

THE JOURNAL
of the
UNITED REFORMED CHURCH HISTORY SOCIETY
incorporating the Congregational Historical Society, founded in
1899, and the Presbyterian Historical Society of England,
founded in 1913)

EDITORS: Revd. Dr. R. BUICK KNOX and
Dr. CLYDE BINFIELD, M.A.
Volume 3, No.5 March 1985

CONTENTS

Editorial	159
Newman and Prophecy, Evangelical and Catholic by <i>Sheridan W. Gilley</i> <i>B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S.</i>	160
Reviews by <i>Stephen Mayor</i>	188
Our Contemporaries	190

EDITORIAL

For reasons which will become pleasantly apparent with the next issue, 1985 will see three issues of the Journal. The present issue is devoted to the society's annual lecture which was delivered during the study weekend held at Kirkley Hall, Ponteland, in September 1984.

Dr. Sheridan Gilley, Senior Lecturer in the Department of Theology at the University of Durham, has placed the society firmly in his debt both by his readiness to lecture at unavoidably short notice and by the theme of his paper.

At first sight "Newman and Prophecy", whether Evangelical or Catholic, is unlikely to be of immediate relevance to our concerns. The past year, however, has seen the hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Edward Irving's death, and Dr. Gilley's paper, by reminding us that prophecy was a major concern of mainstream Protestantism until well into the nineteenth century, provides a context for our understanding of what otherwise is an embarrassingly eccentric (and therefore ignored) aspect of our past. Other aspects of this will be explored in the Journal's October issue by Professor Roger H. Martin and Dr. Stephen Orchard. Dr. Gilley's paper has two further claims on our attention. The first is that it demonstrates the *development* rather than the *reaction* of a theological mind: it helps to explain why Congregationalists, Presbyterians and others of the evangelical mainstream were not held fast by prophecy. The second is that any contribution to Newman studies is of the most catholic interest. This contribution includes some unpublished material. It is part of that ferment with which Durham theology is currently to be associated.

NEWMAN AND PROPHECY, EVANGELICAL AND CATHOLIC¹

You may have read recently in the *Times* of the worst modern fire in York Minster: not the recent blaze in the south transept, but the great chancel fire of 1829, the work of a pyromaniac called Jonathan Martin, a native of the Hexham area of Northumberland. Martin had already disrupted a confirmation by a Bishop of Oxford in 1817 by threatening him with a pistol, and now he presided in solitary glory over the nocturnal flames in the Minster dressed in velvet hangings and claiming to be King David.² The scene ought to have been painted by Jonathan Martin's older brother John, the visionary planner of a London sewerage system, who had become still more famous for his gigantic lurid oils of stories from the Books of Daniel and Revelation: "The Fall of Babylon", "Belshazzar's Feast", and later, "The Last Judgment", "The Great Day of His Wrath" and "The Plains of Heaven".³ Jonathan and John, and their equally eccentric brother the inventor and natural philosopher William Martin, were haunted by the contemporary apocalyptic imagination, and John's fiery canvases remain as a witness to the influence of Daniel and Revelation on the prophetic and millenarian fantasies of the nineteenth-century religious world.⁴

The Millennium is the era of a thousand years described in the twentieth chapter of Revelation, when Satan will be bound and Christ will reign with his saints on earth. The idea was widely current in the Early Church, but suffered eclipse when Augustine identified the Millennium with the Church Militant, while the accompanying events described by St. John the Divine were, by the Roman Catholic scholars of the Counter-Reformation, assigned, on the "preterist" theory, to the first Christian century, or on the "futurist" view, to the end of the world. In its Protestant form at the Reformation, however, millennial prophecy drew on the antipapal rhetoric of the medieval heretics to acquire its specifically anti-Roman Catholic character, as an apocalyptic assurance of the ultimate triumph of good over evil, and in the hands of the disciples of the seventeenth-century Joseph Mede it was

1. I wish to thank Gerard Tracey, the archivist of the Newman papers in the Birmingham Oratory, for his expert guidance to the Newman papers relating to prophecy in his care. I am also grateful for assistance from Mr. Louis Allen.
2. George Hill, "York Minster's Human Firebug", *The Times* 17th July, 1984. *The Times*, with a Freudian inaccuracy, attributed the confirmation of 1817 to the Bishop of Durham, for whom the Bishop of Oxford was acting.
3. On John Martin, see Christopher Johnstone, *John Martin* (London, 1974).
4. On the general background, see E.R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism 1800-1830* (Chicago, 1970); David N. Hempton, "Evangelicalism and Eschatology", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol.31 (April, 1980), pp.179-194. Both writers stress the strict attention to the word of Scripture in prophecy as a source of twentieth-century fundamentalism. For a comprehensive bibliography of recent writing in the area, see Hillel Schwartz, "The End of the Beginning: Millenarian Studies, 1969-1975", *Religious Studies Review*, vol.2 (July, 1976), pp. 1-14, which lists more than two hundred and fifty items for the period covered by the survey alone.

cast in its obvious pre-millennial form, in which the Second Coming of Christ precedes and ushers in the Millennial kingdom.⁵

Pre-millennialism, however, with its vision of Christ's sudden advent, inspired radical Puritan insurrectionists in the 1650s, and demanded a revolutionary discontinuity with the present which was unacceptable to Mede's more respectable successors, but learned exegetes continued their speculations, attracting to their number Sir Isaac Newton and his episcopal namesake Thomas.⁶ The apocalyptic of the Puritan radicals went underground, and had little influence on the great Evangelical Revival; indeed it only resurfaced in the 1790s, under the pressure of a new literal attention to the word of scripture, in the spectacular revelations of Richard Brothers and Joanna Southcott,⁷ when the French Revolution shook the thrones of Europe, both papal and royal, and the last days seemed to be at hand. The revival of pre-millennial theory, however, was reserved to the 1820s, and it was then that there occurred the international crisis of Evangelical Protestantism,⁸ in which the centre of the Clapham Sect of William Wilberforce failed to hold, the Evangelicals suffered division and schism, and Edward Irving and J.N. Darby founded two of the most famous of pre-millennial sects, the Catholic Apostolic Church and the Plymouth Brethren.⁹ What was still more important, the leaders of the Anglican Evangelical party, Edward Bickersteth, Lord Ashley and Hugh M'Neile, were converted to pre-millennial doctrine, with some of the most influential Protestants in the mainline churches,¹⁰ while out of this turmoil there arose between 1830 and 1850 those adventist sects and churches which now live in the expectation of Christ's imminent second coming, and which number their adherents by the millions in America and round the world.¹¹

-
5. On Mede see especially Paul Christianson, *Reformers and Babylon: English apocalyptic visions from the reformation to the eve of the civil war* (Toronto, 1978), esp. pp.124-9.
 6. On Isaac, see Frank E. Manuel, *The Religion of Isaac Newton* (Oxford, 1974), pp.55-67, 83-106; for Thomas, see note 14.
 7. Ronald Matthews, *English Messiahs: Studies of Six English Religious Pretenders 1656-1927* (London, 1936), pp.43-126; J.F.C. Harrison, *The Second Coming: Popular Millenarianism 1780-1850* (London, 1979), pp.57-134.
 8. David Newsome, "The Crisis of Evangelicalism", *The Parting of Friends. A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (London, 1966), pp.1-19; Iain Murray, *The Puritan Hope* (Edinburgh, 1975), esp. pp.187-206.
 9. H.H. Rowdon, *The Origins of the Brethren* (London, 1967), pp.1-33; F. Roy Coad, *A History of the Brethren Movement* (London, 1968). For the materials on Irving's millennial ideas, see notes 4, 8, 10, 11. John Henry Newman's conception of prophecies fulfilled not once but through a succession of types is anticipated by Irving. See Edward Irving, "Preface", to his translation of *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, by Juan Josafat Ben-Ezra, a converted Jew (London, 1827), 2 vols., vol.1, pp.xxxiv-xxxv.
 10. S.C. Orchard, *English Evangelical Eschatology 1790-1850* (University of Cambridge Ph.D., 1969); W.H. Oliver, *Prophets and Millennialists: The Uses of Biblical Prophecy in England from the 1790s to the 1840s* (Auckland, New Zealand, 1978), esp. pp.144-9, on John Henry Newman, on which see also note 47 below.
 11. A vast body of information about the history of millennial prophecy interpreted from a Seventh Day Adventist pre-millennial viewpoint is set forth in Le Roy Edwin Froom's *The Prophetic Faith of our Fathers* 4 vols. (Washington 1950-1954).

The essential outlines of prophecy are furnished by Daniel and Revelation, which on Mede's historicist theory were believed to describe the whole course of Judaeo-Christian history. Nebuchadnezzar's dream in Daniel Chapter 2 of the great image of gold, silver, brass and iron, with its proverbially famous feet of iron and clay, was generally held by Protestant scholars, in a tradition deriving from St. Jerome, to foretell the four monarchies of the Babylonians, Persians, Greeks and Romans, the ten toes being the ten barbarian kingdoms into which the western empire was divided.¹² The same sequence appears in Daniel's vision in Chapter 7, of the four beasts from the sea, a winged lion, a bear with three ribs in its mouth, a winged four-headed leopard and a "dreadful and terrible" unnamed creature with iron teeth, brass claws and ten horns. These, again, in post-Reformation exegesis, were usually the Roman Empire and its ten successor kingdoms. The beast sprouts a tenth "Little Horn with eyes, and a mouth, which spake great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows"; and this Roman horn on a Roman beast could only be the Pope. It is true that the third century Neoplatonist Porphyry had advanced the more generally received modern critical opinion that the Book of Daniel had not been written by the prophet of that name in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, six centuries before Christ, but was composed under the Maccabees in the second century B.C. to stiffen Jewish resistance to the monstrous fourth beast, the Seleucid empire, with its ten kings, and its persecuting Little Horn Antiochus IV Epiphanes.¹³ But the restatement of this theory by the early eighteenth-century "freethinker" Anthony Collins was refuted to the satisfaction of nearly everyone by Bishop Thomas Newton,¹⁴ and to most good Protestants the fourth beast was pagan Rome, and its famous Little Horn was Popery.

This identification was clinched by Revelation Chapter 13, in which a beast with ten horns, seven heads, bear's feet and a lion's mouth, a sort of taxidermist's muddling of Daniel's four beasts, also rises from the sea. This was clearly the Roman Empire, and its ten successor kingdoms, and possibly, by extension, the Pope's secular power, while the second beast of the same chapter with two lambs' horns was the spiritual power of the papacy, which reappears in Chapter 17 as the notorious Scarlet Woman, who has fornicated with the kings of the earth and sits on a scarlet ten-horned, seven-headed

-
12. Modern critical theory describes the four empires in Daniel as the Babylonian, Median, Persian and Greek: see Louis F. Hartman, C.S.S.R., and Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M., *The Book of Daniel* (New York, 1978), pp.33-42.
 13. *Ibid.*, pp.46, 53, 214-5. Such standard surveys of English theology as Vernon F. Storr's *The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century 1800-1860* (London, 1913), and Bernard M.G. Reardon's *From Coleridge to Gore: A century of religious thought in Britain* (London, 1971), entirely ignore Evangelical eschatology, no doubt because it is considered pre-critical: Storr does not even mention Irving in his index. The issue is also largely overlooked by Peter Toon, *Evangelical Theology 1833-1856. A response to Tractarianism* (London, 1979).
 14. "Introduction to the Lecture founded by the Honourable Robert Boyle", January 5, 1756, in *Dissertations on the Prophecies* (21st edition, London, 1838), pp.252-261.

beast with her name on her forehead, "MYSTERY, BABYLON THE GREAT, THE MOTHER OF HARLOTS AND ABOMINATIONS..." The Man of Sin of Thessalonians and the Antichrist of the Johannine Epistles were also identified with the Pope, as by Bishop Newton,¹⁵ though they might point as well to a mysterious individual, possibly papal, who would rise and fall at the end of the world.

