no escape from the final prison-house of despair. So far as the righteous are concerned, transgression shall be shut up by "making reconciliation for iniquity;" sin shall be effaced by pardon and the application of the atonement of Christ.

To this negative side of the ultimate salvation is further added its positive side, and this too in three particulars; first, the bringing in an everlasting righteousness, a righteousness which shall endure throughout the endless ages of Messiah's kingdom; secondly, "sealing up vision and prophet," by which he understands not precisely confirming them by their

full accomplishment as a legal instrument is sealed to give it validity, but as in the parallel clause "sealing sin" rendered it thenceforth inoperative, so prophecy is sealed and set aside, its visions are all realized, its work all performed, and it is thenceforth to cease, 1 Cor. xiii. 8. The struggle with sin and imperfection, in which it bore its part, is at length over, and its aid is no longer required; it must accordingly pass away with the other helps, and appliances belonging to this transitory state. And to crown all, "a most holy shall be anointed;" all that the temple foreshadowed shall be brought to pass. God shall inaugurate a fresh abode amongst men, and dwell with them, Rev. xxi. 3. Thus interpreted, verse 24 points, not as it is commonly and as we believe properly, understood, to the achieving of man's redemption by Christ's work on earth; but to the final issue of that redemption as it shall be perfected, when Christ shall come the second time to judge the world and set up his kingdom in glory.

This protracted term, extending to the end of the world, is then subdivided into three minor periods. There shall be first seven weeks from the going forth of the decree to restore and to build Jerusalem; *i. e.*, as he expounds it, from the edict of Cyrus to the advent of Christ in the flesh. Then during a second period of threescore and two weeks after the advent, this work of restoring and building shall still go forward, not, however, in application any longer to the literal Jerusalem, but to the spiritual city of God, his kingdom amongst men. This has its fulfilment in the continued existence and progress of the Christian Church, amid troubles and conflicts, until the last great struggle shall come. The cutting-off of Messiah after these threescore and two weeks have expired, or in the last week of this world's history, is then understood in conformity with the general view taken of the prophecy, not of his violent death, but of the subversion of his authority. He shall be cut off from being recognized or regarded as the anointed of God. The next words, inaccurately rendered in our version, "but not for himself," are properly translated; "and there shall not be to him" or "he shall not have," *viz.*: what as Messiah he is entitled to possess, that consideration and homage which are his due. The prince that shall come

and destroy the city and the sanctuary, is, in Keil's view, the personal Antichrist; and it is his end that shall be in the flood, *i. e.*, the outpouring of the Divine vengeance. Antichrist is still further supposed to be the subject in the following verse. It is he that shall make a strong covenant with the many, the great mass of the people, who are thus spoken of in implied contrast with the few who remain faithful to their God and Saviour. Throughout this week he shall constrain the vast majority to follow and submit to him. And for half the week he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease, interdict and abolish the public exercise of divine worship; this being regarded as identical with the statement in Dan. viii. 25, respecting the little horn on the fourth beast, who "shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time." "And on the wing of abominations," *i. e.*, upheld and borne along on the pinions of idolatry and false religion, he shall execute his work of desolation, until God's own inexorable decree of destruction shall be poured upon himself, and the destroyer shall be himself destroyed.

Remote as all this is from the genuine and proper intent of the prophecy, it is remarkable with what facility most of its expressions lend themselves to this view of the case. The language employed to describe the salvation wrought out by the incarnate Saviour, who put away sin by the sacrifice of himself, may be readily accommodated to its finished fruits in the complete deliverance of his ransomed people. And the enigmatical brevity of the passage renders it possible in some of its clauses to confuse the subject and the object, and to apply indifferently to Antichrist what is said of the desolating armies of the Romans, of the rapid spread of the doctrine of Christ, of his setting aside the sacrificial services of the old economy, and of the destruction visited upon the guilty city that rejected and crucified him. Some of these adroit interpretations may however be set aside by a rigorous grammatical exegesis. But without insisting on minute and subtle points, this interpretation, ingenious as it is, is wrecked by three palpable considerations.

1. The statement that "Messiah shall be cut off," in the absolute manner in which it is here made, can mean nothing else than that he shall be put to a violent death. These terms cannot by possibility denote merely the extirpation of his worship, the abolition of a genuine and vital Christianity.

2. Our Lord plainly declares that Daniel had predicted the overthrow of Jerusalem by the Romans, Mat. xxiv. 15, Mark xiii. 14, comp. Luke xxi. 20. It also appears from Josephus that the belief was current in his day of the existence of such a prediction. Keil tries very hard to evade this difficulty, and particularly to parry the force of our Lord's words by alleging that he alludes, not to ix. 27, but to Dan. xi. 31, or xii. 11. But after all his argumentation the stubborn fact remains that these latter passages relate to an entirely different event; and if the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans is predicted by Daniel at all, it can only be in the prophecy now under consideration.

