

OUR MONTHLY.

A

RELIGIOUS AND LITERARY MAGAZINE

AUGUST—1870.

THE THEBAN LEGION.

BY PROF. W. M. BLACKBURN.

CHAPTER VIII.

REFUGE.

THE desert was fearful to the people of the East, on account of its deathly influences. A shelter, a retreat, a place of refreshment was rarely to be found; but if one were found it was appreciated by the traveler, exposed to the burning heat or drifting sands. Hence the reference of the prophet to a time when "a man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest: as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land." Such should a king be at a future day. But no such king, prince, or emperor appeared in the East during those years of which we are writing. The imperial breath was as the deadly wind, making a desert on which were dying thousands of heavenward pilgrims.

The man, who was as a shadowing tent in the daytime from the heat, "and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from the storm," was usually to be found in humbler life. Here and there was a shield for the saints of God.

No house was better known as a refuge, than that of Otho, the innkeeper of Ancyra. It was called a Noah's ark. It was a *rendezvous* for the persecuted of all that region. It was a home in which plundered Christians were supported; a hospital for beaten and tortured confessors, or for the eyeless and the hamstrung heroes, who groped and limped along their way of escape; a church wherein bread and wine were furnished gratuitously to those who refreshed their souls in the supper of the Lord, and forgot their sufferings when they remembered Calvary (at this time everything sold in shops and markets was first offered to the gods).

Otho and his wife were worthy of the portrait drawn by the orator Tertullian, when he had in his eye a Christian home. Of such a wedded pair he says: "How shall we find words to express the happiness of that marriage which the Church effects, and the oblation confirms, and the blessing seals, and angels report, and the Father ratifies? What a union of two believers, with one hope, one discipline, one service, one spirit, and one flesh! Together they bow, together they pray, together they keep their

ited with too long a mark for this concession, it may be well to state that Uncle Peter had caused her to be the happy inheritor of his gold-lined snuff-box and the accompanying pouch of oiled silk, well stuffed with the genuine Scotch article.

After this the minister and his wife rode in their new carriage, and the "Smiley mare" was seldom seen on the road. Indeed her mission in life seemed to have been fulfilled, for though her kind-hearted master and mistress tempted her with the most relishing food and bedded her with the cleanest

straw, she grew daily more apathetic. She would doze, standing in her favorite attitude, for hours together.

One morning Mr. Smiley came in with a grave face.

"Well, dearie," he said, "the poor old creature is dead."

"Is she? O George, I am so glad for her. It seems foolish, I know, to cry about it," she added a minute or two afterward, wiping the tears from her eyes, "but there are so many associations connected with her! I can't help thinking of poor old Uncle Peter."

THE DOUBLE SENSE OF SCRIPTURE.

BY REV. HOWARD CROSBY, D. D.

BY the use of the *double sense of Scripture* is meant the rightful interpretation of the prophetic and historic portions of the Old Testament (which form nearly five-sixths of the whole) in a literal or proximate and a typical or remote way. The double sense is affirmed only of the Old Testament, because *it* only belongs to a typical dispensation and because *of* it only have we an apostolic authority for this view. Yet we do not deny that the same principle may be involved in the New Testament Scriptures, especially in their prophetic parts, which necessarily have many points of resemblance to the prophecies of the Old Testament. The subject naturally divides itself into two departments: that which treats of the prophetic Scriptures and that which treats of the historic Scriptures, the arguments touching the two being by no means identical.

I. Let us first regard the double sense of the prophetic Scriptures.

Those who oppose the double sense are of two classes—first, the literalist, secondly, the tropist, and they which are only proximately exact.* The lit-

*The literalist accepts figurative and emblematic language in some cases, and the tropist accepts the literal interpretation in some cases.

