

**THE TWELVE HUNDRED
AND SIXTY DAYS, IN
REPLY TO A REVIEW
IN THE MORNING WATCH**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649271566

The twelve hundred and sixty days, in reply to a review in the Morning watch by S. R. Maitland

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

S. R. MAITLAND

**THE TWELVE HUNDRED
AND SIXTY DAYS, IN
REPLY TO A REVIEW
IN THE MORNING WATCH**

JA. 1930

THE TWELVE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DAYS

IN

REPLY TO A REVIEW

IN THE

MORNING WATCH.

BY S. R. MAITLAND.

LONDON :

C. J. G. AND F. RIVINGTON, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD,
AND WATERLOO PLACE;

STRONG, BRISTOL AND EXETER; AND LEW, GLOUCESTER.

Edward Power, Printer, Westgate Street, Gloucester.

MDCCLXX.

621.



Erratum.—Page 7. The words in a parenthesis, which form the fifth line, should have been inserted immediately after the word *king*, in the preceding line.

REPLY

TO THE AUTHOR OF "A REVIEW OF TWO ENQUIRIES
INTO THE GROUNDS ON WHICH THE PROPHETIC PERIOD
OF DANIEL AND ST. JOHN HAS BEEN SUPPOSED TO CON-
SIST OF 1260 YEARS," IN No. III. OF THE MORNING WATCH,
PAGE 509.

SIR,

In your Review of the Pamphlets which I have lately published, on the Prophetic Period of 1260 days, there are some mis-statements so gross, that I should do injustice to the cause which I am attempting to advocate, were I to allow them to pass unnoticed.

Before I proceed to them, however, I will notice what you have said respecting Mr. Irving's statement, in his preface to the work of Lacunza.—"If you will interpret the periods literally, you may as well interpret the other parts literally." To this I replied, that I do interpret the other parts as literally as I interpret the days; and that, as far as I know, Mr. Irving, and all other commentators, do interpret the *beasts* as literally as I interpret the days—

that is to say, they understood the word "goat" to mean a literal goat, and nothing else. Whether the goat thus literally named was a symbol or not, has nothing to do with the question. In all interpretations which I have seen, the word *goat* stands for *goat*, and is never supposed to express that which is meant by the word *king*; and the words *goat* and *king* are interpreted as literally as if one were not the symbol of the other. In like manner, I contend that the word *day* means *day*; and that in order to maintain consistency, these commentators ought so to understand it. If indeed they can shew that the 1260 days were *literal days*, symbolical of some other things, which are not literal days (as the literal beasts were symbolical of some other things which were not literal beasts), this will help their general argument; but even this will not authorize their translating the word *day*, by the word signifying that thing which they suppose the literal day spoken of, to symbolize, any more than they now feel authorized to substitute the word *king* for the word *goat*.

In fact, the matter depends on the sense in which we use the word "interpret." If we use it (as I think it must be obvious that I did) to express *the giving a meaning to words*, then, undoubtedly, commentators do interpret the beasts, and all that is said about them, *literally*—they do not consider the word *goat* as *figurative*, or inter-

pret it *here* as they would in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew, where our Lord speaks of placing the *goats* on his left hand. They cannot substitute the word *king* for the word *goat* (which is the name of the thing symbolized), without falsifying the meaning of the prophet; but they might substitute the word *micked*, for the word *goat*, in our Lord's discourse, without falsifying his meaning; and they insist on doing the same in this case—that is, they substitute the word *year* for the word *day*, or while they take the word *goat* as literal, they assume that the word *day* is *figurative*.

If by the word "interpret" you chuse to understand the fitting of symbols with the things which they symbolized, it is obvious that any argument raised on this ground must, in the present case, be merely begging the question. You must prove that the 1260 days *were symbols*, before you can *thus* interpret them at all—that is, you must prove that the 1260 days were literal days symbolizing some other things, which were not literal days; and I do not know of any interpreter who pretends that this is the case. They "interpret" the beasts (according to your use of the word "interpret") by shewing what the things were which they symbolized; but without pretending to any *such* interpretation of the days, they assume at once that the word *day* is *figurative*, and substitute the word *year*.

I am sorry, Sir, that you should descend to such criticism as to expend half a page, and six notes of admiration, on what you call my "carelessness" by which "the words of the angel are imputed to Daniel." I really do not see that it makes any material difference to the argument, whether the words were uttered by Daniel, or by that "Saint" whom (though you are pleased to decide that he was an "angel" and "mysterious") you also call "the Revealer of secrets;" and whose language might therefore be expected to be at least as intelligible as that of the prophet. I know not how far it may be permitted, by the rules of modern criticism, to speak of the words of Scripture, as the words of the Author by whose name that book is called in which they stand; but I know that it was done by those whom I presume you did not intend to include in your witty censure.* As, however, in your triumphant drollery, you have quite slipped away from the argument, I will repeat it in a form which does not admit of the same evasion. I will put

* "Now that the dead are raised, even MOSES shewed at the bush, when HE CALLED the Lord, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Luke, xx. 37.

"First, MOSES SAITH, I will provoke you to jealousy by them that are no people, and by a foolish nation I will anger you; but ESALAS is very bold and SAITH, I was found of them that sought me not." Rom. x. 19, 20.

St. John instead of *Daniel*, *leopard* instead of *goat*, and *month* instead of *day*, and (*mutatis mutandis*) I will say, as I said before, "Let it only be admitted (and I cannot conceive why it should not) that by the word *month* he means *month*, as much as by *leopard* he means *leopard*, and all farther argument on my part would be unnecessary."*

The idea of Peter's "eating the Gentiles" is particularly humorous; but it happens unfortunately for you, that Peter did take the words accompanying that *emblematical* vision, *literally*. You perhaps would have seen farther into the matter than he did, when he answered in simplicity, "Not so, Lord, for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean."

To proceed however to what is more important. Your charge against me with regard to the prophecy of the seventy weeks is of so weighty a nature, and contains so much that is erroneous, that I feel it necessary to answer it; and though it has but little to do with the argument, yet as it is to clear myself from a flat charge of blasphemy, I trust that no christian reader, into whose hands these pages may fall, will grudge me the time, or trouble, of reading a few words in reply.

* See Rev. xiii. 2, 5. The beast which I saw was like a leopard. . . . and power was given to him to continue forty and two months.