

**REPLY TO THE REV. T.K.
ARNOLD'S
REMARKS ON THE
'HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ'**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649370177

Reply to the rev. T.K. Arnold's Remarks on the 'Horæ apocalypticæ' by E. B. Elliott

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

E. B. ELLIOTT

**REPLY TO THE REV. T.K.
ARNOLD'S
REMARKS ON THE
'HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ'**

REPLY

TO THE

REV. T. K. ARNOLD'S REMARKS

ON THE

“HORÆ APOCALYPTICÆ.”

BY THE

REV. E. B. ELLIOTT, A.M.

LATE FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON :

SEELEY, BURNSIDE, AND SEELEY, FLEET STREET.

MDCCCXLV.

NOTICE.

Other engagements, and distaste to the controversy, united to prevent the Author from doing more, on first receiving Mr. Arnold's Pamphlet, than noting down on the margin of his copy of it, the heads in brief of answers to each of its criticisms and charges. A Paper however in the British Magazine of last September having been brought to his notice, which referred to Mr. A.'s Remarks on the Horæ as triumphant and unanswerable, he deemed it necessary not to delay longer drawing out his Reply : which however has given him somewhat more trouble than he expected : not from any difficulty in the matter of Reply ; but from the difficulty of making the large questions treated of intelligible in so small a compass to the general Reader, and the Pamphlet readable.

It is the Author's wish that each Reader, where he has the opportunity, should have Mr. Arnold's Critique in hand as he peruses this Reply ; and compare them passage by passage : in order so to do fuller justice to Mr. Arnold ; and also to judge with better reason whether his attack on the Horæ has been in every point *fairly met and refuted*, or not.

Torquay, November, 1845.

CONTENTS.

PAGE	3.	THE FIRST SEAL.
—	12.	THE SECOND AND THIRD SEALS.
—	27.	THE TWO FIRST WORDS.
—	35.	THE WITNESSES.
—	45.	THE DRAGON, BEAST'S IMAGE, AND ANTICHRIST.
—	75.	THE CONCLUSION.

ERRATA.

Page 12, line 3.—The expression "like the rest of the *fulwinks*," seems to me, on better acquaintance with Mr. Arnold's Pamphlet, to be probably an incorrect classification of his Apocalyptic views with those of Mr. Maitland, from whom however he so often quotes approvingly. His views may perhaps be those of the more modern German School. The *argumentum ad hominem* however is equally applicable and strong, whether the Rider of the White Horse be construed by Mr. A. of Christ going forth to conquest at the time of his *first*, or that of his second advent.

Page 13, line 12, for *once*, read *at once*.

— 33, line 24, for *of*, read *one of*.

— 63, line 26, for *in thus*, read *while thus*.

INTRODUCTION.

THE Rev. T. K. Arnold has published a Pamphlet of Remarks on my *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, expressive of "his deep conviction that the mode of investigation there pursued, is perverse and uncritical, and the interpretations advanced such as will not stand the tests of grammatical construction, common sense, or the ordinary works of historians."¹ By the epithet *perverse*, applied to my *mode of investigation*, Mr. Arnold means, I presume, such as involves, or is calculated to issue in, a distorted view of the subjects considered; though the word is certainly one not quite so distinct in meaning as might be desired in an opening statement of charge: by *uncritical* the contrary to judicious, or (more exactly speaking) to a judge's wise and discriminative mode of discussing evidence and investigating truth. Elsewhere, on the same first page of his Pamphlet, Mr. Arnold protests against my "*false method of interpretation.*" Now the *mode or process of investigation* actually pursued in the *Horæ* is described at p. ix of the Preface:—"first to consider the simple grammatical meaning of the prophetic passage, comparing Scripture with Scripture; then to consult the most authentic histories of the period supposed to be referred to, and, where necessary, such works also as might furnish antiquarian illustration: this done, and an independent judgment formed thereon, then to consult the most approved and elaborate commentators on the subject, more especially those of different views from the Author's own, and to weigh their arguments ere