eralist holds that the prophecies mean exactly what is on the face of them and no more. A corollary from this position is that the great bulk of the prophecies are of no more value to us than are Jacob's sheep in Padan-aram, that they are incidents of the past and only in a very general way suggest wholesome thought. If this is the case, it seems strange that nearly one-quarter of the sacred volume preserved for the use of the Christian Church should be of this material. A small specimen of prophecy would have sufficed. The bulk of Old Testament prophecy, as we all know, is directed to Israel and Judah; and the surroundings of those nations are those of the pre-Christian era, such as Assyria, Egypt, Babylon, Moab, Ammon, Philistia, Amalek, Edom, etc. We have no mention of Turkey, France, England, Russia, or the twenty lands which for many modern ages have had chiefly to do with the descendants of Jacob. Hence, the literalist, with regard to the bulk of Old Testament prophecy, is obliged to make the return from Babylon the extreme horizon of his view. Notice here that we are speaking of the *bulk* of prophecy. In some few portions, as in Daniel, for example, the horizon is extended to Rome and its sequents. The literalist

accepts figure, but only where language utterly forbids a literal rendering. As, for example, the various beasts and horns in Daniel, and the horses, stone and candlestick in Zechariah must refer emblematically to human facts and movements in the future. He does not, therefore, reject figure, but only uses a strict economy in its use.

The arguments against the literalist, besides that already noticed, are three: first, that *the tone and language of prophecy are wholly disproportioned to the event*. Take, for example, the sublime passage in the beginning of the 2d chapter of Isaiah, copied by Micah. "The word that Isaiah the son of Amoz saw concerning *Judah* and *Jerusalem*. And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. O house of Jacob, come ye, and let us walk in the light of the Lord." Now, there is no event in the history of Judah and Jerusalem that can for a moment answer this grand description. Was anything in the Persian colony or the Syro-Greek province of Judea the *point d'appui* of this prophecy? Did the highest achievements of the Maccabees come within the stoop of this exalted language? The only refuge for the literalist is in the still future exaltation of the literal Judah and Jerusalem. But he can not escape trouble in this refuge. This same prophet Isaiah thus pictures the same scene with more minuteness: "And it shall come to

pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. * * * They shall fly upon the shoulders of the Philistines. * * They shall lay their hand upon Edom and Moab; and the children of Ammon shall obey them," and then follows in the 12th chapter a passage of great sublimity describing the glory of that latter day. Now, if the literalist is going to dull the edge of our objection to his literalism (that the language is too grand for the events) by pointing to the final return of the Jews to Jerusalem, he is bound to recognize equally a return of the Philistines, Moabites, Ammonites and Edomites. Is he ready for that? Is he prepared to reconstruct the geographic ethnology of the East *tanto quanto* according to the days of Isaiah? If he says that these are generic names for "enemies," then he deserts his colors—he leaves his literalism and gives us the right to translate "Judah" into "the Christian Church."

A second argument against the literalist is *his own inconsistency*. We have seen it in the last quotation. Let us produce one other. Jeremiah (chap. 20.) thus prophesies of Israel and Judah: "I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah, saith the Lord. * * * * It shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of hosts, that I will break his yoke from off thy neck* * * * and they shall serve the Lord their God, and David their king." The prophet Ezekiel has words (in xxxiv. and xxxvii.) equivalent. If Israel and Judah and their land must be literal in these passages, we insist upon it that David must be literal too, and that the re-

*Babylon is the last oppressor mentioned.

established Jewish monarchy will see not Jesus but the actual son of Jesse and conqueror of Goliath on its throne. If the literalist draws back from this, then his whole cause is lost.

The third argument against the literalist is the *testimony of the apostles*. In the book of Joel we have the following (ii. 28; i. 2). Here are Mt. Zion and Jerusalem and Judah and the valley of Jehoshaphat and sun and moon and heaven and earth. The apostle Peter quotes this very prophecy on the day of Pentecost, and declared that it refers to the great spiritual event of that day. Again, Isaiah, after speaking of the Egyptian bondage (ch. lii.), exclaims with regard to an unmentioned captivity, "Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord." The apostle quotes this prophecy with the solemn addition of "saith Jehovah," and declares that it refers to the coming out of Christian believers from a godless world. (2 Cor. vi. 17.)

