

The Church Tradition of Historicism

Tract c20

ChristianEschatology.com

"Historicism is a method of interpretation in Christian eschatology which attempts to associate biblical prophecies with actual historical events and identify symbolic beings with historical persons or societies. The Historicist school of prophetic interpretation results in a progressive and continuous fulfillment of prophecy....."
"The main texts of interest are apocalyptic literature, such as the Book of Daniel and the Book of Revelation, and historicist methods have been applied to ancient Jewish history, the Roman Empire, Mohammedism, the Papacy, the Modern era and even into the End time." - Wikipedia

Thus Jews and Christians take a historicist approach to Old Testament Bible prophecy. Available evidence suggests historicism was also the approach through which the church understood New Testament prophecy was being fulfilled, up until the 19th century, when the approaches of preterism and futurism began to come into vogue. Thus among

the four approaches to prophetic interpretation, historicism is the one that can be considered *traditional*, while also employing a *uniform* approach to *all* bible prophecy. Through this traditional approach 1900 years of otherwise unavailable Christian era history opens up for consideration, as historical fulfillment of New Testament prophecy, while embracing over 1800 years of Christian era historicist tradition.

Importantly, this allows consideration of the 7th century antichrist false prophet Muhammad in the role of **THE** false prophet referenced in the Book of Revelation, and thus his Islamic kingdom "beast" as the final foe of God's people. This shouldn't really be a surprise considering that one-quarter of mankind in the world today are filled with complete resolve to specifically **DIS**believe the whole subject of the Gospel, **DENY** the Son of God, and **REJECT** His shed blood, *as articles of their faith* in the false prophet Muhammad alone. Let alone that Muhammad commanded his followers to fight, conquer and subjugate specifically Jews and Christians, as well as the rest of mankind, to disbelieving, denying and rejecting the same.

The traditional historicist approach has been largely ignored in modern times, in part because it has been employed by some cults that are noted for Roman Church bashing. While not supported directly through scripture, it shouldn't be a surprise to find that some of the Reformers desired to at least pencil in the papacy as a possibility for the role of "The"

"Antichrist", with the smell of the burning flesh of their brethren still in the air. The SDAs (William Miller - Ellen White) and some other historicists, continue to bash the Roman Church today, primarily because of the historical persecution of Christians and scripturally unsupportable RC traditions. However, at least through the four verses that include the term "antichrist", it is beyond difficult to qualify the Roman Church as being such.

Christians on Islam in Prophecy

Of Revelation chapter 9: John Foxe who authored Foxe's Book of Martyrs wrote that it is "clearer than light itself" as being a prophecy of the Muslim conquests.

Albert Barnes: "With surprising unanimity, commentators have agreed in regarding this to the empire of the Saracens (Muslims), or to the rise and the progress of the religion and the empire set up by Muhammed."

W.B. Godbey: "This chapter is a thrilling description of the rise and progress of the Mohammedan wars."

Of the locusts of Revelation 9:

Adam Clarke wrote: "certainly agrees better with the Saracens than with any other people or nation" and "agrees very well with the troops of Mohammed."

Matthew Henry: "the armies of the Mohamedan empire."

John Wesley: "All this agrees with the slaughter which the Saracens made for a long time after Mahomet's death."

Reformers on the "time of the end"

Great men of God of the Reformation like Matthew Henry and Isaac Newton understood that the "time of the end" to which Daniel's prophecy refers was yet in their future, and thus the book of Daniel was still sealed, so they knew they were precluded from gaining a complete understanding of it. Yet consider the excitement that 17th century Matthew Henry expressed, when anticipating the "time of the end" in his future, in which we may well find ourselves today:

"VI. That this prophecy of those times, though sealed up now, would be of great use to those that should live then, v. 4. Daniel must now shut up the words and seal the book..... He must seal the book because it would not be understood.....till the things contained in it were accomplished..... Those things of God which are now dark and obscure will hereafter be made clear, and easy to be understood..... Truth is the daughter of time. Scripture prophecies will be expounded by the accomplishment of them; therefore they are given, and for that explication they are reserved."

Isaac Newton: "This Prophecy is called the Revelation, with respect to the scripture of truth, which Daniel was commanded to shut up and seal, till the time of the end. Daniel sealed it until the time of the end; {Daniel 12:4, 9} and until that time comes, the Lamb is opening the seals:.... All which is as much as to say, that these Prophecies of Daniel and John should not be

understood till the time of the end: But in the very end, the Prophecy should be so far interpreted as to convince many."

If Matthew Henry or Isaac Newton were around today would they have difficulty recognizing this Islamic Second Jihad as being in the image of the First Islamic Jihad, with Muhammad as the false prophet of the book of Revelation, and his Islamic kingdom "beast" as the final foe of God's people. Since most Christians are unfamiliar with the traditional historicist approach as applied to New Testament prophecy, as the Reformers did, it's important to set aside doctrine rather than trying to wring this entirely separate approach through a filter of pre-conceived notions or doctrine. A complete Dan-Rev study within this traditional historicist approach is available, and presented as a brick by brick empirical argument, that's free and fun to read. A PDF of "The False Prophet" by Ellis Skoldfield is available on the author's website at EllisSkoldfield.com, with an html version along with PDFs of the book in several languages, at BeholdTheBeast.com

Futurism and preterism essentially preclude even considering 1900 years of Christian era history as having any relevance to prophesy in the book of Revelation (after chapter 3), while the traditional historicist approach leads to a hermeneutically irresistible conclusion that Muhammad is an excellent fit as the false prophet, and his Islamic

kingdom "beast" as the final foe of God's people.

The False Prophet

Considering an entirely separate approach to New Testament prophecy is difficult, since we tend to filter what we read through familiar doctrine, rather than offer it a chance to stand entirely on its own merit before comparing. Since the history of the Christian era is essentially unavailable to preterists and futurists, their approaches to the Book of Revelation *necessarily preclude them from even considering*, that Muhammad could be **THE** false prophet, and his Islamic kingdom "beast" the final foe of God's people.

This even though Muhammad's followers are taught that the single most "heinous" and *only unforgivable sin* ("shirk") in the false prophet Muhammad's anti-religion would be committed, if a Muslim were to confess that Jesus is the Son of God, or even to pray in Jesus' name. Here's the false prophet Muhammad on the Gospel:

Quran Surah 19:88 They say: "(Allah) Most Gracious has begotten a son!" 89 Indeed ye have put forth a thing most monstrous!

Surah 4:157 That they said (in boast), "We killed Christ Jesus..... but they killed him not, nor crucified him..... for of a surety they killed him not.

For a PDF on Muhammad's Islamic kingdom "beast" in prophecy, see **tract c19** at: ChristianEschatology.com For more on Muhammad's counter-Gospel anti-religion: FalseProphetMuhammad.com