The chronology of these future events was also laid down in Scripture. Daniel speaks (Chapter 7) of the Little Horn's rule as lasting "a time and times and half a time" which according to modern scholars describes the one plus two and a half, or three and a half, years of Antiochus Epiphanes' desecration of the Temple.¹⁶ But the three and a half year period recurs in the 1,260 days of the twelfth and thirteenth chapters of Revelation, when the woman who bore the child will dwell in the wilderness, and the ten-horned and two horned beasts will rule. For Mede and those who followed him, each day in Daniel and Revelation meant a year, and the 1,260 years were the era of the papal oppression of the saints. At some time afterwards would come the fifth monarchy of God's rule in Daniel, which was also the millennium of St. John, arriving as the seventh day of rest of creation after the labour of the six thousand years of human history. The five-fold sequence of the kingdoms in Daniel needed further harmonization with the other seven-fold schemes in Revelation, of seals, angelic trumpets, woes and vials. Moreover, as the kingdoms of the beast covered only the so-called "papal earth" which oppressed the Christian west, so there was a parallel Moslem "Little Horn" on the head of the Macedonian he-goat of Daniel Chapter 8, which equally oppressed the Christian east. Also prominent as a part of prophecy was the restoration of the Jews to Palestine and their ultimate conversion, a sure sign of the coming of the end. There was nothing lacking in the learning of the theologians who compiled these schemes, which embodied a very ordinary Protestant state of mind, one which discerned in both the past and present a literal pattern of events laid down in Scripture.

There was, however, a political difference between those who, like Isaac Newton, saw in Rome the supreme type of all corrupt anti-Christian church establishments; and those, like Thomas Newton, who used prophecy to defend the Church of England establishment against Deism and Infidelity as well as Rome. The French Revolution sharpened that distinction, as Joseph Priestley, a Unitarian scientist and divine as well as a political radical, discerned in infidelity the earthquake of Revelation Chapter 11 which was to bring down all the corrupt Christianities, Protestant as well as papal. On the other hand, the ablest bishop in the Anglican hierarchy, Samuel Horsley, welcomed French Catholic priests to England, and identified the "Little Horn" of the Beast not with Rome but infidel and democratic France. Thus Horsley's establishmentarian prophetic writing had both a conservative thrust

15. *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, pp.455-68.

16. Hartman and Lella, pp.49, 215.

against internal radical sedition in Britain, and a nationalist and patriotic message for the fight against the Gallican continental colossus, with whom England was at war.¹⁷

Indeed there was an affinity here with the Roman Catholic prophecies of the eighteenth-century English Benedictine Bishop Charles Walmesley, which enjoyed a great vogue in Ireland in the 1820s as a prediction of the end of Protestantism. The principles of Walmesley's historicist scheme may have partly come from Isaac Newton, but his old-age hostility to the Enlightenment led him to predict disasters for the Church which in fact then occurred in the Revolution.¹⁸ Another Roman Catholic influence was that of the former Chilean Jesuit Manuel Lacunza Y Diaz, whose treatise, *The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty*, written under the pseudonym Juan Josafat Ben-Ezra, a "converted Jew", was translated in 1827 by Edward Irving: and Irving's counter-revolutionary mentality – described as "High Toryism" by his biographer Mrs. Oliphant – was quite as extreme as any Catholic's.¹⁹

The gap between the two systems, the anti-French and anti-papal, was, however, bridged by another arch-conservative, George Stanley Faber, Rector of Darlington and later Master of Sherburn Hospital near Durham,²⁰ and uncle of the notorious ex-Evangelical Roman Catholic convert and hymnologist, Father Frederick William Faber of the London Oratory. George Stanley Faber dated the beginning of the two Little Horns, the Roman Catholic and Mahometan,²¹ from the simultaneous recognition of papal power by the Byzantine usurper Phocas and the rise of Islam in the early seventh century.²² This neat parallelism meant for Faber that both "Little Horns" would last the predicted 1,260 years until 1864 when Antichrist

17. Oliver, pp.37-54.

18. Dom Geoffrey Scott, "The Times are fast approaching: Bishop Charles Walmesley, O.S.B. (1722-1797) as Prophet", in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, forthcoming. I am grateful to the author for the opportunity to read this paper in advance of publication.

19. *The Life of Edward Irving*, 2 vols. (London, 1862), vol.1 p.382; cited Hempton, p.183. See also note 9.

20. G.S. Faber, *The many mansions in the house of the Father... with a prefatory memoir of the author*, by Francis A. Faber (London, 1854) esp. pp.xxxvii-xxxix.

21. Thomas Newton derived the Pope's "Little Horn" from his acquisition of the exarchate of Ravenna in the early eighth century, the source of his temporal authority. But see Newton, *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, p.362, where he dates the beginning of the Pope's spiritual power from 606 AD, when Phocas made his grant and Mahomet retired to his cave. (Faber preferred the date 604 AD.) Newton seems to have forgotten this (p.465) when he declares that "in the opinion of a bishop of Rome, Gregory the Great... whosoever affected the title of universal bishop, he was Antichrist, or the forerunner of Antichrist... When John, then Bishop of Constantinople, first usurped this title..." But it was to Gregory's agent and later successor Boniface that Phocas made his grant. The confusion was reflected in Newman's early conviction that Gregory was both Antichrist and "a good and holy man"; see note 59.

22. G.S. Faber, *The Sacred Calendar of Prophecy: or A Dissertation on the Prophecies* 3 vols. (London, 1828), vol.1, p.165. On Faber's other theological interests, see Toon, *Evangelical Theology*, pp.132-5, 141-7.

would come. But neither Little Horn was Antichrist. Rather, the rise of Antichrist was foreshadowed in the seventh head of the Roman imperial beast of Revelation, the Napoleonic Empire, which Faber thought was bound to rise again after its fall: he had the melancholy satisfaction of living to see his prophecy fulfilled in 1851, in the Second Empire of Louis Napoleon. Antichrist, then, was to be a future merging of the Pope and Turk with a French-inspired revolutionary infidelity and democracy, an alliance given point in English politics by the radical democratic politics of the Irish Catholics. It was this highly conservative conception, that Irish Popery and French democratic infidelity were allies, which fed the imagination of the young Evangelical John Henry Newman.

Faber was hardly an optimistic writer, though he treasured a guarded hope that Britain, in spite of her sins, might be the maritime power of Isaiah 18 who would restore the Jews to Palestine. Yet he was not so pessimistic as to go over to the pre-millennial theory, that the world was so lost that only Christ's Second Coming could redeem it by introducing the Millennium. The Evangelicals of Faber's generation saw in the explosion of Protestant evangelistic and philanthropic activity the hope that human effort, under God, might gradually usher in the millennial kingdom: the "eclipse" of this hope, as it has been called,²³ was brought about by an archpessimist Evangelical extreme, for whom no good work could save a world which only the Son of Man on clouds of glory could redeem. The pioneer of this reaction was James Hatley Frere, whose tragic pre-millennialism transformed the fortunes of Evangelicalism in the 1820s, in the hands of Frere's great disciple, Edward Irving.²⁴ But Frere's central obsession was the figure of Napoleon, who had broken the ancient order of Europe in pieces, and as a superhuman colossus to the romantic and religious imagination, assumed a central role in apocalyptic fancy.²⁵ For Frere Napoleon was Antichrist, the beast in the pit of Revelation, the ten-horned beast from the sea.²⁶ Napoleon was also the mysterious infidel king of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, a point taken up by Edward Cooper, a Staffordshire rector and former Fellow of All Souls.

23. Murray, Chapter IX, "The Eclipse of the Hope", pp.185-206.

24. *Ibid.*, p.189.

25. A number of English titles on this theme are listed from Paul Vulliaud's *La Fin du Monde* (1952) by Frank Paul Bowman, *Le Christ Romantique* (Geneva, 1973), p.192: J.J. Holmes, *The Fulfilment of the Revelation of Saint John displayed, from the commencement of the Prophecy, A.D. 96, to the Battle of Waterloo, A.D. 1815*, 1819; Lewis Mayer, *Bonaparte, the Emperor of the French, considered as Lucifer and Gog*, 1806; *The prophetic mirror or a hint of England, containing an explanation of prophecy... proving Bonaparte to be the beast that arose of the earth*, 1806. Bowman cites (p.172) a work I have not seen, Jean Tulard's *Anti-Napoleon* (1965) as containing the essential texts in French on Napoleon as Antichrist, and refers also to works by Wendel Wurtz identifying Napoleon with Apollyon, Gog and Tubal. There was even a demon called Napoleon. Bowman's chief interest, however, in his "Napoleon et le Christ" (pp.171-193) lies in the material comparing Napoleon and Christ. I am grateful for this reference to Louis Allen.

26. Oliver, pp.42, 58.

Cooper was an Evangelical who had warmly defended the Bible Society against episcopal criticism,²⁷ and was no pre-millennialist, as one who still hoped for the Protestant conversion of the earth. His work, published in 1825, was entitled *The Crisis; or, an attempt to shew from prophecy, illustrated by the signs of the times, the prospects and duties of the Church of Christ, at the present period. With an enquiry into the probable destiny of England during the predicted desolations of the Papal Kingdoms.*²⁸ The work was dedicated to an Evangelical bishop, Henry Ryder, and it attracted a review by Newman.²⁹

For Cooper, prophecy had long been "an interesting and favourite pursuit", whose "vast importance" was being proven as the secrets of God's Word were unveiled through the "Signs of the Times". Thus the last elements of prophecy were now being made clear to console the Church, through a special privilege accorded to the "people of God" in these "the latter days" upon the earth. Cooper belonged to a school which argued that the 1,260 years of the papal "Little Horn" had lasted from Justinian's recognition of universal papal jurisdiction in AD 533, to 1792, concluding with the pouring of the fourth and fifth vials upon the Western empire or "papal earth", as the French revolutionaries assailed the Roman Church. Cooper saw in the "reaping" of Revelation Chapter 14 a prediction of the restoration of the Jews, and while he departed from Faber in arguing that the 1,260 days were now expired, he followed Faber in dating the "last days" from the text in Daniel Chapter 12, that he would be blessed who lived 1,335 days. The difference between 1,260 and 1,335 indicated that the "Time of the End" would last seventy-five days, i.e. seventy-five years from 1792 to 1867, when the end of all things would come.³⁰ The reference to 1,290 days in Daniel verse 11 Chapter 12 divided the "time of the end" into two periods of thirty and forty-five years; and as we will see, it was this chronological framework of two periods in the last days, which enabled Cooper to interpret the infidel king of Chapter 11 as Napoleon.