We now leave the literalist and turn to the tropist. His position is that there are many prophecies that use figurative and emblematic language of some far future and perhaps spiritual event, but that such prophecies have only the one sense. He would deny the literal sense where there is this pneumatic (πνευματικῶς. Rev. xi. 8) sense. This error is much more venial than that of the literalist. It shows a higher sense of revelation, a grander view of God's dealings with our race. It elevates the Scriptures and lifts the prophets out of the circumscription of a petty nationality and a little city. But the difficulty in the case of these is that they divorce the prophecies from their immediate causes and circumstances. These prophecies originated from the needs of God's ancient people. They were uttered to meet their case. Captivity was threatened them for their sins, and deliverance and return were promised them on their repentance. To cut off these allusions from the prophecies would be to make the prophets masters of a *non-sequitur*

vocation. The people need their counsel, and they utter their voice to them, but it is about matters that have nothing whatever to do with the people. If the prophecies of return from captivity (for example) did not refer to the return from Babylon, then Isaiah and Jeremiah and Ezekiel were as miserable comforters as Eliphaz, Bildad and Zophar. It would certainly be giving a stone when bread was asked to answer the wants of the Jewish people under Ahaz or Zedekiah with an enlargement on the Christian Church.

Now, in the double sense of prophecy we have both the primal adaptation of threat or comfort to the persons immediately concerned and the grander application to the enlarged Church of Christ. We see the latter foreshadowed in the former, so that the events of the primal adaptation are typical of the events of the grander application. The prophet looks forward and sees both events (perhaps there may be more than two) as if in the same plane, and mingles, therefore, the description of the two together. The events belong to one genus, they are furnished with the same signals, they are ensouled with the same principles, and they are both intended by the prophet and by the Holy Spirit who inspires him. There is no accommodation or mere use of analogy in combining the two, but the two are one. What God has joined together let not man put asunder.

In this view of prophecy we are supported by the testimony of the New Testament writers. For example, it must be acknowledged by every reader of the 41st Psalm that it has a direct reference to the personal circumstances of David. Imagine David singing that psalm without such a reference, and he would appear to be playing the fool. In that psalm he says "Yea, mine own familiar friend, * * which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me." But our Lord quotes this very passage as of himself. In the same way must we treat all the Messianic psalms. That they had a primal reference to David's own case

is clear from their verisimilitude, their perfect naturalness, their intensity of utterance, as well as their adaptedness to the trials of that afflicted prince. But that they had a grander reference to Jesus who can deny who believes the abundant testimony of the New Testament writers and that of Jesus himself?

We do not see how any one can study the use of the phrase "the day of the Lord," as so often used in both the Old and New Testaments and not recognize a varied application of the one phrase, not only in the aggregated passages but in each separate passage, where, though an allusion to a woe upon the city of Jerusalem may be most clear, yet nothing but the final day of retribution will completely answer the demands of the language.

This view of prophecy is, besides, more consonant with the dignity of the subject. It is *a priori* presumable that God in ministering to man's present wants will provide for his future need. It is like God to unfold the future from the present, and to erect along the ages roadmarks and tokens of the coming issue. It is like Him, who has furnished all outward nature with purposed analogies, to create events in the likeness of one another, in series of types of one grand Antitype, which is also the Prototype for its class.

II. Many are willing to acknowledge the double sense in prophecy who deny it of history. We affirm it only of the history of the Jewish people (and others as affected by them).

1. Because they were a people selected to be types of the spiritual people of God. The New Testament is full of allusions to this fact. The phraseology used by God toward the Israelites is used again and again by the New Testament writers toward the Church of Christ. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people," is a statement made by Peter to believers, but the phrases used are taken bodily from Isaiah, Exodus, and Deuteronomy, where they are applied to God's ancient people. I need not multiply the examples. The whole New Testament

