

...THE...

Union Seminary Magazine

Vol. XXI.

FEBRUARY—MARCH, 1910

No. 3

The Modern Pulpit and Bible Teaching.

By ROBERT E. VINSON, D. D.

There is in my mind a picture of a scene in the district court room of a certain western city. The case under consideration had excited much interest, for in it certain great corporations were being tried for alleged violations of law. The room was filled with eager listeners. On one side were the lawyers of the corporations, sharp, shrewd men, ready to take advantage of every turn of the case. On the other side, the attorney for the State was hotly contesting every inch of the ground. He was just closing a great speech for popular rights. The peroration was filled with sarcasm, which reached its climax in a reference to Scripture in the words:—"If it please the court, I desire to say that when the last attorney for the defense finished his argument, I felt much as I imagine Saul of Tarsus must have felt when he was struck with the jaw-bone of an ass."

The man who perpetrated this withering piece of Scriptural sarcasm is not an ignoramus. He is a lawyer of repute, a very intelligent man, and one who has had opportunities of sitting under as good preaching as can be found in America. He is used not so much for individual comment but as a type, even though a somewhat extreme one, of that which every observer knows to be quite prevalent to-day, which is ignorance of the plain facts of the Bible, colossal in individual cases, and hardly less so in general. Whether this ignorance is greater to-day than formerly, as some writers insist, or whether we simply are more aware of it than we have been before, is not certain, nor

The Little Horn

By C. R. VAUGHAN, D. D.

"I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots; and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth speaking great things."—Verse 8.

"These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth."—Verse 17.

"Thus, he said, the fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces."—Verse 23.

"And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings."—Verse 24.

Daniel in His Prophecy.

It will appear from the examination of the three lists of marks in the fourth chapter that the little horn of Daniel is described with several of the peculiarities attributed to the Man of Sin of Paul, and the two beasts of John. As in the case of the book of Revelation there are several successive and parallel presentations of the same great series of events. It is a mistake to suppose that the narrative in both of the two great prophets is altogether an advancing history of separate events: it is rather an account of the progressive events in the history of the same great subjects of remark. We must therefore look for the marks of the little horn of Daniel in more than one chapter of the Prophets. These marks are sometimes repeated yet somewhat differentiated, and other marks are then added to the list. When Daniel, the seer of the vision of the great beasts and the ancient days was perplexed to understand what the vision of the four great bears meant, he says that he applied to one of them that stood by—evidently one of the great train of the Ancient of Days, or of the

Son of Man, who came to him and was invested with an everlasting dominion, who had evidently been commissioned to do so—who told him the interpretation of the things. According to one of the members of the text “these great beasts which are four are four kings which shall arise out of the earth.” In another member of the text, he explains that the fourth beast is a kingdom upon earth. In another member of the text he explains that the ten horns of the great beast are ten kings that shall arise. As he had just explained that a prophetic king was a kingdom, the lesson becomes clear that the terms “beast” and “horn” both describe an aggregation of political or state power, in a kingdom upon earth. Whether there is any difference in the significance of the two terms is neither clear nor of special importance. In some uses of the word “beast” it clearly represents a kingdom or a mixed form of a political organization of very large dimensions, out of which the “horns” grow. Thus the three large states, or what in modern usage would be called “empires” of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and Macedon were called beasts. So was the great Roman dominion, although it differed from the other Oriental despotic powers just mentioned, by retaining the form of a republic, out of which the ten horns grew. It is therefore fairly within the teaching of the actual usage to decide that the terms “beast” and “horn” interchangeably mean a kingdom of variable dimensions, a mixed form of government, even a republic, or any form of government, just so it is really the actual ruling power in the territory of the nationality alluded to in the narrative. The very same state is sometimes called a “beast,” and sometimes a “horn.” The terms are in effect interchangeable and equivalent.

The little horn of Daniel is described with a number of marks, all of which need not be investigated at large, in a treatise like this; although each mark would contribute something to the identification of the horn. The most significant of the long list are those which are duplicated, centuries after Daniel's day, by Paul and John. The little horn of the Old Testament prophet is a kingdom like all other horns as defined by the prophet himself, or the angel who explained his vision to him. It is a kingdom, not an individual person in a kingly office. It is a true