Cooper argued that the language of the eleventh Chapter of Daniel is not of figurative symbols like "*beasts and horns*" but, by common scholarly consent, refers to actual kings.³¹ The second verse of the chapter mentions the four kings who followed (the now-considered legendary king) Darius of the first verse; the third verse refers to Alexander the Great. As Bishop Newton had said, the subsequent kings of the north and south were historic rulers of Alexander's conquests in Syria and Egypt. But the pace quickens

27. See Edward Cooper, *The Conduct of the Clergy in supporting the Bible Society, vindicated from the charges brought against them by the Rev. Richard Lloyd, in a letter to that gentleman* (London, 1818). Cooper died in 1835. A prolific preacher, his collected sermons were published as late as 1883.

28. (London, 1825).

29. See Ian Ker and Thomas Gornall, S.J., *The Letters and Diaries of John Henry Newman* (Oxford, 1978), vol.1, p.223.

30. Cooper, *The Crisis*, pp.3, 77.

31. *Ibid.*, p.14.

with the 30th verse, which is a veiled allusion to the Roman Empire. The 31st "predicts the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus", the 32nd and 33rd the pagan persecution of the early Christians, the 34th the conversion of Constantine and the 35th the 1,260 years of papal persecution continuing "*even to the time of the end*":³² it introduces a king who "shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods..." This king could not be Antichrist as some like Frere had imagined, if Antichrist was also the Little Horn or one of John's beasts.³³ Rather, he was an actual king, like the earlier kings in the chapter, a minister of divine vengeance, the scourge of the Little Horn of the Beast, as Napoleon had been in his onslaught on Roman Catholic idolatry. Napoleon's chief characteristics were the "wilfulness" and "impiety" he had shown in dedicating Les Invalides to the pagan god of war, and in declaring in Syria and Egypt that he was a Moslem who had destroyed the Cross and fulfilled the Koranic prophecies. The king's rejection of the "desire of women" was his rejection of the Messiah; indeed a man who had declared himself a pagan and a Moslem and restored French popery, could only be an infidel, magnifying himself "above every god", speaking "marvellous things against the God of gods..."

Daniel's prophecy also alluded to Napoleon's varied successes and failures. His conquest of Egypt is described in verse 42 of Chapter 11, the Libians and Ethiopians of verse 43 were recruits to his army, while the disastrous outcome of the expedition is declared in the escape of Edom and Moab out of his hand, and in the tidings from the north and east which troubled him. His onslaught on Syria had been marked by the "great fury" of verse 44. Moreover "at the time of the end" in verse 40, the king of the south would "push at him", and "the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships". The "king of the south" is clearly Spain or Portugal, which "pushed" Napoleon back across the Pyrenees; the "king of the north" is even more clearly England, which fought him with her ships as well as horsemen. In verse 45, the prophecy is fulfilled: "yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him", in his six years of helpless exile on St. Helena. Cooper admitted that the prophecy was not set out in this order, but he claimed that this ambiguity could be divinely intended, lest the prophecy be understood before its completion.³⁴ Yet Napoleon was a portent of that last age of history in which Christians would see that all the prophecies were now all but fulfilled.

The great king's fall in the last verse of Chapter 11 is immediately followed by Michael's standing up for the Jews in the first verse of Chapter 12, a clear reference to the restoration of the Jews to Palestine: so that Napoleon's death in 1821 was a sign that their deliverance was at hand. But

32. *Ibid.*, pp.18-9.

33. *Ibid.*, pp.24-5.

34. *Ibid.*, p.57.

if the 1,260 years were complete in 1792, then the 1,290th year in verse 11 of Chapter 12 must refer to 1822, and to the ending of the first thirty years of the time of the end, and the beginning of the Jewish restoration. Cooper saw the first signs of this in the pouring of the sixth vial of angelic wrath on the Turkish Empire, in the Greek revolt and the Congress of Verona. Thus in summary of Cooper's system: the 1,260th year, or 1792, had seen the outbreak of the French Revolution and the advent of Napoleon, and the end of the prosperity of the Roman Catholic Little Horn. Napoleon had died in 1821, and in 1822, the restoration of the Jews had begun, and would be complete by 1867, when the end would come.

This, then, was the "Crisis" of Cooper's title, "the latter days": the "time of trouble" predicted in Daniel Chapter 12, of the "Great earthquake" of Revelation Chapter 16 when the Latin nations of the "papal earth", "the kingdoms of the Beast", would be ravaged by the three unclean spirits of infidelity, despotism and popery, arising like frogs from the mouths of the Dragon, Beast and False Prophet. Cooper's final question was whether England could escape these tribulations, even if she were the tenth part of the city in Revelation Chapter 11 which had separated herself from Rome.³⁵ The unclean spirits had already been abroad in Britain, in the eighteenth-century departures from Protestant principles and Christian morality, in the secularization of the clergy, the plunder of India and the acquisition of an American empire built upon the slave-trade. Indeed, when the "mystery of iniquity" of the Revolution had overwhelmed the "papal earth" with the fourth and fifth vials of angelic wrath, England herself was threatened by the unclean spirits of sedition and infidelity, and it was only because of the Protestant leaven of the Evangelical Revival that the nation had been spared the wrath of judgement. Since then, there had been new hope. "The triumph over jacobinism was in fact the triumph of the Bible".³⁶ There had been a huge increase in Protestant voluntary and missionary activity, and an end to the British slave-trade, even Horsley's distant prospect that as in Isaiah Chapter 18, England's navy would restore the Jews. It could then be hoped that God will protect England "from the fury of the storm; and will preserve her a monument of Divine mercy, and a refuge for true religion".³⁷ But like Faber, Cooper was not quite sure that England had a special place in prophecy; it was as she rose or fell in godliness that she would escape or incur the judgement still to come.

There would be a short-shrift today for a former fellow of All Souls who suggested that M. Mitterand was the king of Daniel Chapter 11: but there was nothing odd about it in the religious world of 1825, and it was not as an oddity that Cooper's argument repelled Newman. Newman's departure from Evangelicalism in the course of the Evangelical crisis of the 1820s was one

35. *Ibid.*, p.173.

36. *Ibid.*, p.190.

37. *Ibid.*, p.233.

of the heaviest losses which the movement suffered; and as prophetic speculation was one of the principal solvents of the moderate Evangelical consensus established by the Clapham Sect, so his response to that speculation was an integral part of his movement towards High Churchmanship and Roman Catholicism.

Newman's conversion to Evangelical Calvinism in 1816 at the age of fifteen, during the appalling stresses at the time of his father's business failure, has been the subject of some debate, as there is considerable difficulty in defining his relations with the two parties which divided the Evangelical world. As David Newsome has indicated, Newman belonged to the more moderate party in following his beloved Calvinist mentors Thomas Scott and Walter Mayers, in holding conversion to be a process rather than an instantaneous experience, and in stressing the need for holiness as the fruit of conversion, against a hyper-Calvinist antinomianism.³⁸ Newman took as his mottoes Scott's sayings "Holiness before peace" and "Growth the only evidence of life"; indeed it was only by growth in holiness that the soul could know it was alive; and it was out of this that he was to develop in the 1830s his rejection of his early dogmatic conviction of the "Lutheran apprehension of Christ", or justification by faith alone. His belief in the Calvinist Final Perseverance of the saints faded much more quickly, by 1821, and by 1825, under the influence of Edward Hawkins, his parochial work in St. Clement's, and a book by the future Evangelical Archbishop John Bird Sumner, he had rejected a strict Calvinist division of Christians into the elect and non-elect, as an idea which would not work within a parish.³⁹ The eclipse of this aspect of his Calvinism had brought him by the mid-1820s to a belief in baptismal regeneration. Yet his repudiation of the more extreme Evangelicals came only in 1830, when he was voted out of office as a Secretary of the Oxford Auxiliary of the Church Missionary Society, after opposing two other members, one of them later an Irvingite and then a Plymouth Brother.⁴⁰ Newman's other opponent on the occasion, Richard Waldo Sibthorp, was a still more adventurous Evangelical who was to precede Newman into the Roman Church, return to Canterbury, change his mind again and die a popish Canon of Nottingham, though he was given an Anglican burial.⁴¹ Newman's disgrace at the Oxford Society meeting may have been engineered by his younger brother Francis, who was now completely

38. Newsome, *loc. cit.*, and also "Justification and Sanctification: Newman and the Evangelicals", *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., vol.XV (April, 1964).

39. Thomas L. Sheridan, *Newman on Justification* (Staten Island, New York, 1967), pp.67-109.

40. T.C.F. Stunt, "John Henry Newman and the Evangelicals", *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, N.S., vol.XXI (January, 1970), pp.65-74. Stunt, however, seems to be in error in supposing that it was the extreme anti-Catholic William "Millennial" Marsh for whom Newman did duty at Hampstead in 1927. The Hampstead clergyman was the Rev. Edward Garrard Marsh. (See *Letters and Diaries*, vol.II, pp.13-7, 25-6). On "Millennial" Marsh, see Catherine M. Marsh, *The Life of the Rev. William Marsh, D.D.* (London, 1867).

41. J. Fowler, *R.W. Sibthorp, a biography* (London, 1880).

under the spell of J.N. Darby, and was soon to set off to convert the Persians to pre-millennial Protestantism, before becoming a kind of freethinking Unitarian.⁴² In this shifting world, the ecclesiastical gypsy of no fixed abode was a commonplace, and Newman's own development in a more "Catholic" direction looks like a part of the theological current which carried so many ex-Evangelicals on to Rome, very often in reaction against the kind of Evangelical extreme represented by Sibthorp and Francis Newman.

The difficulty with such a simple classification is that Newman belonged temperamentally to the Evangelical extreme himself: not merely in the defect which von Hügel later ascribed to him, of lacking the joy of the Catholic saints, or in the unflinching severity which can be so depressing a quality of his Anglican sermons; but in the otherworldliness which stood in opposition to the "holy worldliness" of Clapham. Wilberforce's circle hoped to Christianize culture, rejoiced in the simple pleasures of hearth and home, embarked on social and political crusades and looked to the creation of a holy world; the Irvingites thought all such human effort and pleasure either as sin at worst, or at best as a distraction from the proclamation of the Lord's return, to trifles soon to be consumed in the fires of tribulation. Newman was inclined to this kind of otherworldliness, first by his childish imaginings that the material world was a dream or a deception, a trick played on him by his fellow angels; and second, by his sombre Augustinian vision of the mass of mankind as exiled from God's presence, seemingly without hope in this world or another.