3. The notation of time, which forms so marked a feature of this prophecy, loses all its significance and value upon the interpretation adopted by Keil. The weeks cease to be fixed or determinate measures of time and are converted into periods of uncertain duration. The intervals which are successively described as seventy, seven, or sixty-two weeks or a half week, do not bear the proportion to each other in their respective extent which these numbers appear to indicate. According to this theory the seven weeks extend from B. C. 536 to the advent. But why that period should be denominated seven weeks does not appear. And this is not supposed to afford any basis for estimating the length of the other periods, which are also stated in weeks. It is difficult to understand why the appearance of strict chronological statement should have been given to the prophecy, if the time of fulfilment was after all to be left vague and uncertain.

Keil undertakes to explain the matter, p. 283, by calling these weeks "a purposely indefinite designation of a period measured by the number seven, but whose chronological duration is to be ascertained from other sources." We must confess that this leaves us as much in the dark as we were before. In fact, it does not convey any clear idea to our mind.

What is meant by the statement that these undefined periods of uncertain duration are measured by the number seven? We do not see why, on this hypothesis, they should be called "weeks" at all, nor why the numbers should be attached to them which we here find. If there might be thought to be a symbolical fitness in connecting the numbers seventy and seven with periods which are fraught with such sacred issues as the advent of the Messiah or the final consummation, what symbolical or sacred meaning can be imagined to be associated with sixty-two? This disregard of the numbers and chronological measures of this prophecy is the more unwarrantable because the seventy years of Jeremiah, which was the theme of Daniel's meditation and suggested the form of the response made to him, had their literal and exact fulfilment. This naturally creates the expectation that the seventy weeks are also to be strictly computed; and so, as we have seen, they are according to the common view of the prophecy, which makes them weeks of years, and finds them to correspond with precision to the historical intervals which they represent.

While Keil denies the chronological value of the seventy weeks, and fails to find any revelation of the time of Messiah's advent in the flesh, Judge Taylor goes to the opposite extreme of subjecting to computation times which we are expressly told it is not for us to know, Acts i. 7, and which are declared to be not only unknown to men, but to the angels in heaven, and even to the Son of God himself, Mark xiv. 32. Calculations are given to show that "the antichristian despotism of the Roman hierarchy" was to come to its end A. D. 1867; that "the Mahometan delusion shall die away and disappear, so far at least as the Holy Land is concerned," in A. D. 1897; that "the restoration of the Jews to Palestine shall be accomplished" in the forty-five years next ensuing; that the second coming of our Lord shall take place in A. D. 1942, when the millennium shall begin.

There are several weak points in the attempted demonstration, which it is not necessary here to specify in detail. It is sufficient to explode this and all similar endeavors to fix definite dates for events still future, that they are all based on the unproved and fallacious assumption that in prophetic language

in general, and in that of Daniel in particular, a day stands for a year. For this hypothesis, widely as it has been adopted, there is absolutely no support. It has no confirmation from the fact that "week" is in Dan. ix. 24ff. used to denote a week of years; for the Hebrew term here employed means properly a "heptad" or a "septenary," and, though commonly used of seven days as the most familiar hebdomadal period, is quite as applicable, according to its derivation, to a period of seven years, or, in fact, to any other whole made up of seven parts. That the weeks are weeks of years, is intimated by events being assigned to them which must necessarily require more than seventy ordinary weeks for their accomplishment. And the Mosaic law, with its sabbatical system and its cycles of sevens extended to years as well as days, habituated the Jews to regularly recurring periods of seven years; and these were brought to mind with special prominence at this very time by the seventy years of exile being declared to be in lieu of these neglected sabbaths of years, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

But that a term properly denoting a heptad or cycle of seven should be used in application to years, does not warrant the conclusion that a day in the language of prophecy may be taken to signify a year, much less that this can be accepted as a fixed canon of interpretation.

Two other passages are adduced to prove the canon, but they are quite as little to the purpose. The rebellion of the children of Israel in consequence of the evil report of the spies was punished by their being condemned to wander in the wilderness forty years, a year for every day that the spies had been searching the land, Num. xiv. 34. But this is not a prediction stated in days and fulfilled in years. They are not told that they must remain forty days in the desert, and then required to remain forty years, as they ought to have been in order to support the hypothesis in question. The term in the sentence is unambiguously declared to be forty years, and coincides exactly with the period of the infliction, only the sentence itself was designed to be a perpetual reminder of the offence which had induced it, and was made so to be by connecting the forty years' wandering with the forty days' searching.