kingdom, yet differing from other kingdoms in some peculiar respects. It was distinguished by its size: it was a small kingdom. It was distinguished by its intelligence: it had "eyes": eyes which are the principal organs of perception are the symbol of intelligence. It was distinguished by its haughty domineering spirit—a look more stout than his fellows. It was to be distinguished by audacious uses of words and blasphemies against God, and tyrannical assumptions of power over man. It was to be distinguished by the spirit of malignity and bitter hatred towards the adherents of the Holy Faith. It was distinguished by its open war with these saints, and by his prevailing over them, to the extent of wearing them out. It was to be distinguished by the time allotted to its victory over the people of God: it was to be for a time and times and the dividing of time. This language is explained in Scripture to signify that same mysterious period allotted to Paul's Man of Sin, and the two beasts of John. Three years and a half, or forty two months, or twelve hundred and sixty days, or twelve hundred and sixty years of natural time. The little horn is also distinguished by his seeking to change times and laws made sacred by the Lord of the saints whom he was trying to exterminate. It is distinguished by disregard for every god and the desire of women; for he shall magnify himself above all. It is also distinguished by disregard for "Mahuzzim" which signifies being of another life, such as sorcerers and witches have been accustomed to cultivate. This new class of "strong defenders and protectors" as they are esteemed are made objects of worship, indicated by their being called "a strange God." As such defenders, the little horn is said to place them in the strongest holds, to honor them with gold and silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things." He also causes these Mahuzzim to rule over many, and shall divide the land for their emolument. These eleven or twelve marks of the little horn of the Old Testament Prophet will be sufficient to distinguish the horn of Daniel, and enable a comparison with the Man of Paul, and the beasts of John. We have overlooked one of the most striking marks of the horn which was his plucking up three other kingdoms by the roots.

1. The first point to be discussed is the leading issue between the millenarian and postmillennial parties in reference to the little horn. Did that title refer to an individual king, or to an organized body with a continuous life? In settling this question the length of time allotted to the reign of the horn will afford a conclusive argument. His reign was to last "a time and times and the dividing of time." By reference to the Revelation of St. John, it will be seen that he uses the very same form of expression; for he says the woman "was nourished in the wilderness for a time and times, and half a time." The same transaction is described in the same twelfth chapter: "that they should feed her there a thousand two hundred and threescore days." John also defines the fateful period by forty-two months during which the "holy city shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles." It is therefore certain that the period allotted to the career of the horn by Daniel—"the time, times and the dividing of time," was exactly the same period of which John spoke. If then the literal principle of interpretation is applied to this question of the period allotted to the horn, the astounding career of the individual king, denoted by the term "horn," must be completely developed and run to its close in three years and half, or forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty days of natural time. On the contrary, if the horn is an organized body with a continuous life the period of his career is twelve hundred and sixty years of natural time. One of the prophets of the Old Testament quotes God as saying, "I have given you a day for a year"—a clue which has been tested in the seventy weeks of Daniel as truly applicable to any other prophecy as to the time of Messiah's first advent. On the literal principle, the little horn is an individual king, who with a kingdom noted for its smallness, is to pluck up three kingdoms greater than itself—to dominate the world by his imperious ways, to alter times and laws of great sanctity and divine authority—to introduce a strange religion instead of the Son of his fathers—to exalt himself into great influence and to prosper until a certain notable example of the Divine indignation shall come to a close—to suppose that this astounding career can be run in forty-two months of natural time taxes credulity to the breaking point. One of the rules

of right reason for testing the principle of interpretation proper to be used in a given case, is that the results yielded by the principle should be in accord with the rules of nature, and the ordinary laws of the Divine procedure in his Providence. Is it in accord with the historical experience of those rules that an individual king, with the small resources accredited to him, should be able to do such a work as that ascribed to the little horn in twelve hundred and sixty days of natural time? It is well nigh an impossibility. But the conclusive argument against construing the little horn of Daniel as an individual person, in a kingly office, is the prophet's own definition of a prophetic horn, as a king—as the significance of his four monstrous beasts; and his subsequent definition of one of these beasts as a "kingdom on earth." The prophet's own definition of his "four kings" as a "kingdom on the earth," is demonstration that the small kingdom of the little horn is an organized and continuous or successive body, and not an individual person, wearing the crown of a kingdom. This proof is greatly strengthened and made conclusive by the testimonies of Paul and John about the same extraordinary subject of prophetic announcement. That such prominence should be given in three great prophecies of the Word of Almighty God, to a single person, limited to a career of three years and a half of natural time, is incredible. To only one Person, the Divine Redeemer Himself, is any such prominence given in prophecy. The whole testimony bears decisively against the premillennial theory of the antichristian horn of Daniel as a particular, individual king. But the matter is so important on the general doctrine of the millennium that it needs a more particular and extended discussion, than can be given in a more explanatory statement. Let us proceed, then, to discuss more of the prophetic marks of the horn of Daniel.