This otherworldliness was rooted in his Evangelical conversion, of which, half a century after, he was still more conscious than of his hands and feet: and in that experience the intensity of his "childish imaginings" was still the dominant force, "isolating me from the objects which surrounded me, in confirming me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and making me rest in the thought of two and two only supreme and luminously self-evident beings, myself and my Creator."⁴³ The knowledge of God was immediate, direct, and at once opened the gulf between the divine perfection and the imperfection of its creatures. "If I looked into a mirror, and did not see my face, I should have the sort of feeling which actually comes upon me, when I look into this living busy world, and see no reflection of its Creator... The sight of the world is nothing else than the prophet's scroll, full of 'lamentations, and mourning, and woe'." The only explanation for the human condition was the "terrible aboriginal calamity" of original sin.⁴⁴ If matter was illusion, man was evil: reality lay elsewhere, in the solitary communion of the heart which spoke to heart in God.

In such moods, Newman was one with a great radical Evangelical like Edward Irving, both in his pessimism about the human condition and in his

42. William Robbins, *The Newman Brothers. An Essay in Comparative Intellectual Biography* (London, 1966).

43. *Apologia pro Vita sua* (New York, 1950), p.36.

44. *Ibid.*, pp.240-1.

Tory conservative conviction of the uselessness of political effort: "Either", wrote Ronald Knox, "had the same reactions to the Age of Reform; either foresaw, and branded as apostasy, our modern preoccupation with politics".⁴⁵ Thus the true mystery of Newman was one he shared with Irving, that "he did not give a damn for this world"⁴⁶ — either for its material improvement or its purely mundane happiness. In this, as in his famous saying that it would be better for the whole world to perish in agony by fire than for one man to commit a venial sin, Newman carried a rigorist Evangelical extremism into his Anglo- and Roman Catholicism. It was, then, in this world-denying temper that he delighted in Bishop Newton's *Discourses on the Prophecies*, and was firmly convinced that the Pope was the Antichrist predicted by Daniel, St. Paul and St. John.⁴⁷ "My imagination", he wrote, "was stained by the effects of this doctrine up to the year 1843; it had been obliterated from my reason and judgment at an earlier date; but the thought remained upon me as a sort of false conscience. Hence came that conflict of mind, which so many have felt besides myself; — leading some men to make a compromise between two ideas, so inconsistent with each other, — driving others to beat out the one idea or the other from their minds, — and ending in my own case, after many years of intellectual unrest, in the gradual decay and extinction of one of them, — I do not say in its violent death, for why should I not have murdered it sooner, if I murdered it at all?"⁴⁸

His remark to his aunt Elizabeth that he found Newton's prophecies "extremely ingenious and also *satisfying* (I mean they account and explain well)"⁴⁹ is made more clear by a curious hitherto unpublished document in the Birmingham Oratory, the "Lateinos" paper of 1816:

A.D.

727 — the Pope revolted from the Exarch of Ravenna

755 — obtained the Exarchate of himself

767 — the worship of Images was fully established

A.D.

727

1260

1987 A.D.

45. R.A. Knox, *Enthusiasm: A Chapter in the History of Religion* (Oxford, 1950), p.557.

46. Cited C.S. Dessain (ed.), *Letters and Diaries*, vol.XI, p.xvii.

47. The topic of prophecy in relation to Newman has been treated by two authors before me from different viewpoints, Paul Misner and W.H. Oliver. See Misner, "Newman and the Tradition concerning the Papal Antichrist", *Church History* vol.42 (September, 1973), pp.377-95; and *Papacy and Development: Newman and the Primacy of the Pope* (Leiden, 1976), pp.45-57. W.H. Oliver's more wide-ranging discussion (see note 10 above) from the stance of the general Evangelical tradition does not refer to Misner's contribution to the subject, though it locates Newman in his 1820's setting.

48. *Apologia*, p.38.

49. Quoted in Maisie Ward, *Young Mr. Newman* (New York, 1948), p.21, and in Misner, "Newman and the Tradition concerning the Papal Antichrist", p.385.

We are living under the 6th Trumpet and Second Woe -- Ez.38-39 -- Dan. 11-44 and 45.	A.D.
Mohammed contrived his imposture	606
Phocas granted the supremacy of the Pope	<u>1260</u>
Not to be dated from thence	A.D. <u>1866</u>

The Pope then became supreme in spiritual things But not a temporal horn or beast till 727.⁵⁰

There is an irony as well as an interest about the fifteen year old Newman transcribing all these references from Newton; to the Pope's acquisition of the power of the Ravenna exarch, and his rise as a "horn" or temporal prince in the eighth century, the beginning of image worship, the sixth trumpet and the second woe in the present, the imposture of Mohammed and the grant of Phocas.⁵¹ Newman also covered the page with arithmetical calculations copied from Newton on the number of the Beast whose title had been identified by patristic speculation as "Lateinos". Newton -- and Newman -- arrived at 666 by adding together the numerical equivalent of each letter in "Lateinos" in the Greek 2nd Hebrew alphabets.⁵² Newman also followed Newton in preferring the date 727, the papal repudiation of the exarch, for the beginning of the Antichrist, a date which takes his fall to 1987, or as Newton put it, near 2,000 A.D., and the completion of the 6,000 years of normal human history. Newman's two sets of estimates, therefore, neatly picked out the ambiguity in Newton, over the grant of Phocas as the *fons et origo* of the Pope's spiritual supremacy in 606, and the beginning of the Pope's temporal rise to the full stature of Antichrist in 727, with his revolt against Ravenna. This lost both the neat parallel in Faber of the simultaneous rise in the west and east of the papal and moslem "Little Horns" around 606, and the eschatological urgency of the schemes of Faber and Cooper, with their terminations in 1864, and in 1792 and 1867. Newman was, however, nearer to Faber than Cooper, and it was to something like Faber's scheme that he was to turn.

Thus the reading of prophecy was not a simple thing, as Newman argued in an exégesis of Chapter 6 of Revelation, eight closely written large pages which he got up at 4 a.m. to compile in October 1822.⁵³ The chapter concerns the famous four horsemen of the Apocalypse, which Faber thought described the four empires,⁵⁴ and the opening of the first six seals, which Thomas Newton had assigned to events in the first four Christian centuries,⁵⁵ and which Cooper was to spread over the whole of church history. Newman

50. 1816 "Lateinos" paper, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham, A.9.1.a.

51. Newton, pp.241-8, 567-8.

52. *Ibid.*, pp.618-20.

53. Notes on Revelation, Chapter 6, dated "October 7th 1822 -- Monday --" Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham. I owe this reference and much else to the archivist Gerard Tracey.

54. *Sacred Calendar*, vol.2, p.292.

55. *Dissertations*, pp.517-34.

referred to Faber, but what is striking is his lack of interest in any of the precise schemes of the chronologists, in assigning the pestilences, wars and famines to particular past events: Newman retained only the interpretation by Newton and Faber of the passage as describing the triumph of Christianity under Constantine.⁵⁶ "There shall be a complete subversion of the existing state of things," Newman wrote, "a most awful revolution — the idols will be broken in pieces, and Christianity established". Some symbols are clear: as Scripture shows, thunder denotes the terrible divine presence. Yet the ambiguities in the passage are considerable. Newman's search through the Bible for an understanding of the red horsemen suggests no very certain conclusion: that the figure might be an evil earthly or angelic power, persecuting the true Church like the Scarlet Woman, or it could equally be a good angel or even Christ, as prefigured by Isaiah's Messiah in garments gory trampling the apostate or heathen. More fundamentally, was the passage literal or allegorical? Was death on a pale horse to smite a literal quarter of the earth? Stars falling like figs must be allegory; and "how could men hide themselves in the rocks of the mountains when every mountain was (already) moved out of its place?"

It was, therefore, suggested Newman, a sign that this chapter was largely allegory that its imagery was "hyperbolic", nay "discordant". "Besides we consider the predictions to have a regular chronological order — how then can the world be destroyed in the sixth seal and exist in the seventh?" A figurative meaning of a word was still possible, even if Scripture contained a hundred literal counter-usages; and as the Old Testament books of prophecy showed, earthquakes, falling stars, bloody moons and darkened suns were usually intended as allegory. Newman acknowledged, again with copious quotation, that the Psalms contain literal references to natural portents, to the miracles of the exodus, and the signs attendant on the crucifixion and the end of things, and that references to fire usually denote the day of judgement. But the "great day of His wrath" of the final verse of this chapter is probably not judgement day as first appears, but as in ordinary prophetic usage, is a visitation of which that day is the supreme type: in this case the text describes the triumph of Christianity, when God had his vengeance on the heathen. In short, Newman still plumped for historicism: the chapter describes the past in terms of allegory. True, he felt the force of the objection that it might seem infidel to allegorize the text by stressing its discordances, but his own position was not so much critical as moral: "How little is the Bible to be comprehended by a casual glance and a superficial reading... what comparison of things spiritual with spiritual; above all what diffidence and distrust in our own powers should we entertain, and to what continual waiting and praying for the illumination of the Lord should we accustom ourselves, when we see a passage wh (*sic*) at first sight we shd. so unhesitatingly have pronounced to be meant literally turn out

56. *Ibid.*, pp.528-30; *Sacred Calendar*, vol.2, p.324.

so different to our expectations.”

Yet historicism was literalist enough. The bare outlines of Newman’s Advent sermons of 1824–5 survive, noted with the remark, “greater part fr Newton”,⁵⁷ but in the *Apologia* Newton recalls that in a sermon preached around Christmas 1825, he dated the Roman Antichrist from the time of Gregory the Great, for though Gregory was a “great and holy man”, he also claimed to be universal bishop. This was a departure from Newton’s position, which as we have seen, dated the “Little Horn” from 727, but Newman has also remedied the ambiguity in Newton, where the latter seems to ascribe the origin of the Pope’s spiritual supremacy to the grant from Phocas in 606. The parallel between Mahomet and the Pope appears in the sermon to which Newman may have been referring as his “Christmas” one, preached on 2 January 1825, which opens with the vision of the Son of Man in Daniel Chapter seven, and expounds the sole and complete mediatorial office and kingdom of Christ. Newman refers the punishment of the corrupters of Christianity by idolatry to Revelation Chapter 9 verse 4, and, declares again, following Newton, that the rise of Mahomet is described in the same chapter. The Pope is Satan in the garb of the “angel of light” in 2 Corinthians 11, and of the Man of Sin of 2 Thessalonians 2, “sitting in the temple of God showing himself that he is God”:⁵⁸

Now the professed servants of Christ began to persecute His true disciples – and, as in the primitive times, His real and spiritual bride reviled and contemned and cast out, was destitute [,] afflicted, tormented < Hebr 11 >. – Thus that apostate church of Rome usurped the throne of Christ’s Kingdom, substituted a poisonous creed for the faith as it is in Jesus, and, having taken to itself temporal power, lorded it over the Kings of the earth and made them work together for its own aggrandizement. – This was that woman of St. John’s vision arrayed in purple and scarlet colour and decked with gold, and precious stone [*sic*] and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication < Rev 17 >. ‘And I saw’ he continues, ‘I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus – and when I saw her, I wondered with great admiration.’