¹ Page 1.

coming to any final conclusion."—With such a *mode of investigation* I really think Mr. Arnold himself can scarcely quarrel; and scarcely more, I should conceive, with the *principle* on which I have proceeded to my *conclusions*. For it appears from the *Horæ* that the grounds of there concluding in each case on an interpretation, has been uniformly the coincidence, or supposed coincidence, in all its several requirements, of historic fact with the prophetic statement or symbol. And supposing the coincidence that I speak of proved in respect of a prophecy of many particulars, and not of one such prophecy only, but of a continuous series of prophecies, he would surely not be prepared to assert that such coincidence was but the result of chance.—It seems clear to me that the strength of Mr. Arnold's objections must be considered to be rather against my *use* and *application* of the interpretatory plan and principle, than against the principle itself. For, no doubt, an Expositor may have laid down a good plan and principle for his investigations and his conclusions, and yet may so carry prejudice, unlicensed fancy, carelessness, or a want of the necessary learning and discrimination into them, as to arrive at results quite erroneous, and such as to merit Mr. Arnold's censure of "not standing the tests either of grammatical construction, common sense, or the ordinary works of historians." Whether such be the case in the *Horæ* is a question only to be decided by an examination of the cases on which Mr. Arnold grounds his inculpatory charges against it. These are my expositions of the *three first seals*, the *two first woes*, the *witnesses' testimony*, *resurrection*, and *ascension*, the *image of the Beast*, *Antichrist*, and the *Millennium* :—expositions very fairly selected for examination, as among the most characteristic; and which, had Mr. Arnold only added what relates to the *Reformation*, would have formed as complete a list for the testing as could have been desired. On each one I shall proceed to meet him. And I am mistaken if in every one save the *second Seal*,—on which Seal I neither did full justice in my first edition to my own principle, or to the subject,—I say I am mistaken if in every case save this, which in my new Edition is completely rectified, Mr. Arnold's inculpatory charge will not be found utterly to break down.—It is well that we meet on the common ground of viewing the Apocalypse as "a

noble and blessed work of inspiration." ¹ It is well too that we agree in making appeal to "grammatical construction, common sense, and the ordinary (I would rather say, the best and most authentic) works of historians." Thus the decision of the question, as between us, will be the easier.

Before however commencing my reply to Mr. Arnold's specific charges and objections, let me premise a word to the Reader on the exceeding importance of the question pending between us. For it involves nothing less than this,—whether the *Papal succession and Popedom* be, or be not, that which was prefigured by the Spirit of God under the awful symbols and titles of the *Apocalyptic Beast*, the *Man of sin*, *Antichrist*. A question at all times momentous; and now perhaps almost more so than ever. The expression of sentiment in our Houses of Parliament in the late debates on the Maynooth Bill has strikingly shown this. A nobleman eminent for his piety and zeal in the great missionary cause, distinctly grounded his vote for the Bill on the (assumed) fact of *Papery* being not *antichristian*. A prelate of high attainments and learning quoted with strong approval the saying of the late Dr. Arnold, that "good Protestants and good Christians had talked nonsense, and worse than nonsense, about Popery, the Beast, and Antichrist." If the exposition proposed in my *Horæ* be unimpeachable,—nay if but its commencement be proved,—then the inference is inevitable that the old Protestant Church of England opinion of the Popedom being the thing prefigured as Antichrist and the Beast, instead of being absurd, is *simply true*.—Proceed we then without further delay to the important inquiry before us.

SECTION I.—*The First Seal.*

My exposition of the four primary Seals, and more especially of the first, claims not only the earliest, but the most particular attention of the inquirer after truth: it being that, as just before intimated, (and Mr. Arnold's observations do not incline me in the least to qualify the statement,) on which, if proved, all the rest will follow.—The sacred text on which the discussion arises stands thus.

¹ Page 60.