2. The second mark of the little horn which attracts attention is the method of its becoming a horn, and plucking up three other horns by the roots, and the time when it arose, indicated by the circumstances of its origin. The prophet says that as he considered the ten horns of the great Roman beast, another little horn came up among them and plucked up the three first horns by the roots. The ten horns of the great Roman beast then pre-

ceded the little horn; and the rise of the ten horns was subsequent to the fall of the great beast. We may then look for the period of the little horn after the fall of the great beast, and the development of the ten horns springing out of its ruins. To trace out in the actual events of the history of the case the explanation of what the prophet describes in the striking symbols of his vision, it will be necessary to follow up in a brief narrative the history of the great empire of pagan Rome. The fourth beast of Daniel is represented as the greatest and fiercest of all the monstrous forms which rose on his prophetic vision. It had great iron teeth, with which it devoured all before it, and stamped the residue with its feet. No resemblance to any animal form is alleged, as in the case of the other three great beasts; but the emphatic remark is made that "it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns." A prophetic "beast" and a prophetic "horn," both signifying an earthly kingdom, according to Daniel's own definition. We are to understand by this great beast an earthly empire of surpassing extent, power, and lust of dominion, out of which at the close of its career ten kingdoms were to emerge. This gives us a clue to the time when the celebrated little horn should arise: it would appear after the close of the original empire of the beast, and after the establishment of the ten kingdoms which are to be formed upon its territory; for three of these were to be overthrown by the small horn. So the prophet himself explains. The great beast is universally construed by interpreters to be the great empire of pagan Rome, which is beyond question the greatest and most remarkable empire in all the past history of mankind. It was the greatest in extent, reaching from the British Islands to the borders of Hindustan; and from the north of Europe to the great deserts of Africa, embracing large sections of the three continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa. It was the greatest military power the world ever saw, and the greatest in its laws, policies, and wise administration. Some of its military roads, built into the countries subdued by its arms, are in constant use at this very day. It was diverse in form from every other government ever known: even in the days when the power of its rulers was most despotic, it still wore the outward form of a republic: its

emperors were for the most part elective, and its Senate was nominally and legally supreme. At the close of the career of this great State, we are to look for the rise of the little horn. Full two hundred and fifty years were to elapse; for ten separate kingdoms were to develop and settle their political institutions; and only then would the most remarkable of them all make its appearance. At or just about this time the little horn would receive its first investiture as a horn or earthly kingdom; and at the end of fifty years more would complete that investiture. This little horn was the most remarkable of all the kingdoms mentioned in the ancient prophecies of the Old Testament Scriptures. It is signalized with extraordinary expressions of interest in the two greatest of the old prophets. It is equally emphasized in the prophecies of the New Testament; and will continue in existence from the fall of the old Roman empire down to the beginning of the millennium. It is in existence now. All the great empires of the past—the great beasts of Daniel's vision—have passed away to return no more; but the little horn has not yet completed the 1260 years of its warranted existence. What power is it? There are three theories about the little horn kingdom. First, by the Jewish interpreters, and by some Christians it is construed to be Antiochus Epiphanes, a king of Syria, who reigned about 175 or 200 years before Christ. If the horns of Daniel are kingdoms and not individual kings, that fact alone is sufficient to set aside the claim of Antiochus. This monarch was a singular, eccentric, but gifted and energetic man, who was animated by a frenzied hatred of the Jewish nation, and to their religion. He overwhelmed the power of the Jews, abolished the national religion, profaned the temple by offering swine's blood upon the sacred altars, and by setting up his own statue and the image of Jupiter Olympus within the holy of holies, and by a remorseless use of military strength endeavored to replace the worship of Jehovah by the worship of the Olympian gods. To enforce this infamous policy he filled the land with blood and massacre, and displayed a savage cruelty never surpassed in all the evil ages of an evil world. He certainly possesses some of the marks of the horn of Daniel, the hatred to the holy people, the contempt of God, the merciless thirst of

blood, the inhuman war upon the faithful followers of Jehovah. But he wants the great bulk of the predicted marks. His pretension to be the little horn of Daniel is annihilated by the fact that his course was run several hundred years before the fall of the Roman empire—nay, before the Roman power had reached the fullness of its ascendancy. He was defeated and driven out of Palestine by the heroic resistance of the celebrated family of the Maccabees and died of disease on one of the military expeditions—thus completing his forfeiture of the claim to be the horn of Daniel, whose end was to come by a burning flame, by a sudden judgment from Almighty God. This theory is pointedly condemned by the evidence. The second theory of the little horn is that held by the premillennial and Romanist interpreters, who strenuously contend that the horn of Daniel is an individual king of great talents and greater wickedness, who is yet to appear, and whose overthrow will immediately precede and introduce the millennial ages. The same definition of a prophetic king as a kingdom on the earth by the prophet himself disposes of this theory as it did of Antiochus Epiphanes. The third theory is that of the overwhelming majority of the Protestant interpreters—that the horn of Daniel, the Man of Sin of Paul, and the two beasts of John is the great religious apostacy represented by the Church of Rome with an universal bishop—the Vicar of Christ—at the head of the visible church, combined with the temporal kingdom over the states of the church, represented by the triple crown of the Pope.