Both the western and eastern woes, however, receive their check with the Reformation and the retreat of Turkish power, and after the third woe and the seventh angelic trumpet, the mediatorial kingdom will be established, not in pre-millennial fashion, but through an outpouring of the spirit for the creation of a new and glorious universal Church.

Implicit in this is Newman’s later notion from Bernard Gilpin that it was the idea of Rome as Antichrist which justified the Reformation, for

57. Abstracts of the 1824 Advent Course of Sermons 37, 39, 41, 43, Newman Papers, the Oratory, Birmingham.

58. Sermon No.51, first preached 2 January 1825, Newman Papers The Oratory, Birmingham.

anti-Roman polemic lost half its force if it merely maintained that Roman Catholics held erroneous doctrines. A more coherent Protestantism discerned in Popery the very embodiment of Antichristianity, the living substance and essence of all those texts which predicted the Antichrist to come.⁵⁹

Yet in April 1825, Newman was writing his review of Cooper.⁶⁰ He had moved quickly in the intervening few months from Evangelicalism, and he was unwilling to concede what Cooper had assumed, a 1,260-year-old papal Antichrist who had ceased to prosper in 1792. There was, Newman insisted, no good reason to accept with Cooper that Daniel's phrase "the time of the end", should describe "a *period* rather than a *date*."⁶¹ Again, there was no good reason to assume that this was "a definite and bounded period", which could be calculated as seventy five years, by subtracting the 1,260 years of Daniel Chapter 12 verse 7 from the 1,335 in verse 12: indeed either date would be understood as referring to the time of the end. A natural reading of verse 7 was that the Jews would be restored at the end of 1,260 years not 1,335; and Cooper had quite arbitrarily assigned the beginning of the Jewish restoration to the 1,290th year, simply because the 11th verse mentions this date, "which he knows not how else to apply". Equally arbitrary was Cooper's assignment of the impious king to the thirty-year period following the 1,260th year. There is no good reason for not placing his rise before the 1,260 years of the apostasy. It was either improbable that the king was an individual, or that he had not been mentioned before, among the eastern kings of the earlier verses of the chapter, or in a dynasty to which they belonged. These preceding kings of Persia, Greece and Syria "are introduced because their exploits affected the chosen race"; and it would be more natural to understand that this king was to chastise the Jews than the papal apostasy. Moreover the Papal States which Napoleon had destroyed were now restored: Cooper had to violate the ordinary meaning of the text to make Napoleon's punishment of Rome a merely partial rather than a complete one. Napoleon's wrath had fallen on Protestant Prussians and German Lutherans as well as on Roman Catholics. The "desire of women" did not mean the Messiah, nor did Napoleon have Libians and Ethiopians in his army. The kings of the north and south in the second half of Chapter 11 had already appeared in the first half of the chapter, in passages assigned by Cooper to ancient history with other scholars. If England, rather than Prussia or Russia, were really typified by the king of the north who waged war on Napoleon, then it was odd that Spain, so late into the fray, should be given the honour of making the southern king's first stand against him. But as Cooper admitted, the events in the

59. *Apologia*; pp.78-9, 81.

60. Review of Cooper's Crisis, *The Quarterly Theological Review* (June 1825), pp. 33-44. *The Quarterly Theological Review* was incorporated in 1826 with the *British Critic*, which had a very important part in Newman's later Anglican career. See E.S. Houghton, "The *British Critic* and the Oxford Movement", *Studies in Bibliography*, vol.16 (Charlottesville, Virginia, 1963), pp.119-138.

61. *Ibid.*, p.36.

chapter were wholly out of sequence as a prophecy of Napoleon. The text refers to two incursions into Palestine, with the Egyptian expedition sandwiched between them, where Napoleon had invaded Palestine from Egypt only once. But if the prophecies of the first half of the chapter were precise, why should the later ones be jumbled? True, the prophecy in some respects described Napoleon: but equally it might describe Saladin. Newman's final point of a *reductio ad absurdum* of the arbitrary character of Cooper's argument:

There is scarcely a fact or trait of character brought forward in Mr. C.'s work relative to Napoleon, which might not be found in the history of Saladin: and, though this be an instance taken almost at random, we might, on Mr. C.'s principles of interpretation, make out a very plausible case for that hero of the crusades. Napoleon did according to his will; so did Saladin. — He spoke marvellous things against the God of gods; so did Saladin. — He did not regard the God of his fathers; nor did Saladin; — for though belonging to a nation heretical in creed, and enemies to the Moslem name, he became an orthodox and rigid Mohammedan. — Napoleon honoured the god of forces; so did the warlike Saladin. — He was not emperor at the time of his expedition to Egypt; nor was Saladin sultan, when he marched into the same country — Napoleon 'had power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt;' and so also had Saladin. — Tidings from the east and north (Damascus and Constantinople) brought Napoleon from Egypt to Palestine; and Saladin was brought from Egypt by the troubles at Damascus, occasioned by the minority of the son of his master Nouredin. And then more exactly than Napoleon, he fulfilled the prophetic description, by "going forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly making away many." He made himself successively master of Hems, Hamah, Baalbec, and afterwards of Amida, Aleppo, and other cities. Next, marching into Palestine, against the crusaders, he defeated them in a most bloody battle; and, among other places, captured Tiberias, Acre, Neapolis, Caesarea, Jaffa, Ascalon, and afterwards Jerusalem. And so savage had been the war, that in many of these cities only women and children were found on their capture, the men having been already all killed or taken prisoners. While he was in the neighbourhood of Antioch, the Christians, with fresh succours from Europe, recommenced the attack from Tyre; and two years after, Richard Coeur de Lion arrived in Palestine: — events in which may be discovered the predicted hostilities of the Kings of the south and north, quite as well as in the resistance of Spain and England to Napoleon's power.

Lastly, if Napoleon "came to his end, and none did help him," may not the same be said of Saladin, who died neither on a glorious field of battle, nor by natural consequence of age, but by premature disease? It is admitted that there are one or two coincidences between

Napoleon's history and the description in Daniel, which do not exist in Saladin; but, on the other hand, in spite of the superior fulness and minuteness which the recent date of the events in question gives to Napoleon's life, there are points in which Saladin's outweighs the later conqueror. If Napoleon more strikingly 'exalted himself above every god,' the austere and ascetic Saladin more literally 'regarded not the desire of women.' And if Saladin's grand defeat by Richard, with the loss of 40,000 men, be not alluded to neither is Napoleon's Russian campaign, nor the battle of Waterloo. Indeed, we are only concerned to show that Saladin answers to the prediction *as far* as Napoleon: nay, we should strenuously maintain that, in reality, neither fulfilled it. The prophecy is not loose or indeterminate: it contains a number of definite criteria; and, easy as it may be to amuse the imagination with partial resemblances, the character that really fulfils it, must answer to them all.⁶²

Newman's conclusion was that Cooper's work would only "prejudice the unbeliever against the argument from prophecy" by demonstrating that it could be made to mean anything, and was convincing only to "weak minds and enthusiastic tempers". Newman did not decide the main question as he saw it, "how far, namely the events of the present day may be known to be the subject of Scripture prediction", but by his "almost irrational conviction of the truth of his interpretation", Cooper had "rather brought the prophecy to the history, than made the history subservient to the prophecy".

Cooper was attacked on similar lines in the *British Review*,⁶³ and it was that review rather than Newman's which he answered in a substantial reply.⁶⁴ But the great days of prophetic influence were now at hand, with the first of the conferences at Albury Park in 1826, when the cream of the Evangelical world assembled around the banker Henry Drummond to ponder the final age and the pre-millennial advent, on the basis of the theory that the 1,260 years of Antichrist had expired at the French Revolution. In 1828, the new Evangelical *Record* newspaper fired the first salvoes of its No Popery crusade, and J.N. Darby assembled his first Brethren, among them Francis Newman. With this ferment came deep division: "The years 1829 to 1832",

62. *Ibid.*, pp.41-2.

63. Review of Cooper's Crisis, Article XII, *The British Review and London Critical Journal*, vol.23 (May 1825), pp.237-60. The review anticipated Newman's developed position on prophecy: it congratulated Cooper as an "able practical expositor" of the "pious view" of calling the Church to watch always for Christ's Second Coming, in a time of trial and impending doom; but it condemned Cooper's "fanciful" interpretation of the infidel king as Napoleon. Like Newman, the reviewer called Cooper to task for violating Faber's principle, in the directly historical prophecies of "a strictly chronological character", of maintaining chronological order. The reviewer also queried Cooper's assumption of the dating of the last days from 1792, preferring the prediction of 1867. The subsequent Article XXXIII (*The British Review and London Critical Journal* vol.23, November 1825, pp.610-33), made the same points again in response to Cooper's reply.

64. *A Letter to the Editor of the British Review, occasioned by his remarks on "The Crisis"*. In the number for May 1825 (London, 1825).

writes Clyde Ervine, "had seen internal Evangelical squabbling and vitriol on an unprecedented scale".⁶⁵ In 1830, Joseph Smith founded the Mormon Church, in 1832, Drummond appointed the first Irvingite Apostle, in 1834, the pre-millennialist Hugh M'Neile took up a cure of souls in Liverpool, in which he was to become the nineteenth-century Ian Paisley. Newman had by then moved into his High Church phase: yet he retained an otherworldly, Irvingite Evangelical temper even while he repudiated its literal chronology.

Not that he abandoned literalism: rather, in his unpublished Advent sermons of 1830, he argued that the texts have too many meanings to be absolutely clear, in an implicit rejection of Faber's principles that every symbol had only one meaning and every prophecy only one fulfilment. When the prophets predict the destruction of Jerusalem, declared Newman, they may refer to the fall of the city at the time of Jeremiah or the Apostles, or again, at the end of the world. Curiosity and idle imagination will soon tire of the contradictions of a subject so obscure. The Old Testament prophets did not date their prophecies, and "so in the case of the future trials of the Christian Church — they will come suddenly, tho' they are foretold — because being told obscurely, men will not be at the pains to attend the warning". Rather, insight into prophecy is a matter of moral depth, of holiness of life, and the holy man will see that the world is always wicked, divine judgement is always falling, and the greater judgement of Christ's returning may at any time occur. "There is nothing new under the Sun — one age succeeds another — and the people of the earth rage and swell, then subside, then collect their force again". "They bot, (*sic*), they sold — they married and were given in marriage, till the wrath of God fell upon them... The sun rose on Sodom, brt. (*sic*) as usual, that very morning of wrath when God rained fire upon it".⁶⁶ There are many disastrous portents of the last age: "God's vengeance upon the Jews" and on the cities of Babylon, Egypt and the East, whose destruction Scripture likens to the burning of the world at the Second Coming. Another sign of the end is a "*scoffing unbelief*", a part of the liberal progressivist mentality and self-trust rooted in the false English pride "*in our own greatness as a nation*", and in "our glorious far-spreading empire on which the sun never sets". The beloved disciple had foreseen in Revelation the "mad impiety" of the English liberal mind with its "great variety of opinions and parties — an open licence to blaspheme".⁶⁷ The same themes appear in Newman's poetry: to "England":

65. W.J.C. Ervine, *Doctrine and Diplomacy: Some Aspects of the Life and Thought of the Anglican Evangelical Clergy, 1797 to 1837* (University of Cambridge Ph.D., 1979), p.308. On the wider background to these tensions, see Roger H. Martin, *Evangelicals United: Ecumenical Stirrings in Pre-Victorian Britain, 1795-1830: Studies in Evangelicalism*, No.4 (London, 1983); and Doreen M. Rosman, *Evangelicals and Culture* (London, 1984).