In Ezekiel iv. 4-6 the prophet was directed to lie a certain

number of days first upon one side and then upon the other, to bear the iniquity of the two houses of Israel, in which a day was appointed for a year. Here an action performed by the prophet in view of the people, represented in miniature the penalty to be inflicted on the entire body. But the penalty itself is expressly stated at the time, not in days, but in years. While, however, this passage does not serve the purpose for which the advocates of the year-for-a-day system of interpretation commonly adduce it, it affords an admirable illustration of what may be called the typical employment of numbers in prophecy. The rigor with which the prophet was bound so that he could not turn from side to side, represents the hardships to which the people would be subjected in the threatened exile. But the 390 years allotted to Israel and the forty to Judah do not correspond with the actual periods that their respective captivities were to last. The numbers in both instances belong to periods in the past, and represent the future as a reproduction of what had already taken place. The 390 years is the period which had elapsed since the schism of Jeroboam; this is taken as the measure of their guilt, and the penalty is graduated accordingly. They must continue to bear it until all these years of transgression are expiated. The forty years of Judah are in like manner borrowed from the forty years' wandering in the wilderness. The exile was not to last forty, but seventy years, as Jeremiah explicitly predicted. But it was to be to them what the abode in the desert had been to their fathers, a period of purgation and trial, to issue when the ends of discipline were answered, in their being brought again to Canaan. The employment of the familiar number recalls the event of the past with which it was associated. The very same parallel here suggested by the number forty is by the same prophet, Ezek. xx. 35-38, unambiguously expressed. The usage of the prophets to set forth the future as the iteration of a typical event in the past, and to describe what is hereafter to take place not so much in its own actual forms as in forms or under emblems borrowed from what had previously occurred, is too frequent and well known to require extended exemplification. Comp. Isa. xi. 15; Hos. viii. 13; Mic. v. 5; Zech. xiv. 16.

The fact is that in Daniel, as in other prophets, the periods of the future are never represented in the enigmatical method, which this school of interpreters alleges to have been their invariable practice. They are either given in their actual value, the prophetic statement squaring precisely with the historical fulfillment, which is commonly the case, or they are used in a typical and symbolical sense. The most frequent instance of the latter is that which is variously stated as a time, times and a half, forty-two months, or 1260 days, and which figures so largely in all attempts to compute the dates of the future by the numbers of prophecy. This is a purely typical or ideal period, and is not designed for calculation at all. The three years and a half during which the oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes were to last, Dan. xii. 7, and actually did continue, is made a type of the period during which other foes shall oppress the people of God, not that the actual duration shall be the same, but that they shall be of like character and issue, a similar term of suffering followed by a similar triumph. The one is substantially repeated in the other, but no computation of historic times based on the one can have any validity in respect to the other.

Judge Taylor rigorously applies this false canon to all the prophecies of Daniel, and, as a consequence, he understands them all to refer to events posterior to the time of Christ. Thus, in express contravention of the interpretation given to the prophet himself, the ram of ch. viii. (the kings of Media and Persia) is made to be the Roman Empire or the Pope of Rome, and the he goat (the king of Grecia) to be the kingdom of Chosroes of Persia, and the little horn, ver. 9, the Moham-medan delusion; though once, pp. 92, 93, he appears to forget himself, and the Persia of the prophecy is no longer treated as Rome but as Persia proper. This, of course, substitutes mere guess-work for interpretation, and leads to the most extraordinary identifications, as, on p. 141, "the taking away of the daily sacrifice" with the conferring of the title of universal bishop upon Boniface. 2 Peter iii. 10 is paraphrased as follows, p. 175: "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in the which, in the midst of terrific convulsions, the governments of the world shall all be subverted and pass

away; legal ordinances and ritualistic ceremonies shall be abrogated, ecclesiastical tyranny abolished, and all the enemies of God shall be consumed." A number of minor slips betray the fact that this volume, though evidently the fruit of much reflection and of an earnest spirit, has led its author into a department with which he is not professionally familiar—as where he unintentionally plays into the hands of modern unbelieving criticism by speaking of the book of Daniel as the work not of the prophet but of a compiler, p. 13, and prepared after the prophet's death, p. 44, or makes our Lord's ministry to have lasted seven years, p. 26, or explains "host," Dan. viii. 13, by the Latin "*hostia*," or substitutes a Septuagint reading for that of the Hebrew, and makes it the basis of his computations, p. 39, or founds an interpretation on expressions in the Septuagint which are wholly out of relation to the original, p. 77ff.

ARTICLE VI.—*The General Assembly.*

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States met in the First Presbyterian Church of Chicago on the 18th day of June, 1871, and was opened with a sermon by Rev. J. Trumbull Backus, D.D., the moderator of the last Assembly. The Rev. Z. M. Humphrey, D.D., was chosen Moderator.

REDUCTION OF THE RATIO OF REPRESENTATION.

The body was very large, numbering some 500 members, or more. This number was greatly augmented by a very large attendance of others who, in various capacities, and for various reasons, always crowd around such gatherings. The size of the body, which must constantly increase on the present basis of representation, with the growth of our church, has already become too onerous to Christian hospitality to be endured in any but the largest cities, and in them only on special occasions, nor more than once in a generation; and it has become