Enough has been already said to discount the theories of the Jewish, Romanist, and Millennialist interpreters. They all agree in making the little horn an individual person. But the evidence of Daniel's own interpretation of his prediction—the violence done to the laws of nature, and the ordinary rules of the Divine procedure, the arbitrary alteration of the rules of the prophetic, symbolic interpretation—are conclusive against making the little horn an individual person. This discount of two of the three theories as untenable would of itself throw us back on the acceptance of the third. But this conclusion will be infinitely strengthened by an examination of the mark of the horn, his plucking up of the three other horns of the great Roman

beast, as it is illustrated by the history of the events which occurred. The Roman empire in its pagan form, after centuries of world-wide supremacy, had become divided into two grand divisions, in the time of the first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great. According to Gibbon, the gifted author of "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," this decision was the first general cause of the ultimate ruin which ensued. It introduced a division of strength, confusion of policies, jealousies, and divided interests as well as divided counsels and thus weakened both sections. These sections eventually assumed two distinct titles: one, the western division—of which the old capital, the city of Rome, remained the seat of government, retained the name of the Roman or Latin empire. The section of which the new city of Constantinople was the capital, took the name of the Eastern empire—the title of the Greek, or Byzantine empire. This eastern section, after lingering in the most remarkable manner for many centuries in a state between life and death, was finally destroyed as late as the year 1453, by the Turkish conquest. But the first blow to the independent existence of the western section—the real representative of the old undivided empire—was struck over a thousand years earlier by Alaric and his Gothic hosts in the year of the Christian era, first in A. D. 395, and then again in the year A. D. 410. After suffering repeated invasions with terrible results, by Attila and his Huns, by Genseric and his vandals, the very name of the western empire was extinguished by Odoacer and the Heruli in A. D. 476. The reign of Odoacer, after sixteen years was ended by the conquest of Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, whose kingdom lasted about sixty years. It may be said then, with some degree of precision, that the old Roman empire came to an end about the close of the fifth, and the beginning of the sixth century of the Christian era. Italy became divided into three independent governments—that is, independent of each other, although one, and perhaps two of them acknowledged a nominal allegiance to the Byzantine power at Constantinople. The City of Rome returned under the control of a Roman Senate and a Roman Duke. The territory of Ravenna was governed by an independent Exarch. The kingdom of the Lombards occupied the

northern portion of the Italian peninsula. Many kingdoms sprang up upon the territory of the ruined empire of old Rome which have substantially remained in the same distinct and independent conditions down to this day. These local governments shifted and changed rapidly among themselves, but at various periods showed the exact number of the horns predicted by Daniel. Ten was the prevailing number; and although listed differently by different calculators, at different periods of the shifting political arrangements, always resulted in the same number of stable governments. The list of Sir Isaac Newton enumerates: 1. The kingdom of the Vandals and Alans in Spain and Africa; 2, the kingdom of the Suevi in Spain; 3, the kingdom of the Visigoths; 4, the kingdom of the Alans in Gaul; 5, the kingdom of the Burgundians; 6, the kingdom of the Franks; 7, the kingdom of the Britons; 8, the kingdom of the Huns; 9, the kingdom of the Lombards; 10, the kingdom of Ravenna. The list of Bishop Newton seems somewhat preferable, because it embraces more permanent and modern establishments. 1, the Kingdom of Ravenna; 2, the Kingdom of Lombardy; 3, the Kingdom of Hungary; 4, the Kingdom of Germany; 5, the Kingdom of France; 6, the Kingdom of Burgundy; 6, the Kingdom of Spain; 8, the Kingdom of Britain; 9, the Kingdom of the Saxons; 10, the Kingdom of the revived Senate and Dukedom of Rome. Now the Kingdom of the Little Horn predicted by Daniel, was to be the product of a growth among these Kingdoms, and was to pluck up three of them. It was still more pointedly marked out by kingdoms thus plucked up being the first of those kingdoms to be established. The Roman government of the Senate, the Exarchate of Ravenna, and the government of the Lombards were the first to become notable after the final extinction of the Western Empire. The Little Horn Kingdom was not to rise immediately on the fall of the empire, the Ten kingdoms were to be developed before three of them could be plucked up. The Church of Rome had existed in the great capital city of the empire from the time before Paul's first visit. It had been probably probably founded by some of those visitors to Jerusalem at the time of the crucifixion or the day of Pentecost. It had remained comparatively pure under the Ten dreadful persecutions which