66. Sermon No.274, first preached 19 December 1830, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham.

67. Sermon No.273, first preached 12 December 1830, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham.

Dread thine own power!...
 He who scann'd Sodom for His righteous men
 Still spares thee for thy ten;
 But, should vain tongues the Bride of Heaven defy,
 He will not pass thee by...⁶⁸

And again:

O Britons! now so brave and high,
 How will ye weep the day
 When Christ in judgment passes by,
 And calls the Bride away!⁶⁹

We cannot be sure *when* Christ will return; but we can know that it will be to an evil and unbelieving world just like our own.

Dr. Oliver makes this point of Newman's published sermons, in which an otherworldly adventism has a prominent place.⁷⁰ In the Dark Ages, argued Newman, in his sermon on "The Religion of the Day", Satan had stressed "the darker side of the Gospel; its awful mysteriousness, its fearful glory, its sovereign inflexible justice". Now, however, the Devil had made of religion the very opposite, by explaining away "those fearful images of Divine wrath with which the Scriptures abound... Every thing is bright and cheerful. Religion is pleasant and easy; benevolence is the chief virtue; intolerance, bigotry, excess of zeal, are the first of sins". Sin itself is also identified with the grosser vices which offend a fastidious refinement. Some Christians had cooperated with anti-Christian men to secure by human effort a millennial kingdom which is nothing more than "the elegance and refinement of mere human civilization", and have so emphasized a reasonable "*Natural Theology*" that the reality of judgement is forgotten. Rather, declared Newman, "it would be a gain to this country, were it vastly more superstitious, more bigoted, more gloomy, more fierce in its religion". Such "tempers" are not desirable in themselves, but they are better than the false security of the sleeping Jonah, and pointed to the text that "Our God is a consuming fire" who will avenge the sins of the world.⁷¹

Indeed in his sermon on "Watching", Newman was one with Edward Cooper in insisting that the Christian life is one always lived in expectation of the Second Coming. We do not know the hour when He will come as a thief; but the difference between "double-minded or incomplete Christians" and perfect ones is between those who love "the fashions, the distinctions, the pleasures, the comforts of this life", and those who see all these as nothing in the light of Christ's return.⁷² In the sermon "Waiting for Christ", Newman

68. "England", December 18, 1832, *Verses on Various occasions* (London, 1868), pp.70-1.

69. "Christmas without Christ", *ibid.*, p.79.

70. Oliver, p.67 *et seq.* sums up these sermons: some of our quotations coincide.

71. "The Religion of the Day", *Parochial Sermons* 6 vols. (London, 1835-42), vol.1, pp.359, 361, 365-6, 370-2.

72. "Watching", *Parochial Sermons* (London, 1839), vol.IV, p.376.

acknowledged that past ages have erred in believing that Christ would come in their time, just as unbelievers have always held that the Church would soon be dead. Definiteness of dating was not in itself desirable: "Enthusiasts, sectaries, wild presumptuous men, *they* have said that He was *actually* come, or they have pointed out the exact year and day in which He would come". "Hence you find numbers running eagerly after men who profess to work miracles, or who denounce the Church as apostate..." Newman thereby repudiated those who had rejected the existing Church out of their prophetic vision, like Francis Newman and Irving. But while Newman stressed the need for the Church and sacraments, yet he insisted that "though time intervene between Christ's first and second coming, it is not *recognized* (as I may say) in the Gospel scheme, but is, as it were, an accident". Since Christ's first coming, Christians had lived in Apostolic times, in the last days; and as Christ may return at any time, so it is a thousand times better to believe that He is soon coming out of superstition, than to ignore the whole idea out of scepticism: it is "better to be wrong in our watching, than not to watch at all". And that state of watching, is, Newman declared, one of mingled fear and hope, of shrinking from the fire without, of hope that aflame with the fire of the spirit within, "the flame of judgement be to us only what it was to the Three Holy Children, over whom the fire had no power!"⁷³

Newman was here at one with most conservative Evangelicals, in seeing the spirit of Antichrist in the infidelity of political liberalism: indeed Newman made the Evangelical connexion between Liberalism and Popery as well, in the alliance between the political liberals and O'Connell's Irish Catholics.⁷⁴ Yet in the Advent sermons just quoted, the infidelity of liberalism has displaced Popery as the Antichrist of the age, an interpretation supported by S.R. Maitland, a sometime admirer of Edward Irving and later Lambeth librarian, who from 1826 subjected the whole historicist tradition deriving from Joseph Mede to a ruthless destructive analysis. As Maitland put his arguments in a tract of 1830,⁷⁵ all Christian writers before the twelfth century had identified the Antichristian apostasy not with an impure Christianity like Rome's, but with an "open, and blasphemous, and persecuting, infidelity" — the very view now so attractive to Newman. Again, in the traditional view, this apostasy would last a literal three years and a half, not 1,260 years worked out on Mede's wholly arbitrary year-a-day principle.⁷⁶

73. "Waiting for Christ", *Parochial Sermons* (London, 1842) vol. VI, pp. 254-76.

74. "I can hardly describe too strongly my feeling upon it. I had an unspeakable aversion to the policy and acts of Mr. O'Connell, because, as I thought, he associated himself with men of all religions and no religion against the Anglican Church, and advanced Catholicism by violence and intrigue..." Cf. his injunction in 1840 to Fr. Ignatius Spencer: "Break off, I would say, with Mr. O'Connell in Ireland and the liberal party in England..." *Apologia*, pp. 142, 144.

75. *An Attempt to elucidate the prophecies concerning Antichrist* (London, 1830). S.R. Maitland's ancestry was impeccably Dissenting, and chiefly Congregational.

76. *An Enquiry into the grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John has been supposed to consist of 1,260 years* (London, 1826). Also *A Second Enquiry into the Grounds on which the Prophetic Period of Daniel and St. John, has been supposed to consist of 1,260 years...* (London, 1829).

Moreover the early Church had expected an individual Antichrist at the end of the world, not a long succession of popes. This future figure was the "LITTLE HORN, the BEAST, the MAN OF SIN, the SON OF PERDITION, and the WICKED ONE". Nothing in the past history corresponded exactly with the literal application of the prophecies by divines from Mede to Faber, neither the succession of Empires, nor the ten heathen kingdoms, nor the Little Horn of the Pope, nor the Little Horn of Mahomet and his Moslem successors. Maitland had a wicked pen, and mocked the dogmatism and learning of those Protestant sages who so freely copied from one another. Ordinary people, he declared, were prepared to give these learned men a "cold assent", perhaps knowing nothing "about Justinian or Phocas — they are quite bewildered among the Ostrogoths and Wisigoths, the Sueves and Alanes, the Heruli and Turingi, the Huns and Lombards, and are glad to give them their ten kingdoms to get rid of them — with as little reserve they hand over the Turkish Sultanies (*sic*) to Ghelaluddaulas, Sadjduddaulas, *cognomine* Cutlumusus, Sjarfuddulas and Tagjuddaulas".⁷⁷ This sarcastic citation of Mede's sonorous litany of satrapies had the serious and scholarly point, that there was nothing about these later happenings laid down in Scripture, and little in the Fathers; and though Maitland was not strictly speaking a Tractarian, his scholarship and his sarcasm were alike acceptable to the Oxford Movement after 1833, as the new High Churchmen, with Newman at their head, sought a *Via Media* between two superstitious systems, that of Rome on the one hand and of popular Protestantism on the other.

But not all High Churchmen, let alone Protestants, were willing to abandon Newman's early view of the Roman Antichrist, even though the idea was repudiated by his two closest High Church associates, Hurrell Froude and Keble. In his poem on "Gunpowder Treason" in *The Christian Year*, Keble told his readers to treat Rome softly: "Speak *gently* of our sister's fall". Froude, a sentimental Jacobite who loved the Roman Breviary, disliked anti-Roman polemic and criticized Newman for indulging it. Indeed in *The Arians of the Fourth Century* of 1833, Newman declared Paul of Samosata one of St. Paul's many Antichrists, while deriving the papal apostasy, not from the medieval Church, but like some Anglican divines before him, from the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century.⁷⁸

It is, however, in the third volume of the *Letters and Diaries*, in Newman's correspondence from Italy in 1833, that there occurs a sudden resurgence of his apocalyptic interest, as the ruins of Rome represent to him the survival of the monstrous Fourth Beast of Daniel: "Here we see the only remnant of the 4 great Enemies of God — Babylon, Persia, and Macedon have left scarce a trace behind them — the last and most terrible beast lies before us as a subject for our contemplation, in all the visibleness of its plagues"

77. *An Attempt*, pp.1, 20-1. Cf. Newton, pp.550-1.

78. *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (London, 1871), pp.3, 259, 393-4, 474; cited Misner, "Newman and the Tradition", p.386.

(pp.248-9). But this is not the Roman Church but the pagan city of Rome, of which Newman is reminded by the obscene frescoes from Pompeii, which was overwhelmed (p.253) by the "strictly juridical" fire from Vesuvius like the cities of the plain, as an "offshoot" of the "hateful Roman power, the 4th Beast of Daniel's Vision". Writing from Rome, Newman recalled to Pusey Thomas Scott's reference to the sixteenth chapter of Revelation as a prophecy of the French Revolution and its attack upon the Roman Church, though Newman had forgotten that Scott had also doubted this. Newman also wondered if the 1,260 years of the Church's captivity could be dated from Constantine to the Reformation, and he suggested to Pusey the application of the six woes in Revelation Chapter 6 to the Roman state and city. But that was the rub: the Church was not the city, and the city was the Beast and not the Church. "I dismiss", wrote Newman, "the question of Antichrist, or [?] the difference of pagan and Christian Rome, altogether. If the persecuting ungodly spirit of the Iron Monster has got hold of and corrupted the Church, making use of it as a medium of its sorceries, is another point. If so, undoubtedly the Church too so far will suffer — but for this part of the subject I would rather turn to St. Paul's epistles, 2 Thess. ii etc. — but I mean that St. John is concerned with Rome as an existing place, and seat of rule, and thus completes what Daniel has left" (p.261). So the *future* Antichrist might be Roman, and even implicate the Pope through the secular power: but it was the Antichrist in the future which would then hold the Church in bondage. Certainly there was something like that bondage in the present. Newman, when present at a papal Mass, thought (p.268) of "the Church's uniting itself with that enemy of God, who from the beginning sat on the 7 hills, with an enchantress's cup, as the representative and instrument of the Evil Principle". The context of the remark is Newman's objection to the ceremonial kissing of the Pope's foot. Yet the Roman Church is still a Church with the marks of Christ upon her: "I could only say in very perplexity my own words, How shall I name thee, Light of the wide west, or heinous error-seat?" This fascinated ambiguity also appears in Newman's other Roman poetry:

Oh that thy creed were sound!