is interwoven with them, and they will be present to every mind. The current phraseology of the Church is derived from this typical fact. We use, Canaan, the Promised Land, the Jordan, Zion, the Wilderness, David, the High Priest, the Sanctuary, etc., from more than a mere suggestion of analogy—rather from a traditionary recognition of a typical structure in the Israelitish history. The tabernacle and its service, priestly and sacrificial, were all certainly typical. If not, then they were monstrous. The pattern shown Moses in the mount was not a plaything, an arbitrary dealing in fringes and sockets and skins and cubits. It was a most solemn embodiment of truth, made most solemn in the delivery by forty days and nights of miraculous fasting amid the awful glories of Sinai. We are far more sure that there is a divine meaning to every board and curtain of the tabernacle, and every article of the high priest's dress than we are that there is a meaning to every hieroglyphic on Karnak and Luxor. Now this typical tabernacle service in the midst of Israel was the typical soul of a typical people. It suggested in the nation a typical life. Their history was the book wherein God had chosen to record his great truths for all the world to see and read. "Israel" was to be a constant type of the "True Israel."

2. The New Testament writers testify to the historic typicalness of Jewish history.

Paul declares that the Rock (*i. e.* the water from the rock) that followed Israel meant Christ. He does not seek and find an analogy or make an accommodation. Paul's decided language will not bear such a diluted interpretation. The Holy Ghost did not leave Paul to make a pretty picture from analogy, the child of mere fancy, when study, clinching arguments of truth were needed. The language "that Rock was Christ," reminds us of those other words "This is my body," and equally drives off all other trifling about analogies and accommodations. Again, Paul declares expressly that the history of Abraham, Sarah, Hagar,

Isaac and Ishmael are given us as typical—"ἀπινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορομενα" (which things are "spoken so as to imply something other than what is said"). This is Plutarch's use of the word and the exact definition given by Liddell and Scott. "These *are* the two covenants." "This Hagar is Mt. Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem that now is." Such is the pointed language of the apostle as if he had expected a Liliputian army with their literalistic needles to swarm over him, and would prepare a protest in advance.

The objection to all double sense in Scripture is no doubt strengthened by the follies of Origenism and Swedenborgianism. In the case of Origen and his predecessor Clement, and in the case of Swedenborg, fancy was their only guide to Scripture interpretation. In Clement, this fancy was combined with ignorance, in Origen with oriental phantasmagorical philosophy, and in Swedenborg with downright craziness. These men made fools of themselves and brought reproach, if not upon the Scriptures, upon the true interpretation of the Scriptures.

Fancy is never to be a guide in interpreting God's word. The sacred writers and the common law of a well-regulated mind settle the mode.

If John tell us that the great unbelieving world which crucified our Lord is Sodom and Egypt, we are fur-

nished with a key to unlock the preamble of the decalogue. If Paul tell us that the Horeb Rock was Christ, we are prepared to know what murmuring in the wilderness spiritually means.

If Peter tell us that the Deluge was a type of baptism, we are able to understand that baptismal grace is no hocus-pocus or magic presto-change, but a destruction of sin, and we see what the *ark* spiritually means. We observe, too, that all types center in Christ. Any explanation of types in history or prophecy that does not end in Christ must be wrong. This we learn from the New Testament.

The New Testament has given us an example to follow. It tacitly urges us to seek types in the Old Testament by showing us that they lie hidden under the most unexpected places. If we keep Christ ever in view and use faithfully the guidance of the sacred writers and the analogies of Scripture, and then go ahead zealously and earnestly in discovering the hidden sense of Scripture, we shall be more full of their glory than we should be by halting at the outside view through fear of Swedenborg's ghost, and shrugging our shoulders at the audacity of others who desire by going beneath the letter of Scripture to discern spiritually (*πνευματικῶς*) the deep things of God.

THE ETHICS OF ART.

BY REV. C. H. RICHARDS.

IF Quill writes down in black and white, and scatters broad-cast through the land, the assertion that Art is one of the most effective preachers of the world, sending from its pulpit one of the most powerful moral influences, and working as one of the most successful correctives of evil, he is very likely to be met with a stare of inquiry. A multitude of professionals, the distinct object of whose

vocation is to reform wrong, feeling their province invaded, arrest the bold writer with the indignant question, "What do you mean?" And as the following paragraphs may rouse such a challenge, it may be well to give answer beforehand, by making clear what they do not mean. They would be very far from claiming the office of moral teacher for every thing that goes under the title of "Art" in these