for three hundred years, under the Pagan Emperors had scourged the Church. But it had gradually grown corrupt; it had begun to claim a supremacy over all the churches abroad, as due to its position at the centre of the Empire. No prominence at first was given to the Primacy of Peter, probably for the reason that it could not be proved that Peter was ever in Rome until shortly before his martyrdom. It was known that Peter was in a peculiar sense the Apostle of the "circumcision" and Paul was the Apostle of the Gentiles. But the claim of Supremacy in the great Christian body was thought to be fully sustained by its position in the center of the empire. After the Old Empire had become nominally Christian on the ascension of the throne by the first Christian emperor, Constantine, and the filling of all the offices of the empire with professed Christians, under the warmth of Imperial favor the corruption of the Church increased rapidly until it ripened to an actual "Apostasy" from the Faith of the Lord Jesus. It is not easy to determine with precision when this apostasy actually began, nor when it was actually completed. It was a growth slowly evolving into its final and decisive character: its points of origin and completion cannot be definitively settled. The falling away began in a spirit of antagonism to the faith of the gospel which had begun to show itself to the keen discernment of Paul in his own day. A departure from the faith and obedience of Christ is indicated by the refusal to abide by the great foundation for hope laid in the Righteousness of God by faith, and the substitution of human works in its place or as controlling the application of that Divine foundation. It is also indicated in a claim to supremacy in the kingdom, in contempt of the Master's statement and command; "the princes of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them but it shall not be so among you." It is indicated by the repeal of the Divine laws concerning "times and laws." It is indicated by the introduction of a strange God, and by all kinds of innovations on his worship—by the introduction of idolatry and uncountable superstitions—and by the cruelties, tyrannies, and persecutions by a so-called Church of Messiah. It is probably completed by an "adulterous" union of this ecclesiastical organization with an earthly kingdom. Then the character is complete.

The apostasy was begun in the heartfelt discontent of the carnal mind against the humbling and pure doctrines of the Christian gospel. It was greatly advanced by the general corruptions of the Church. It was still more conspicuously revealed by the assumption of the universal Bishopric of the Church in the early part of the Seventh century. It was probably completed by becoming a "Horn" and incorporating the Church with an earthly kingdom. It is certain that this incorporation could not occur until the Church became a "Horn" and thus invested with an earthly Sovereignty. This was accomplished by a series of accessions to a political sovereignty, ranging along a series of some fifty years, commencing about two hundred and fifty years after the death of the Old Roman empire. The story of the historical events which had so appalling an effect on the fortunes of the Church of Christ may be briefly told. The first step towards the development of the Little Horn was the grant by Pepin of France in making the Bishop of Rome, Exarch of Ravenna. This was done, A. D. 755. The second step was taken by Charlemagne, A. D. 774, extinguishing the authority of the Senate and Dukedom of Rome, and transferring the sovereignty to the Bishop of Rome. The third step was taken by Louis the Pious of France, by turning over to the Pope the sovereignty of Lombardy. These were the "Three" kingdoms or Horns, plucked up for the benefit of the Head and Hierarchy of Rome. In consequence of this amazing departure from the doctrine of the Messiah-King, the Pope of Rome has assumed a Triple Crown, worn on the Mitre of the Bishop of Rome down to this day—three crowns placed on the tiara of the Pope, one above another. This sign which the Prophet several thousand years ago fixed for the discovery of the Little Horn—the plucking up of three horns or kingdoms, and the time when it should be done; accords rigidly with the actual history of the investiture of the Pope with temporal power: and it fits no other brow; it can be traced to no other origin.

3. Another distinguishing mark of the "Little Horn" was its size. It was to be a small kingdom whose political and military strength was always to be small. Daniel declared "his power should be mighty, but not by his own power." St. John declared

of the Ten Kings: "these have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfill his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled. And the Ten Horns which thou sawest upon the beast, these shall hate the whore, and shall make her desolate and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire." The exclusive temporal sovereignty of the Popedom was never anything more than a sovereignty over a comparatively small territory which has been constantly reduced even from its first insignificance, until for quite a long period before it was entirely taken away by Victor Emanuel in our own day. It had been confined to a section of Italy, called the States of the Church." Its political power, however, was extended over the ten kingdoms which held the religious creed of the Beast, and permitted the Roman Hierarchy with the Pope speaking as its Head, and claiming to determine all questions of Duty, political and others. Thus the political influence of the Little Horn, extended far beyond the narrow boundaries of its own small sovereignty, and was probably far greater abroad than it was at home. Small in appearance, it was surpassingly great in the entire sphere of its influence.