For thou dost soothe the heart, Thou Church of Rome...⁷⁹

His more careful consideration of the same problem appeared, first, in "Home Thoughts from Abroad" in 1833; Rome itself has an "exalted Church", but, "the monster of Daniel's vision", the "*Genius Loci*" of pagan Rome, the "Sorceress upon the Seven Hills, in the Book of Revelation, is not the Church of Rome, but Rome itself, the bad spirit, which, in its former shape, was the animating spirit of the Fourth (Roman imperial) Monarchy". Newman cited St. Malachy's famous prophecy of the future destruction of the city, and it was the *city*, or rather "the old dethroned Pagan monster, still living in the ruined city", that was Antichrist and sometimes invaded the papal Church and throne.⁸⁰ The same idea underlies Newman's four lectures

79. "The Good Samaritan", *Verses on Various Occasions*, p.131.

80. Cited *Apologia*, p.138.

on "The Patristical Idea of Antichrist", preached as Advent sermons in 1835, and published as Tract 83. They offer Maitland's futurist views as a consensus of the Fathers: Antichrist, the Little Horn, the Man of Sin, Daniel's infidel king, is an individual, not a power or kingdom, and will come after the Gospel has been preached to all the nations, in a time of tribulation, to persecute the saints for just three and a half years. He will probably be a Jew, and restore the Temple. But he is also on the patristic reading of the famous 666, "*Latinus*" the head of the revived Roman empire of the beasts of Daniel and Revelation, which still exists though dying in Europe in the present, for there had as yet been no complete fulfilment of the prophecies of the Empire's fall, or of its division into the ten kingdoms and their domination by the Little Horn. Again, though Babylon was undoubtedly Rome, the prophecy of its downfall had only been partially fulfilled, for the bishops of Rome had intervened with the barbarian invaders to save it from wholesale destruction.

It was, however, the idea of partial fulfilment, by types and symbols which were shadows of the fulness yet to come, that enabled Newman to hold on to a version of the papal Antichrist. Antichrist was only clearly the papacy, on Mede's historicist principles: on the strictly futurist understanding, Antichrist could *not* be the Pope. But as Paul and John had spoken of the mystery of iniquity at work even now, and of many Antichrists, forerunners of the last Antichrist of all, so Antiochus Epiphanes, Julian the Apostate and Mahomet were types of the Antichrist of futurist theory. So too, the spirit of pagan Rome, the mystic Babylon, still lurking in the ruins of the ancient city, had corrupted the Roman Church, teaching it to be "ambitious and cruel". But Rome the *city* was now Newman's Babylon, which was quite distinct from the institution that it sometimes corrupted, the Roman Church and see; and though as Antichrist's city, Rome would be destroyed by fire at the last, so, according to Our Lord, would be Jerusalem, like Sodom and Gomorrah and the supreme ancient prototype, old Babylon itself.

Indeed Newman's chief antagonist and Antichrist was no longer the Roman Church, but the contemporary political and intellectual liberalism, "that arrogant, ungodly, falsely liberal, and worldly spirit, which great cities make dominant in a country".⁸¹ This had been strikingly apparent in the French revolutionary worship of the goddess "LIBERTY", the pillage and destruction of the French churches and the spoliation of the Gallican clergy. In a postscript of 1838 to "The Patristical Idea", Newman cited with melancholy relish Bishop Horsley's prediction of the future persecution of Christians and the impending ruin of religious establishments; Newman found the same spirit at work in England among the radicals and utilitarians.

In this conservative repudiation of political and theological liberalism as

81. "The Patristical Idea of Antichrist", republished in *Discussions and Arguments on Various Subjects* (London, 1878), p.91.

a type of Antichrist, Newman was one with many Evangelicals as well as High Churchmen like Horsley. But again like Horsley, he had now replaced the papacy with Liberalism as the true figure of some future Little Horn, and he repudiated the idea of the Pope as Antichrist altogether in his *Letter to Professor Faussett* of 1838, indeed reinforcing in his second edition what Faussett had derided as the “flippant suggestion” that London could as well be the apocalyptic Babylon as Rome.⁸² In short, Newman was effacing the imaginative stain of the papal Antichrist, on a good antiliberal, conservative Evangelical principle: and on that principle he agreed with Faber and his erstwhile opponent Edward Cooper, whatever their difference about Napoleon.

Newman's last attempt to exorcise the antipapal ghost was his review of the *Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the writings of Daniel and St. Paul* by James Henthorn Todd, a Trinity College, Dublin, Professor, who wrote to dispel the overwhelmingly popular popish Antichrist of Irish Protestants. As Todd told Newman, he was attracted to the new Oxford High Churchmanship in the ultra Protestant environs of Trinity College,⁸³ and his work, which was dedicated to Maitland, identified the Little Horns of the fourth beast and he-goat with the infidel King of Daniel Chapter 11.⁸⁴ But because he saw the critical difficulties in simply applying these accounts to the exact history of Antiochus Epiphanes, as do more modern scholars, so on good patristic principles he followed Maitland in making the whole set of prophecies futurist, a prediction of the Antichrist to come at the end of the world. Todd afterwards apologised to Newman for attacking the typological Antichrists set forth in Newman's Tract 83,⁸⁵ as savouring “more of poetry than of theology”,⁸⁶ but he was critical of Newman for retaining, like the Fathers, the Roman Empire in his futurist scheme, when the Empire had now ceased to exist: my chief object”, he told Newman, “was to refute the theory

82. Misner, “Newman and the Tradition”, p.390; Gerard Tracey (ed.), *Letters and Diaries*, vol.VI (London, 1984), p.276.

83. “I have had intelligence from various parts of the Country of many clergymen who have made great strides towards Catholic views... (yet) I could not name more than three clergymen resident in Dublin, who are of my mind in Church matters – However we three have formed a sort of meeting at my rooms to read Church history and talk it over –... The most unpleasant part of it is, that, from the strange political union between Papists and Radicals here, most people fancy I have turned radical as well as Romanist, and of course that my object is to obtain preferment from the present ministry...” Todd to Newman, 15 April 1839, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham. I owe this reference to Gerard Tracey.

84. Lecture IV, pp.133-188, on “The Prophecy of the Wilful King”: and particularly p.144, in *Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the writings of Daniel and St. Paul: preached before the University of Dublin at the Donnellan Lecture*, M.DCCC.XXXVIII (Dublin, 1840).

85. Todd told Newman, 18 June 1840, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham: “I have often since regretted that I was led to express my dissent with what I quoted from Tract 83 – for as you justly remark we have enough to fight with without taking a ‘fling’ at each other – I fear I had no better motive in attacking you, than to endeavour to shew my ultra protestant assailants that I was not sold body and soul to ‘the Oxford Tracts’, as many of them thought, and that I could venture to differ from the ‘Tractarians’.” Also Todd to Newman, 21 May 1839, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham.

86. Todd, *Discourses on the Prophecies*, pp.255-6.

of Mede... wch. is the basis of the Protestant interpretations — and to shew that the discarded system of the antient Church was more consistent with Scripture and with itself...”⁸⁷ Newman considered Todd, however, unlike most prophetic writers, “methodical, careful, and accurate in his investigations”, indeed with a tendency, if anything, to prove too little: but his interest was not in the detailed historical arguments but their wider moral significance. Newman disclaimed any learnings to Romanism: “we owe her of late years nothing at all”, he wrote, “except indeed, according to the Scripture rule, love for hatred...”⁸⁸ But the true test of her Antichristian character was holiness: could she produce saints? “Who, indeed, but the like of ascetic Daniel, much-suffering Paul, and contemplative John, will suffice to establish the paradox that Carlo Borromeo sucked the breast of Babylon, and that Pascal died in her arms?...”⁸⁹ Protestants were therefore impaled on a dilemma; they had either to deny the force of the prophecies about Antichrist by acknowledging that Roman saints were obviously saved, like à Kempis, or to strain credulity by denying their sanctity, with the assurance that “every one who has lived or died in that communion is utterly and irretrievably perished for ever.”⁹⁰

Yet it was on that very score of holiness that Newman now found his former mentor Bishop Newton wanting, as a notorious preferment-seeker, ecclesiastical careerist and pluralist, “who cast a regretful look back upon his dinner when he was at supper, and anticipated his morning chocolate in his evening muffins, who will say that this is the man, not merely to unchurch, but to smite, to ban, to wither the whole of Christendom for many centuries ... will it be pleasant to have exchanged St. Chrysostom for Newton...? Is this good company to live and die in? Who would not rather be found even with Whitfield (*sic*) and Wesley, than with ecclesiastics whose life is literary ease at the best, whose highest heights attain but to Downing Street or the levee?”⁹¹ Here Newman speaks in the accents of the otherworldly Evangelical, as a Wesley, denouncing in Newton the corruptions of an eighteenth-century Church establishment given over to lax worldliness.

Yet Newman was not attacking establishment himself: rather, he was also arguing on another level of *tu quoque*, that the charge that Rome was Antichrist bore with equal weight upon the Church of England. A Sandemanian, a Ranter or a Quaker might call Rome Babylon, but this argument was not open to Anglicans. If Rome was Antichrist as an establishment, then so was Canterbury, which bore all the other marks of the beast, an episcopal hierarchy, an Apostolic Succession, priesthood, formal worship and sacraments. “(Oh, Dr. Newton!)”, exclaimed Newman when he discovered

87. Todd to Newman, 13 June 1840, Newman papers, The Oratory, Birmingham.

88. “The Protestant Idea of Antichrist”, republished in *Essays Critical and Historical*, 2 vols. (London, 1871), vol.II, pp.112, 114.

89. *Ibid.*, p.134.

90. Newman citing Todd, *ibid.*, p.150.

91. *Ibid.*, pp.138-40.

that worldly prelate decrying popery for making "a gain of godliness, and teaching for *filthy lucre's* sake": "we think no English divine does us a service who so vaguely delineates Antichrist that at a little distance his picture looks not very unlike ourselves." Nor did even the Kirk escape this "frightful imputation". "We have", wrote Newman, a

strange paper before us, ... written by a late Fellow of a College in the University of Oxford, which, after deciding that the first Beast [of Revelation] is the Papacy, the seven horns the seven sacraments, ... goes on to say, that the second Beast is the Queen's supremacy, the two horns like a lamb, are the two Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, the image to the first Beast, the book of Common Prayer, the name of the second Beast the supreme head of the Church, and ends by warning the Kirk that the Queen's High Commissioner in the General Assembly 'sits there, as in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God'...

Thus Newton's arguments "involve the Primitive Church, our own, the Kirk — nay, all sects and denominations whatever, — in one common ruin",⁹² insofar as they all stand forth as Christ's representatives with officers who preach and administer the sacraments in His name, as Christ himself.