4. Another mark of the Horn was its "intelligence"; it had "eyes." Eyes as the principal organs of perception were the symbols of intelligence. This mark is peculiarly significant as applied to the governing hierarchy of Rome. That great body has always been distinguished for its learning and ability—for its diplomatic skill—and for its superiority in the arts of governing men, as well as in civil and theological knowledge. For the entire period, historically known as the "dark ages" it possessed almost an entire monopoly of the arts of knowledge. When it was rare that even the highest nobles could write their names, it gave immense advantage to an educated class. The clergy were the teachers of the day for all classes, and it was theirs to determine what and how much education the laity were permitted to have. During all the period of this monopoly of learning, their power was incalculable. Many individual members of the clerical order were highly gifted with superior natural talents.

5. This intellectual supremacy and the well-nigh boundless influence bred by it and by the spiritual power of their official character, very naturally produced another striking mark of the Horn of Daniel. It had a look 'more stout than his fellows,' and spoke great words not only against God, but against man." The haughty terms in which the Popes addressed Kings, Emperors, and the highest nobles—the insolent expressions of their bulls and rescripts—the immeasurable pride with which they asserted their usurped supremacy, not only in spiritual, but in civil and political affairs, yield a most convincing illustration of this mark of the Horn. The introduction of "a strange God" showed how true was the additional ascription to him of disregard to the God of his fathers. The blasphemous assertion of equality, nay of superiority to the Almighty—the claim to sit in his seat—to wield his power—to exercise his attributes, give a most impressive example of the "marvellous words spoken against the God of Gods "by the Horn of Daniel's vision." The Horn is said to "neither regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any God; for he shall magnify himself above all." How applicable all this is to the power which claims to be the Vicar of Christ—to exercise the attributes of infallibility, supreme dominion on the earth, and worthiness of reverence—it is easy to see.

6. The Horn of Daniel was to be distinguished by his hatred to the people of God—make war on them—and "prevail against them." The story of the bloody violence of the Roman Church needs no illustration.

7. The Horn was to distinguish himself by the successful effort "to change times and laws." No power known to history has gone so far in the change of "times" warranted by Divine authority as lawfully devoted to the ordinary avocations of human life, but altered into sacred days, as the Church of Rome. The change of "laws" has been even more conspicuous. Even the sacred law limiting religious worship to the adoration of the Supreme Deity alone, has been changed to admit the adoration of the Virgin, the worship of a whole synod of Saints; nay, their very images have been formally admitted by the highest authorities to receive religious worship after a strenuous resistance for

many years. The idolaties of the Horn in the honors given to "Mahuzzim" the "Gods of forces" placed by him in the strongest holds, and made to rule over many, find an explanation in the Virgin and Saint worship of the Roman Church; and wherever this shameful worship of Mahuzzim is found, there stands revealed the signs of the Horn of Daniel.

8. The Horn was to be noted by a disregard of "the desire of women" or as may be probably more correctly translated "the desire of marriage." Certainly no lack of the desire of women is to be imputed to the Horn; but no great historical and successive body has ever laid such stress upon the disuse and discredit of marriage, which is an institution of God himself and honored by the human race—as the Church of Rome. Marriage is positively forbidden to all ranks of her Clergy, and the multitudes of Monks and Nuns in her communion, who are taught to believe that celibacy is a far holier state than marriage. This is a most conspicuous mark of the "Beast"; and a mark so conspicuously absent in the history of all other members of the human race, as to discriminate the party alluded to by the Prophet with an emphasis which cannot be mistaken.

9. Another mark of the Horn was the Period of its cruel ascendancy already discussed; which was brought to a close by the destruction of the beast by two forms of destruction; one a slow form of "consumption" the other by "violence"; a most appalling species of violence. In one place, the record states that "the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it until the end." This seems to answer to one branch of a prophecy many centuries later, that the same dangerous power was to be destroyed by "the spirit of his mouth and destroyed by the brightness of his coming." The prophet also says "I beheld then, because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake; I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame." The "consumption" by the "spirit of his mouth" seems to point to the overthrow of confidence in the doctrines of the beast; the destruction to some signal overthrow of the seat of the beast in the great City by an outburst of volcanic fire which shall attend the great earthquake that another later Prophet foretells. The