What then of Baxter's jibe that "If the Pope was not Antichrist, he had bad luck to be so like him"? It was this imaginative likeness which had so struck Newman as a young man, and from which he was still fighting to be free. Newman replied that as the Antichrist simulates Christ, it is the counterfeit, so like the real Christ, which deceives. Rome, in brief, will look like Christ, as she also looks like Antichrist, just as the real coin resembles the forgery. But Anglicans cannot call Rome Antichrist if they acknowledge her ministry and sacraments, and though modern Roman Catholics are "a low-minded, double-dealing, worldly-minded set", this was not so in the glory of her saints.⁹³

But as Paul Misner has shown,⁹⁴ Newman's true imaginative liberation comes in his conclusion, a curiously literal inversion of Protestant prophecy, in finding in the medieval Church, not a realization of Antichrist, but an "Imperial Church", anticipated in the glorious prophecies concerning Israel of old. Her "wealth and splendour, the rich embellishment of her temples, the jewelled dress of her ministers, the offerings, shrines, pageants, and processions", were not the purple and pearls of the sorceress of Revelation, but the camels and gold and incense and cedar from Midian and Ephah, Sheba and Lebanon, Isaiah's vision of the kings and ships and isles bringing gifts, and the "*sapphires*" and "*agates*" of the heavenly Jerusalem.⁹⁵ Newman did not, of course, insist on these prophecies *de fide*: rather, he offered them as an imaginative antidote to his now fading image of the

92. *Ibid.*, pp.165-70.

93. *Ibid.*, pp.173, 180.

94. Paul Misner, "The Imperial Image of the Church", in *Papacy and Development*, pp.50-7.

95. "The Protestant Idea of Antichrist", pp.184-5.

whore. But he does not seem to doubt their actual fulfilment: in that literalism, he remained an Evangelical, whatever else he had become.

As a Roman Catholic, Newman lost interest in prophecy, though he republished his Anglican writings on the subject with the exception of his review of Cooper.⁹⁶ This contrasts with his future fellow Cardinal, the ex-Evangelical Henry Edward Manning who like Newman before him predicted, but on the basis of texts taken from Suarez and Malvenda, in a work disliked in Rome, that the city would apostatize from Catholic Christianity.⁹⁷ Newman's enduring Evangelicalism, however, was a curiously complex one. For all Bishop Newton's influence upon him, he was never much interested in the Mede-Newton-Faber crossword puzzle mentality of texts tied down fast to a detailed literal history. His early position had been historicist, on Newton's view of the historical papal Antichrist: but his own tentative explorations of allegory and typology enabled him to avoid too sharp a transition from historicism to futurism, so that the Pope's Antichristian character, as a foreshadowing of Antichrist, under the baleful influence of the pagan city of Rome, remained with him, even while his antiliberalism, which showed him a present Antichrist, made him reluctant to jettison the idea that the Pope was in some degree involved. He shared the conservative Evangelical temper of Faber, in identifying the Antichrist with the democratic infidelity which stemmed from the French Revolution and it was that infidel Antichrist which expelled from his mind the Antichrist of Popery. He retained most of his Evangelical otherworldliness, unlike his brother, Francis, who came to repudiate millennialism precisely because it denigrated all efforts at social, intellectual and political improvement:⁹⁸ indeed Francis Newman ended up

96. See Newman to B.M. Pickering, 5 January 1871, C.S. Dessain and Thomas Gornall (eds.), *Letters and Diaries*, vol.XXV (London, 1973), p.263. See, however, *Letters and Diaries*, vol.XIX, pp.420-3, 430-4, vol.XXII, pp.69-70, for examples of his abiding otherworldliness.

97. See E.S. Purcell, *Life of Cardinal Manning Archbishop of Westminster* 2 vols. (London, 1895), vol.2, pp.153-60.

For another Roman Catholic reaction to prophecy, see E.S. Purcell, *Life and Letters of Ambrose Phillipps de Lisle*, 2 vols. (London, 1900), vol.I, pp.7, 29, for an account of a conversion to Catholicism posited on the premise that Mahomet and not the Pope was the Antichrist.

Among later Anglo-Catholic prophetic writings, the most celebrated is Edward Bouverie Pusey's *Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford* (sixth edition, London, 1880), written as an attack on the Higher Critical view of Daniel as a Maccabean production, and retaining both (pp.102-63) the older orthodox conception of the four Empires as culminating in the Roman, and (pp.92-8) the idea that the infidel king of Chapter 11 is a reference to the Antichrist to come.

98. "Those who stick closest to the scripture do not shrink from saying, that 'it is not worth while trying to mend the world', and stigmatize as 'political and worldly' such as pursue an opposite course. Undoubtedly, if we are to expect our master at cockcrow, we shall not study the permanent improvement of this transitory scene. To teach the certain speedy destruction of earthly things, as the *New Testament* does, is to cut the sinews of all earthly progress; to declare war against Intellect and Imagination, against Industrial and Social advancement." Francis Newman, *Phases of Faith: or, Passages from the History of my Creed* (London, 1860), p.136; cited David Hempton, "George Eliot: The Exorcism of an Evangelical Ghost", unpublished paper, from the author.

exactly the kind of cranky progressive world-improver which his brother John Henry most despised. His application of the Israel prophecies to the medieval Church is a straight reversion to historicism, a repudiation of one historicist theory in the name of another. We may be reminded of Richard Baxter, who denied that the Pope was Antichrist, and rejected a future Millennium, but shared with pre- and post-millennialists a belief in the coming of Christ, an immediate day of judgement and the subsequent reward of the righteous,⁹⁹ the whole eschatological vision of Christ as ruler and judge. Like Baxter, Newman had no great concern about the millennium itself, and confronted with the recent York Minster fire, he would have come to no certain conclusion: but he would have been quite sure that such a judgement was no better than any unbelieving generation deserves.

SHERIDAN GILLEY

REVIEWS

Radical Religion in the English Revolution. Edited by J.F. McGregor and B. Reay, pp.219. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1984. £19.50

If there was a time when the radical Reformation and its heritage was relatively neglected, as seems to be generally agreed, that time is past. Interest in the radical movements of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is now world wide, as is evidenced by this book, edited by two scholars, one in Australia and one in New Zealand.

A serious question to be raised is: What is "radical religion"? Is there any other kind of religion? Broadly speaking we know what we mean by the phrase, but should we be content to speak broadly? Even in this well-organized book, with a careful introductory chapter, one discerns various forces at work which were not all tending in the same direction. What is the relation between theological and ecclesiastical radicalism? Is there not a tension between reliance on the Scriptures and appeal to the immediate guidance of the Spirit? And how far does religious radicalism coincide with political and social?

The authors whose work appears in this book do not all agree on the answers to such questions. J.F. McGregor on "The Baptists: Fount of all Heresy" comes near to providing a general history of the Baptists in the 1640s and his chapter is much the longest in the book, with an emphasis on

99. William Lamont, *Richard Baxter and the Millennium* (London, 1979), p.55. Cf. Harrison, p.226: "The popular millenarian was distinctive not because of his beliefs but because for him the millennium was more than a matter of hymn singing. His belief in prophecies, providences, Satan, and the literal truth of the scriptures was shared by the majority of his fellow Christians ... The cultural matrix of evangelical Protestantism made the claims of the millenarians seem more formidable than they do now."

the social character of this rather inchoate movement and a particular interest in the criticisms levelled by disgruntled Presbyterians like Robert Baillie. He demonstrates that most if not all of the wilder heresies of the period sprang out of the womb of the Baptists; or perhaps it is that the wilder heretics, as well as others, included rejection of infant baptism among their tenets. Another chapter by the same author carries the story to the Seekers and the Ranters.

Brian Manning writes about the religion of the Levellers and G.E. Aylmer on that of Gerrard Winstanley. Even restriction to a single person does not make everything easy, since like so many of his contemporaries Winstanley shifted his position considerably as time went by.

B. Reay's chapter on Quakerism and Society is an important social study of the Quakers in the days of their infancy, with the conclusion that the Quaker impact was "somewhat negative", stimulated "political conservatism", and provided "a shot in the arm" to the reaction which was to lead to the Restoration. Bernard Capp's chapter on "The Fifth Monarchists and Popular Millenarianism" takes the reader to the wilder frontiers of radical religion, while pointing out that the journey from more familiar territory was not all that long: "Popular millenarianism seemed to involve only a small step from orthodoxy".

It is remarkable that the chapter in some ways least satisfactory is that by Christopher Hill on "Irreligion in the 'Puritan' Revolution". The quotation marks indicate that it presents a thesis: that the so-called Puritan revolution was in important respects a secularist revolution, against religion and not simply against the established religion. It cannot be said to make out a very convincing case. Dr. Hill collects quotations and anecdotes which illustrate many things, but rarely a rejection of all religion. It does not indicate atheism to say that the commons "would never be well till they had stricken off all the priests' heads", to refer to the consecrated bread in the sacrament as "Jack in the Box", to believe that there were men before Adam, to deny the existence of hell, to call Moses a juggler, to allow laymen to preach, to ridicule aged and infirm clergymen, however regrettable we may find any or all of these acts.

Dr. Hill finds evidence of materialism in this period, but sees it issuing in the writings of Overton, Winstanley, Ranters, Muggletonians; a catalogue which sufficiently qualifies the term. "Another road towards the rejection of traditional Christianity", he tells us, "was antinomianism"; true enough, but he promised us not "the rejection of traditional Christianity" but "irreligion". Dr. Hill's chapter is of course as valuable as any, but the contents do not fit the description on the packet. Sometimes what he writes seems in contradiction to the conclusions reached by other writers in the volume — on Winstanley, for instance — who probably all regard themselves as Hill's disciples. They are among many who draw inspiration from his work; but sometimes, if not perhaps often, disciples can correct their masters.

STEPHEN MAYOR

Reformed World (Vol.38, Nos.1-4)

These issues contain a commemorative article on Ulrich Zwingli who was born in 1484; it is by Prof. Gottfried Locher, a distinguished scholar who has specialised in Zwinglian studies. There is also a detailed report of addresses at a World Alliance of Reformed Churches Consultation in Cairo on "Called to witness to the Gospel To-day". Our own Dr. Alan Sell has contributed two articles, one on Reformed conversations with Anglicans and Baptists, and one on the Reformed response to *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*.

Proceedings of the Wesley Historical Society (Vol.XLIV, Part 4)

This issue has an article on "Nineteenth-century Methodist College Principals" by Kenneth D. Brown; this makes an interesting parallel to Dr. Brown's article in our issue of May 1984 on "Ministerial Leakage in the Nineteenth Century".

The Baptist Quarterly (Vol.XXX, Nos.5-8)

The life and work of John Smyth runs through all these issues. Smyth (c.1565-1612) was successively a Puritan, a Separatist, a Baptist and an Anabaptist. There is an article by J.F.V. Nicholson on what it might mean if there were to be a move "Towards a Theology of Episcopate among Baptists". Dr. Nuttall writes on the Baptist Churches and their ministers in the 1790's.

R.B.K.