final expulsion of the Little Horn from the earth will take place at the end of a notable instance of the Divine indignation to which Daniel also alludes. This is taken very probably, as the end of the Divine indignation against the Jews for their rejection of Messiah, and their return to their own land. The destruction of the Horn, the exaltation of the Witnesses, the ending of the treading down of the outer court of the Temple by the Gentiles, the overthrow of the Ottoman empire, the return of the Jews, the opening of the Millennial ages, are all bound up together by the fateful and pregnant Period of the 1260 prophetic days or the 1260 years of natural time. It is evident that the hand of the Prophets of God have gathered around that amazing period more important and far reaching events of the future history of the world than any other now known. It is impossible to say beforehand when that period opens, or in what sequence the events will occur, or how long will be the periods between them; for although the fateful number of the years is clearly stated, and there can be no question whatever as to the length of the testing period, there is no deciding from what point in the long past time, the 1260 years are to be counted except in a very general way. This leaves the future still under an indefinite cloud of uncertainty. This result is in accordance with the law of prophecy; it leaves obscurity enough around the fulfillment to check any presumptuous attempt either to fulfill or to prevent the fulfillment of the sacred utterance; and thus to leave the fulfillment to be accomplished by God's own hand. Yet enough is unveiled to create a salutary anticipation of coming events, and to prepare the believers in the sure word of Prophecy to prepare themselves for the opening of the Book of Providence.

Several dates in the past history of the world have been surmised, but none determined. If calculations are made from each of these conjectured dates they develop an indeterminate period of from eighty to one hundred and fifty years from the present time—A. D. 1907—when there may be startling developments in coming history. The calculation is still further complicated by the additional period set by Daniel in the close of his grand announcements—the 1290 days, and the 1335 days. These appear to refer to some special events which concern the

Church of God, one of which at least is indicated by the blessedness attached to the latter of the two dates to be a pledge of the happiest results to the waiting Kingdom of the Visible Church. The other seven kingdoms of Daniel's great beast are said to have their dominion taken away, but their lives were spared. The Little Horn was destroyed utterly; and nothing left of him, but a smoke that ascendeth up forever. His punishment is the due answer to his measureless crimes. John makes the definition of Daniel the exact equivalent of the period during which the Church was to be nourished in the wilderness; and the exact correspondence of the periods indicates that the Horn was the power which drove the star-crowned woman into the solitary and waste places. The Horn was the minister of the old dragon and serpent, to execute his schemes against the Church of the Lamb. His fate was the righteous retribution for his long continued violence to the Saints of the Lord. These numerous adjustments between the Signs or Marks of the Little Horn of Daniel and the actual history of the Roman Church are keenly significant. It is vain for the Roman Catholic interpreters to try to offset the plea against their haughty Mother and Mistress, by endeavoring to make the Little Horn of the He-Goat kingdom obscure the overwhelming demonstration against the Church of Rome. The Little Horn of the fallen Macedonian He-Goat was developed and brought to a close long before the great Roman Empire had completed its ascendancy, or had even reached it. The little horn of the He-Goat was possibly, as has been plausibly shown, the manifestation of the early, and as yet, small and unimportant development of the Roman Pagan empire in the territory of the old Macedonian ascendancy, in which it afterwards became so powerful. But the period in which the little horn of the He-Goat appeared is too early by several centuries—whatever it may signify—to set up any claim to be the Little Horn of the great Roman Beast. The truth is that the confusion arises from not recognizing the fact that Daniel recognizes two Little Horns—one springing up in the territory of the old Pagan Empire of Rome and the other in the territory of the Macedonian Empire of Alexander the Great after its division into Four Kingdoms. The one rose in the Western Church; the other in

the Eastern Church. The one is distinguished as rising among the Ten Horns or Kingdoms, three of which the Little Horn of the Western division of the Old Pagan Empire was to overturn Three. The other is expressly said to have come "out of one of them" when the four "notable" "ones" succeeded to the "great horn was broken." The angel that came nigh to Daniel to explain the vision, told him that "the rough goat is the king of Graecia; and the great horn that is broken between his eyes is the first King. Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power; and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people." It is very evident that many of the best interpreters have been led into confusion by not observing and keeping clear before them this unquestionable fact that there are two Little Horns in the prophecy of Daniel. Bishop Newton has been led by it to not only reject entirely all consent to the claims of Antiochus Epiphanes which was entirely correct so far as the Little Horn of the Ten Kingdoms was concerned, but thinking that the Little Horn of Rome was to be accounted for in the kingdoms of the He-Goat, ascribed all that was done by the Little Horn of the Eastern Empire to the Roman Power. The Roman Catholic interpreters in order to throw off the terrible weight of the evidence against their Church make the Little Horn of the East the only Little Horn of the Prophet. Other interpreters—as Grotius for instance, make Antiochus the Little Horn of the East exclusively. But while Antiochus was utterly out of the question so far as the Little Horn of the West is concerned, he has appeared to many interpreters as filling the character of the Eastern Little Horn to a very plausible and credible extent. But other interpreters find a prediction of Mohammed in the Little Horn of the East—some exclusively of Antiochus, others, remembering that a Horn being not an individual person, but a successive power see no invincible objection to accepting both Antiochus and Moham-

med as the Antitypes of the Eastern Little Horn of Daniel. Certainly the career of Antiochus was too short, and the dreadful effects of his mad proceedings in Palestine were too quickly healed to make him a very plausible candidate for the Eastern Little Horn of the Prophet; there is no question that the vast and long-continued and desolating career of the Creed followers of the Arabian imposter do fill to the fullest extent all the marks of the Eastern Little Horn of the Prophet. Bishop Newton's argument in favor of making the Little Horn of the East the power of the Great Red Dragon, and against the claim of Antiochus to have any connection with the Western Little Horn is conclusive so far as the latter contention is concerned, but only plausible and ingenious so far as the first contention is concerned. Both however fail entirely because they ignore the fact that the Little Horn of the Western Empire is absolutely distinct and different from the Little Horn of the Eastern Church which covered the territory of the He-Goat dynasty. The demonstration against the contention of the Roman Catholic interpreters that the Little Horn of the Prophet was not the Roman Catholic Church, but the Little Horn of the Macedonian dynasty is complete in the words of the Prophet himself. The one sprang out of the beast with ten horns; the other sprang out of one of the four horns or kingdoms of the Macedonian He-Goat. The distinction is compulsory, and cannot be ignored no matter whether the Eastern Little Horn is construed to be Antiochus or the Roman power or the Arabian Imposter. The recent valuable study of the Prophecies exhibited in the "Lost Dream" of the Rev. Luther H. Wilson presents the argument for the latter as the "Little Horn of the He-Goat dynasty in a very striking and convincing form. Presumptively some notice of the vast and long-continued domination of the Mohammedan ascendancy is to be expected in the old Prophecies of the Sacred Scriptures. To suppose that the career of an individual like Antiochus Epiphanes should occupy the attention of the great Prophet, Daniel, to the exclusion of such an episode in the history of the Kingdom of God on the earth as the career of the false religion of the Koran is incredible. The "King of a fierce countenance and understanding dark sentences" indicates a

succession of Princes animated with a form of religious belief. This power was to rise in one of the parts of the four divisions of the He-Goat dynasty; and the section of Arabia in which Mohammedaism took its rise was at one time a possession of the Egyptian Kingdom which fell to Ptolemy in the division of Alexander the Great's empire. The same power was to magnify itself, not only against the great and holy people, but "against the Prince of the Host himself." It was to "take away the daily sacrifice, and cast down the place of his sanctuary." Certainly, wherever the Moslem Faith prevails the only sacrifice which can be properly called a daily or constant sacrifice—the Atonement of our Lord, Jesus Christ, and the doctrine of Redemption is completely swept away. When the fierce hosts of the Saracen Caliphs swept over the territory of the corrupt and apostate Church of the Eastern empire, it cast its polluted "sanctuaries" down with a sweeping vengeance. The power of the Little Horn of the He-Goat was to be compounded of savage violence, and "craft and policy." It was to succeed too by a "power not of its own." The Saracen conquest was accomplished in one hundred and fifty years. It extended from the boundaries of China to Spain in Europe—from the Danube to the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf. Its unparalleled conquest was won over strong armies and regions thickly set with fortified castles and walled to wars. If there had been no elements of decay in the powers it encountered, it was a simple impossibility for the Saracen horsemen to have achieved the conquest it did. Everywhere treachery and deceit met their approach—walled cities and impregnable fortifications were surrendered without a struggle. The Christian populations had been so demoralized and enfeebled by the corruption which let loose upon them the righteous anger of Almighty God, that when their "transgressions had come to the full," there was no moral force left to repel the onset of the Saracen fanatics. The vast conquest of the Crescent was due, not so much to their own power, as to the weakness of those demoralized people over whom they swept like a destroying Angel. Without attempting to develop all items of the argument, there is one consideration decisive against

the theory of Antiochus Epiphanes as the Little Horn of the He-Goat: this destructive power was to last 2560 years. From the testimony of the 13th verse of the chapter in which Daniel records these visions, it would seem to be probable (for no one can speak certainly) that the 2300 years of the He-Goat visions are to be counted from the period when Daniel saw the visions; that is the third year of the reign of Belshazzar. This period includes the history of all these visions, but not specifically the period of the Little Horn of the He-Goat dynasty. This Little Horn was included in the 2300 years, but not exclusively of the other events preceding his appearance. The period of this Little Horn is to be counted from the time the Arabian Imposter began his career in the seventh century of the Christian era and the great fateful periods of the 1260, 1290 and 1335 years will probably reveal the end of the Little Horn of the He-Goat, as well as the end of the Little Horn of the great Beast with the Ten Horns. God speed the day when the earth shall be delivered from both!